The Book of the Twelve Prophets Section

The King in the Book of the Twelve

Paul L. Redditt
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky 40324

The books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles describe the rise and fall of the Israelite monarchy, and they often portray encounters between kings and prophets. Likewise the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah discuss the kings and portray those two prophets engaged in face-to-face encounters with them at times. The book of Psalms too reveals an interest in the king and articulates a royal theology. One might expect a similar interest in the king in the Book of the Twelve, at least among the pre-exilic prophets. A reading of the Twelve for its perspective(s) on the king, however, reveals surprisingly little of the same interest, though obviously the king is not ignored.

How, then, does the Twelve treat the monarchy? Is there any commonality or development in its overall treatment of the king? This article will survey the views of the king in the Book of the Twelve looking for the answer to this question. In doing so it will begin with an overview of texts outside the Twelve concerning the king to form a backdrop for studying the portrayal of the king in the Twelve. It will argue that in the various collections[1] that comprise the Twelve individual kings were typically viewed negatively, though a few texts expressed hope for the future of the monarchy.

In this paper, this author will accept the conclusions of various scholars that at least three precursors to the Twelve appeared during its growth. The precursors consisted of an early exilic "Book of the Four" (Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah), which probably had gone through stages of growth itself; a jointly redacted Nahum and Habakkuk; and the post-exilic work Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, and Malachi (minus the last three verses), which probably had begun with the jointly redacted Haggai-Zechariah 1-8. This discussion will begin with the king in the Book of the Four; continue with Nahum-Habakkuk; and then take up Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, before turning to Haggai—Zechariah 1-8—Malachi . It will conclude with a discussion of the king in Zechariah 9-14, quite possibly the last major addition to the Twelve and its capstone. By following this procedure, the article will be able to keep track of varying perceptions of the king in the individual collections, the precursors, and the Twelve as a whole.

Specifically, one finds a range of views in the Twelve. Both Hosea and Amos were critical of the king of Israel, though a pre-exilic redactor of both was pro-Davidic. Passages in eighth-century Micah are anti-Jerusalem and anti-king, though Mic 5:1-3 (Engl. 5:2-4) looks for a new Davidic king. Hab 3:3-15 remembers the salvation of God's people and God's anointed in the past, but the reference to him is too muted to tie vv. 3-15 to the pro-Davidic redactor. The king is simply missing from Zephaniah, Nahum, Joel, Obadiah, and Malachi. In Jonah, however, a post-exilic narrative placed in a pre-exilic setting, the Assyrian king was a foil for the domestic king Jeroboam II. In Haggai and

[1] In this paper, the Book of the Twelve will be treated as an edited unity; the individual collections attributed to the different prophets will be called "collections" not "books" for the sake of clarity.

Zechariah a new king is anticipated, but Zechariah 9-14 offers a sober re-evaluation of the royal family and implicitly even of the hopes pinned to it.

I. Backdrop for the Study of the King in the Book of the Twelve

The rise and history of the monarchy stand front and center in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. In them some prophets criticized the king: e. g., Nathan (2 Sam 12:1-15), Elijah (1 Kgs 18), Micaiah ben Imlah (1 Kgs 22; 2 Chr 18), Elisha (2 Kgs 3). Others were decidedly pro-monarchical: e. g., Gad (2 Sam 24; 1 Chr 21), Ahijah (1 Kgs 11:29-31), the anonymous prophet who predicted victory for Ahab in battle against King Ben-Hadad of Aram (1 Kgs 20:13-22) and the four hundred prophets of Ahab (1 Kgs 22:5-6). Likewise, the books of Isaiah (chap. 7) and Jeremiah (chaps. 22 and 34) speak about monarchs and even portray those two prophets engaging monarchs face to face.

Things changed in the prophetic literature with the Exile, when the Babylonians removed the king of Judah to Babylon. Even the exilic book of Ezekiel, however, envisions the restitution of the monarchy under God (Ezek 34:23; 37:24-25), albeit one reduced in power (the king is called a "prince" in 34:24 and 37:25) and clearly subordinate to the priests in temple affairs (46:1-2). The exiled priest/prophet Ezekiel could look to Jehoiachin, a descendant of David who had ruled in Jerusalem briefly, as a companion in exile, though Ezekiel's vision for the future included a monarch with markedly less power than in pre-exilic days (Ezekiel 45:7-9).

The king also figured significantly in the book of Psalms, but does so in the context of YHWH as king. J. J. M. Roberts identifies three main points in the Zion Tradition: "(1) Yahweh, the god of Israel, is the suzerain over all the world, (2) Yahweh has chosen David and his dynasty as God's human agents for the divine rule, and (3) Yahweh has chosen Jerusalem/Zion as God's imperial city, as the site of God's imperial throne and earthly abode."[2] The first claim, though self-serving for the Israelite monarchy, located God's rulership in creation, i.e., prior to the rise of kingship, and at times undermined the claims of the monarchs. Proclamations of God's rulership seem to have been taken over at least in part from the imperial claims of the great emperors, and stand closest to the claims made by the Persians.[3]

Clearly in the Zion Tradition, however, God as king had a special person through whom God exercised rulership, namely David (and his descendents).[4] A number of

---

[2] J. J. M. Roberts, "God's Imperial Reign According to the Psalter," *HBT* 23,2 (2001) 212. Cf. his "Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire," in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (ed. Tomoo Ishida; Tokyo: Yamakura-Shuppansha, 1982) 93-108. James Luther Mays (*The Lord Reigns; A Theological Handbook to the Psalms* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994] 13) goes even further, arguing that the phrase יהוה מלך ("YHWH reigns" or "YHWH is king") is the "center" of the Psalter. Cf. William P. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms: A Theology of Metaphor* (Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox, 2002) 29-30.

[3] Erhard S. Gerstenberger, "'World Dominion' in Yahweh Kingship Psalms: Down to the Roots of Globalizing Concepts and Strategies," *HBT* 23,2 (2001) 192-210.

[4] Mays, *The Lord Reigns,* 19.

Psalms celebrate David: e.g., 2, 20, 21, 45, 72, 89, 101, 132 and 144:1-11. Others affirm that God chose him to be king (Ps 89:3, 20, 35), and the kings in Jerusalem are his seed. The phrase "son of God" was applied to the king metaphorically (Ps 2:7). In the act of coronation, the king is called to sit at God's right hand (Ps 89:27). The king therefore is sometimes addressed directly as "my Lord" (Ps 110:1).[5] In the coronation, the king received the charisma and commission of God to rule on God's behalf. He conducted this rulership under the authority of God, and it included bringing *shalom* (peace, wholeness) to the land and to the people.[6] Of particular note for this paper is the insistence that the king was responsible for justice (see, for example, Ps 82:3 and 89:15, Engl. 89:14), a motif that appeared also in the discussions of the king in Isa 9:7, Jer 22:15 and 23:5. The superscriptions in the Psalms attributed to David derive from Samuel with but one exception. They serve to accentuate David, idealizing the earthier David portrayed in Samuel and turning him into a figure whom the reader should emulate.[7] Finally, the royal songs appear to be additions or insertions into the "books" within the Psalter. Thus in the book of Psalms as a finished product they have moved beyond their cultic function and have developed a secondary, messianic function.[8]

What about the prophetic voices heard in the Twelve? Viewed against this backdrop, how did they relate to or speak of the kings? Interestingly, not one prophet is portrayed dealing directly with a king. Even though the pre-exilic prophets included among the Twelve flourished in Jerusalem and Samaria and even in royal sanctuaries, the king is never present in those collections. Indeed, they say remarkably little about the king, some nothing at all. The next section of this paper will survey the collections named for those six prophets. It will begin with four (Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah) that bear marks of a common editing, then turn to two others (Nahum and Habakkuk) that also show signs of a common editing different from the first. In none of the six will the king play a prominent role.

II. The King in the Pre-exilic Prophets in the Book of the Twelve

---

[5] Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986) 108-110.

[6] Ibid., p. 119.

[7] James D. Nogalski, "Reading David in the Psalter: A Study in Liturgical Hermeneutics," *HBT* 23 (2001) 190.

[8] Claus Westermann, "Zur Sammlung des Psalters," *Forschung am Altern Testament; Gesammelte Studien* (TB 24; Munich: Kaiser, 1964) 342.

For decades now scholars researching the Twelve[9] have posited an original precursor, a so-called "Book of the Four." Similar superscriptions in Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah, as well as other indicators of common editing, suggest that these collections came together after the fall of Jerusalem to explain its destruction.[10] Much in them, however, arose from the mid-eighth to the early-sixth centuries, so they will be treated as pre-exilic collections in what follows. It will be necessary, however, to distinguish the pre-exilic from the latter perspectives within the collections.

The King in Hosea. The superscription (1:1) sets the prophet's career during the reign of Jeroboam II of Israel, as well as the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah of Judah. Since there is no obvious reason to date a northern prophet in terms of southern kings, and since Hosea's career is routinely understood by scholars to stretch past the reign of Jeroboam down to 725 or a little later, one must assume that the superscription was added in Judah, probably as part of the editing process that resulted in the Book of the Four.[11] An obvious editorial addition favoring the Davidic monarchy also appears in the first-person narrative of Hosea's marriage (3:5aβ).[12] Albertz thinks that the

---

[9] Research on this issue is so voluminous that the reader is referred to Nogalski's treatment of the topic in *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 217; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1993) 3-12. See also Aaron Schart (*Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs* [BZAW 260; Berlin, new York: de Gruyter, 1998] 50-155), who advanced the theory with the suggestion that there was earlier what might be called a "Book of the Two" that included Amos and Hosea. Cf. Jörg Jeremias, "The Interrelationship between Amos and Hosea," *Forming Prophetic Literature; Essay on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* (ed. James W. Watts, Paul R. House; JSOTSup 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1996) 171-86. That issue is not crucial for this paper, however. Surveys of the history of this research include Paul L. Redditt, "Recent Research on the Book of the Twelve as One Book," *CurBS* 9 (2001) 47-880. For a discussion focused on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature, see Paul L. Redditt, "The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Review of Research," *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (ed. Paul L. Redditt, Aaron Schart; BZAW 325; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2003) 1-26.

[10] Nogalski, *Literary Precursors,* 278-9. Cf. Rainer Albertz, "Exile as Purification: Reconstructing the Book of the Four (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah)," *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (ed. Paul L. Redditt, Aaron Schart; BZAW 325; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2003) 237-250; for a full discussion, see Rainer Albertz, *Die Exilszeit: Das 6. Jahrhundert.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001) 117-85.

[11] So Albertz, "Exile as Purification," 245-50. For the purpose of this paper, it may remain open whether the redactor of the Four worked under Deuteronomistic influences as argued by Nogalski (*Literary Precursors,* 76-79 and elsewhere) and denied by Ehud ben Zvi ('Twelve Prophetic Books or 'The Twelve': A Few Preliminary Considerations," *Forming Prophetic Literature* [ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; JSOTSup 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1996] 125-56).

[12] Hans Walter Wolff (*Hosea* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974] 57-64) argues that 3:4-5 belong with 3:1-3 as constituent parts of a genre called the *memorabile.*

rest of Hos 3:3-5 was programmatic for the theology of the redactor of the Book of the Four, which he argues consisted of Hosea 1-14 (minus 2:1-3, 20, 23-25; 3:5ab); Amos 1:1-9:10; Mic 1:1, 3-3:12; 5:9-13 [Engl. 5:10-14]; and Zeph 1:1-3:13.

The most remarkable text in Hosea about the king, however, is 13:11: "As for me, I gave you a king in my anger, and I removed [him] in my wrath." In other words, monarchy was never a good idea (cf. 1 Sam 8), and losing the king was both justified and salvific. This is a text attributed neither by Nogalski, Schart, nor Albertz to the Book of the Four. Nevertheless, there is a connection. Albertz identifies one primary motif of the redactor as "purification by exile." He finds the hand of this redactor not only in Hos 3:3-5, but also in Amos 9:7-10, Mic 1:5b-7, 13b and 5:9-13, and in Zeph 1:4-6 and 3:1-13. These texts, along with Hos 14:2-5 which he took over, proclaim YHWH's ongoing purifying judgments, by which YHWH separates Israel and Judah from all the things and persons that led them to sin against him, including the cult, idols, the kingdom, weapons, fortresses, and even the upper class. These purifying acts reach their climax in the Exile and determine Israel's new start after the exile, Albertz concludes.[13] Hosea 13:11, then, offered an anchor for this theology in the earlier message of Hosea, which saw the king of Israel as highly problematic and his removal as necessary.

A similar disdain for the kings of Israel appears twice elsewhere in Hosea. In the first (7:7), the prophet reflects on the character of Israel's rebellion against God by observing that the northern kingdom had devoured their kings, all of whom had fallen. That verse seems to have in mind the downfall of the northern monarchy in 724. A few verses later (8:4) one reads another divine comment on the northern kings: "They made kings, but not through me; they set up princes, but without my acquaintance." This verse perhaps had in view the years 746-737, when Israel went through six kings and several dynasties in less than a decade. So, these verses articulate opposition to northern kings and even the institution of the monarchy by Hosea.

The King in Amos. Like Hosea, Amos was also dated by the Redactor of the Four in terms of the kings under whom he flourished: Uzziah of Judah (mentioned first) and Jeroboam II of Israel. The Judean redaction of the collection continues in v. 2, which emphasizes that God speaks from Zion/Jerusalem.[14] The collection concludes (9:11-15) with a clearly Judean hope for the restitution of the fallen Davidic dynasty, a passage that Schart thinks fits well with Haggai and Zechariah and may have been appended to Amos later than the production of the Book of the Four.[15]

Two other texts, however, speak of the king and deserve attention here: Amos 6:5 and 7:10-17. Amos 6:5 appears in a woe oracle condemning the indolently wealthy. It pronounces a woe upon those "singing idle songs to the sound of the harp," and "like

---

Nevertheless, the references to "David their king" are so blatantly Judaic that one must attribute it to a later redactor.

[13] Albertz, "Exile as Purification," 245-250.

[14] Jörg Jeremias (*The Book of Amos* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995] 11) calls attention to the proximity of Amos 1:2 to Joel 4:16 [Engl. 3:16] (in the MT) as an indicator of redactional work at the level of the Twelve or earlier.

[15] Aaron Schart, "The Fifth Vision of Amos in Context," *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (ed. Paul L. Redditt, Aaron Schart; BZAW 325; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2003) 58-59.

David composing for themselves upon instruments of music." To be sure the phrase is sarcastic and metaphorical, intended to denounce members of the eighth-century upper class in Israel. The implied criticism of David, however, seems incompatible with the hope for the fallen "booth of David" in 9:11. It sounds more appropriate for an iconoclastic, even grouchy, southern, shepherd-turned-preacher like Amos. Once again, a passage earlier than the redactor of the Four depicts the monarchy in less-than-favorable light.

The second passage is 7:10-17. What is interesting about this passage is that King Jeroboam II remains "off stage." Amos is confronted by Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, because Amos has announced God's threat to remove the king by sword. It is not surprising, perhaps, that the passage does not narrate a meeting between Amos and Jeroboam. Given Amos' stature as a shepherd from Judah, no one would have expected the king to grant him an audience. Besides, Amos was in Bethel and the king in Samaria. As the narrator tells his story, however, Amaziah sends word to the king, informing him of Amos' prediction (v. 11). Then the narrator has Amaziah turn directly to Amos to banish him from Israel (v. 12: "flee to the land of Judah") and the temple in Bethel (v.13: but do not ever again prophecy in Bethel"). What is missing here, and must be supplied by the reader for the narrative to cohere, is the king's response that Amaziah should silence/banish Amos. The king is conspicuous by his absence. Thus, not only did Amos reject Jeroboam (assuming the basic historicity of the account), but so did the narrator.[16]

The King in the Book of the Four in Hosea and Amos. It is important to remember that the Redactor of the Four added two important passages in Hosea and Amos. The first was Hos 3:3-5, *minus* 3:5aβ, which adds the phrase "and David their king." In the rest of Hos 3:3-5, the Redactor of the Four seems to have looked back on years with no indigenous king in northern Israel and anticipated no new one. He saw only a return to God by the purified people. Similarly, the redactor portrays the purifying of Israel in Amos 9:7-10, but says nothing of a new king.

The Pro-Davidic Recension of Hosea and Amos. Both Hosea and Amos as they stand, however, record a pro-Davidic hope, found in Hos 3:5aβ and especially Amos 9:11-15, which speaks of the restoration of the fallen booth (dynasty) of David. The latter text also mentions the new king's possession of Edom. Was this act to be in response to Edom's role in the fall of Jerusalem (see Obadiah)? In any case, the post-exilic period saw on the part of some prophetic texts an anticipation of the renewed Davidic dynasty. Indeed, the clearest articulation of these hopes in the Twelve appears in Zech 9:1-10, hopes that the Redactor of Zechariah 9-14 seriously qualified (see below).

The King in Micah and the Book of the Four. Micah, like the other collections in the Four, opens with a superscription (from the Redactor of the Four) dating the prophet: this time to reigns of kings Jothan, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. There is no reference to a northern king, even though the redactor notes that Micah spoke to Jerusalem and

---

[16] Hans Walter Wolfe (*Joel and Amos* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977] 310-12) and Shalom M. Paul (*Amos* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] 240-52) both accept it as such, and Paul notes that in the narrative the king does not speak. He does not, however, attempt to draw inferences from the oddity about the narrator's view of the king.

Samaria. The second use of the term king appears in the pun-laden lament in 1:10-16, where (v. 14) Micah mentions a deception to the kings of Israel.[17]

Elsewhere Micah condemns the "heads" (ראשי) of the house of Jacob and the "chiefs" (קציני) of the house of Israel (3:9) who built Zion with blood (3:10). Its heads gave judgment for bribes, its priests taught for money, and its prophets gave oracles for money (3:11). While the king (מלך) is not singled out for special mention, he could hardly be held guiltless in such a society.

An explicit use of the word "king" does appear in 4:9, where one reads: "Is there not lacking to you a king?" The continuing line reads: "Has your counselor perished?" These questions are ambiguous, as a glance at modern scholarship will show. On the one hand, Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman translate the first question as follows: "Thou didst not have a king, didst thou?"[18] On the other hand, Delbert Hillers understands the questions to be sarcastic, implying that there was a king, but that he was ineffectual.[19] The next half of a verse (4:10aα), furthermore, predicts that the daughter Zion would go forth from the city and camp in the open country. The following phrase (v. 10aβ), however, speaks of an exile to Babylon. Hillers correctly points out that the reference to Babylon makes it difficult to assign this part of the verse to Micah because a reference to Babylon, which was also subject to Assyria in the eighth century, would be a stretch for an eighth-century prophet or his audience. Hillers thinks it more likely that this passage as it stands derived from the time of Zedekiah.[20] The disjuncture, however, between a prediction of encampment outside the city in the wilderness of Judah and a prediction of exile into Babylon is so stark as to invite further attention.

The second half of the verse (10b) predicts a rescue or redemption from the hands of Jerusalem's enemies. It implies a return to the city by its inhabitants. The ensuing verses (4:11-13) continue the motif of the restoration of Zion. It would appear, then, that 4:9-10aα (down through the prediction that Jerusalemites would have to leave the city) could well have been authentic, but the explicit reference to exile in Babylon probably derived from a hand after the end of the monarchy. Albertz argues that Mic 5:9-13 [Engl. 5:10-14] displays the purifying motif of the Redactor of the Four and stemmed from his had. It fits well thematically with Mic 3:12. So, however, does the addition of Babylon in

---

[17] The term "Israel" is either genetic or (more likely) used of the southern kingdom, which is under discussion in Micah 1. For a treatment of this issue, see Mark E. Biddle, "'Israel' and 'Jacob' in the Book of Micah: Micah in the Context of the Twelve," *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (ed. James D. Nogalski, Marvin A. Sweeney; SBLSymS 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) 146-65.

[18] Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah* (AB 24E; New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 2000) 441. Literally it would read: "Is there not lacking to you a king?" They argue that the context exudes deeper pathos than mere sarcasm.

[19] Delbert R. Hillers, *Micah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 58-59.

[20] Hillers (*Micah*, 59) suggests the time of Jeremiah or an authentic prediction of Assyria's overthrow of Judah with the name "Babylon" substituted later. James Luther Mays (*Micah* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976] 105) dates the passage during the reign of Zedekiah. Cf. Daniel J. Simundson, "The Book of Micah," *NIB* (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 7.567.

Mic 4:10aβ. Possibly, then, the Redactor of the Four added the reference to Babylon in light of the exile. If not, it entered the book later along with the motif of the restoration of Jerusalem (4:1-8, 10b-13).

One last text needs discussing here. Micah 6 combines a variety of passages of diverse genres in a lengthy condemnation of Jerusalem. At the end of the passage, God levels one final charge against the people of Jerusalem: they had repeated the sins of the northern kingdom in that they "kept the statutes of Omri, and all the deeds of Ahab, and they had walked in all their counsels" (v. 16). Nogalski notes the indebtedness of Mic 6:16 to the Deuteronomistic treatment of those kings in 1 Kgs 16:21-28, 29-34; 20:35-21:29.[21] In other words, at least this part of Hosea 6 (and Nogalski thinks much more of it) derived from the Redactor of the Four.

A putative condemnation of northern kings might not be surprising in a prophet from the south, but that condemnation also reflects on the people of Judah for succumbing to such behavior. For following those kings in their sin, "the city" (probably Jerusalem, but perhaps cities in general) would bear the punishment of God. Their behavior also reflects on their leaders, though they are not explicitly mentioned. That same connection between the sins of Samaria and the sins of Jerusalem, however, appears already in 1:5-9, and not just in1:5b-7, which belongs to the Redactor of the Four.[22] Hence, the motif that Judah repeated the sins of Samaria appears in the oldest part of the text and provides the Redactor of the Four with an anchor in authentic texts for his additions.

The Pro-Davidic Recension of Micah. The most remarkable Mican text about rulers, however, is 5:1-4a [Engl. 5:2-5a]. It opens with an address to Bethlehem of Ephrathah, from which was to come a ruler whose origin was from old (v. 1). Scholars debate whether the reference is to one who will descend from David or to one from David's hometown in Bethlehem.[23] Reading the verse as a reference to David's home rather than David, however, is too fine a distinction. The verse, therefore, appears to have in mind David as the "once and future" ruler, who would rule and protect the people "in the strength of YHWH" (5:3).

This passage is widely considered exilic (e.g., Mays[24]), though it is not necessarily so. Andersen and Freedman, Hillers, and Smith all treat the passage as authentic.[25] It follows three consecutive passages addressed to Jerusalem and introduced with the word "Now" (עתה): 4:9, 12, 14 [Engl. 5:1]. The first (4:9-10a) has been shown to be authentic except for the final phrase. That passage appears to have been expanded secondarily (4:10b-13) in the post-exilic period, expressing the hope that God would rescue Zion from the surrounding peoples. It expressed sentiments similar to Zechariah 12 and 14, where the nations assemble against Jerusalem. The third (4:14; Engl. 5:1) is so fragmentary and susceptible to such widely divergent interpretations that it will be

---

[21] Nogalski, *Literary Precursors*, 142.

[22] Albertz, "Exile as Purification," 238-40.

[23] See James Luther Mays, *Micah* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) 113.

[24] Ibid., p. 113.

[25] Andersen and Freedman, *Micah*, 470-1; Hillers, *Micah*, 65-67; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco: Word, 1984) 45.

omitted from this study. The word "king" is not used; nor is it clear to which office(s) the verse might be referring.

Micah 5:1-4a [Engl. 5:2-5a] is followed by a prediction that God would protect God's people (5:4b-5 [Engl. 5:5b-6]). This passage speaks of Judean "shepherds" and "princes" protecting the people from the Assyrians. At first glance the mention of the Assyrians might seem to secure for the passage a date before 605, unless one wishes to stipulate that "Assyria" is a surrogate for "Babylon" (mentioned redactionally in 4:10a). The problem is, of course, that 5:4b-5 [Engl. 5:5b-6], especially if combined with 5:6-8 [Engl. 5:7-9] reads much more like 4:10b-13 than anything else in Micah. Hence, 5:4b-5 should be read as a post-exilic passage whose author (unlike the Redactor of the Four) specified Assyria as the enemy as Micah would have.

This brings the discussion back, then, to 5:1-4a [Engl. 5:2-5a], which gives no hint of its date. It anticipates that a new David will restore the fortunes of his people, some of whom seem to have gone into exile (v. 2, Engl. v. 3). The distinctive motif of purification Albertz ascribes to the redactor of the Four is lacking in 5:1-4a, though it does appear in 5:9-13 [Engl. 5:10-14].[26]

What should one make of this text? First, it is not an endorsement of a reigning Judean king. Rather, it expresses the hope that a future monarch would see the exiles return, at which time he would "stand and feed his flock in the strength of YHWH, in the majesty of the name of YHWH his God" (v. 3, Engl. v. 4). The passage ends (5:4a) with a curious and maybe curiously short phrase: והיה זה שלום (and this shall be peace). NRSV translates "and he shall be the one of peace." The phrase might mean that having all God's people living securely under the new David would be the way to have peace. In any case Mic 5:1-4a [Engl. 5:2-5a] takes its place alongside Hos 3:5aβ and Amos 9:11-15, all of which anticipate a renewed David dynasty.

The King in Zephaniah. Like the other collections in the Book of the Four, Zephaniah opens with a superscription by the Redactor of the Four, situating the prophet during the reign of a Judean king. This time, however, the king was the seventh century figure Josiah, who received an endorsement in a saying attributed to Jeremiah (22:15b-16). No such endorsement appears in Zephaniah, whose condemnation of Jerusalem and Judah (along with all their neighbors!) is sometimes explained by suggesting that Zephaniah flourished before the reforms of Josiah went into effect.

Regardless, the fact remains that Zephaniah uses the word "king" only two other times. The first is 1:8, where Zephaniah has YHWH threaten to punish "the officials, the king's sons, and all who dress in foreign attire." Here the critique of the sons might be a circumlocution for a criticism of the king himself. The second is 3:15, which calls YHWH the "king of Israel" and belongs to a passage presupposing the Exile (see 3:20)[27] and predicting the restoration of Jerusalem without mentioning the king. Thus, while the king is not absent from Zephaniah, he receives scant notice. Instead, kingly power resides

---

[26] Albertz, "Exile as Purification," 235.

[27] James D. Nogalski, "Zephaniah 3: A Redactional Text for a Developing Corpus," *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift; Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz, Thomas Krüger, Konrad Schmidt; BZAW 300; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2000) 218. Nogalski concludes that Zeph 3:20 demonstrates thematic links to Joel and makes a transition to Haggai.

in YHWH (cf. the discussion of the king in the Psalms earlier in this paper). Even if one deduces from the opening verses, which proclaim a hyperbolic universal judgment, that the king would suffer, one must also recognize that the prophet did not bother to say so.

The King in the Book of the Four. What has become clear in this survey is that in the authentic messages of Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah the king plays a small role. In Hosea, the monarchy (at least the northern monarchy) was a result of God's wrath, and its end would be justified and salvific. In Amos one finds an implied criticism of David in the remark about the wealthy sitting around composing songs as David had (6:5). More telling is that the king was otherwise simply off stage. Even in the passage where he orders the banning of Amos from royal sanctuaries (7:10-17), he puts in no appearance. The reader has to infer that the king banned Amos. Micah rarely uses the word "king," and where he does (4:9-10a) the mood seems sarcastic. Zephaniah mentions the king's sons (a circumlocution for the king himself?), though only in condemnation (1:8), and he speaks of YHWH as the real king of Judah. Thus, any royal authority would be exercised in subservience to God.

The Redactor of the Four seems not to have thought much more highly of the king than did Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah. The Redactor's voice breaks through in Micah 6, where he condemns the people for repeating the sins of the northern kingdom in that they "kept the statutes of Omri, and all the deeds of Ahab, and they had walked in all their counsels" (Mic 6:16). The remark most likely implies criticism of the southern kings too, but their fall perhaps rendered it unnecessary to mention them.

The King in the Pro-Davidic Recension of the Four. At some point the Book of the Four appears to have undergone a pro-Davidic recension, which resulted in the pro-Davidic comment in Hos 3:5aβ, the prediction of the restitution of the Davidic dynasty in Amos 9:11-15, and the picture of the new David in Mic 5:1-4a [Engl. 5:2-5a]. Zeph 3:1-13 belongs to the Four,[28] but 3:14-20 seems separate. For one thing, it emphasizes the kingship of YHWH. Though YHWH's kingship and David's rulership belong to the royal theology, given the absence of any mention of David, there is no warrant for ascribing it to the hand responsible for the pro-Davidic recession.

The King in Nahum and Habakkuk. Duane L. Christensen has argued convincingly that Nahum and Habakkuk were edited together to form a chiasmus, which is reproduced here with slight modifications.[29]

A Hymn of theophany	Nahum 1
B Taunt song against Nineveh	Nahum 2-3
X The problem of theodicy	Habakkuk 1:1-2:5
B' Taunt song against the "wicked one"	Habakkuk 2:6-20
A' Hymn of theophany	Habakkuk 3

[28] So Albertz, "Exile as Purification," 241-42.

[29] Duane L. Christensen, "The Book of Nahum: A History of Interpretation," *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* (JSOTSup 235; eds. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1996) 193. Cf. James A. Watts, "Psalmody in Prophecy: Habakkuk 3 in Context," *Forming Prophetic Literature*, 214. Nogalski ("The Redactional Shaping of Nahum 1," 201-202) argues that the semi-acrostic in Nahum 1 shows affinities with Joel, suggesting that it entered the Twelve at the same time as Joel.

Thus, Nahum/Habakkuk will be treated as a second precursor to the Twelve and examined together.

Nahum opens with a double and Habakkuk with a single superscription, neither of which names the king under whom the prophet flourished – in contrast with the Book of the Four. In fact, the word "king" appears rarely in either collection. In Nahum it occurs only in 3:18, where Nahum concludes a bitter invective against the city of Nineveh by taunting the Assyrian king to the effect that his shepherds/nobles were asleep in the face of impending doom. There was perhaps no reason for Nahum to speak of the Judean king, though given his unqualified condemnation of foreign enemies he may have been his supporter. If the king was Josiah, as seems quite possible,[30] he perhaps saw nothing for which to condemn the king. In any case, Nahum's attitude toward the king of Assyria is a different issue from his view of his own king.

Habakkuk complains to God that the Chaldeans scoff at kings and make sport of rulers (1:10), but he says nothing specific about Judah's kings. The hymn with which the collection ends (3:1-19), however, does speak of God's coming in fury to save his people and to save his "anointed" (3:13). That verse appears in a poem (3:3-15) with two stanzas (3:3-7, 8-15), each of which contains a reference to God's defeat of "the waters" (3:8, 15).[31] The poem also begins (3:3) with a reference to God's coming from the area of Sinai, and concludes (3:15) with language of God's trampling the sea with God's horses. This last verse echoes the songs of deliverance in Exodus 15, which employ the line "horse and rider he has thrown into the sea" (vv. 1, 21). Thus, the entire poem is framed by references to the exodus couched in mythic language. Nogalski also emphasizes its cultic connections, made quite clear by (among other things) its threefold use of the word *selah,* found elsewhere only in the Psalter.[32] So the poem, possibly from the temple itself, celebrates God's customary saving events.

It would appear that 3:12-14 does not just one event in view, but several in which God had acted in the past to rescue God's people/anointed. At issue is whether the terms "people" and "anointed" have the same or different referents. Help is available from the phrase "the head of the wicked house" that follows the word "anointed," which appears to refer to foreign heads of government, presumably the governments in view in 3:12. If so, and if the usage is parallel in v. 13a, the "anointed" one was the Davidic king (Josiah?) or a series of kings. If so, then, the emphasis in the hymn was on the fidelity of God in the past to rescue God's king and people. The most one can say, therefore, is that it might imply an endorsement of the Davidic monarchy, but not of any particular king. In 3:16-19, then, the singer anticipates an attack on those who attack Judah. Though the circumstances of the singer are bleak, described in terms similar to Joel 1:10, 12,[33] the

---

[30] Nahum is dated after the fall of Thebes (663), whose downfall is mentioned (3:8), but before the fall of Nineveh (612), whose demise is gleefully predicted. Most scholars set him closer to the latter than the former, hence during the reign of Josiah.

[31] James Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1993), 160-173.

[32] Ibid., pp. 154-8.

[33] Ibid., 176-8. Nogalski argues, in fact, that almost every phrase in Hab 3:17 has a corresponding element in Joel 1-2. Whether the similarities, which mostly consist of

singer promises to wait patiently upon God. There is no mention of the role of the "anointed one" in that or any of the other victories. The view of the Davidic monarchy in this passage, therefore, is so muted (if even existent) that it seems not to belong to the same hand as the pro-Davidic hand found in Hosea, Amos, and Micah.

III. The King in Exilic and Post-exilic Prophets in the Twelve

At the end of the exile, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah urged the rebuilding of the temple, calling upon the people and the apparently royal figure Zerubbabel to fulfill the task. It is a commonplace among critical scholars that Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 underwent a common redaction. They will treated as a third precursor to the Twelve and studied together. Malachi seems to have been added directly to that precursor, so it will be taken up next.[34] The remaining four collections (Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Zechariah 9-14) do not appear to have belonged to earlier precursors, so they will be discussed second. Zechariah 9-14 very likely was the final addition to the Twelve,[35] so it will be treated last (in the next section of this paper.

The King Anticipated in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8. Cyrus the Great permitted those Jewish exiles that chose to do so to return to Judah and to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. Apparently, the first group of returnees was led by Sheshbazzar[36] (Ezra 5:16), who began to rebuild the temple, but did not finish the task. Haggai and Zechariah urged Zerubbabel[37] and Joshua to take up the task again in the year 520 (Ezra 5:1-2; Haggai 1:12-15), [38] a task completed in 515 (Ezra 6:14-15).

---

individual words, constitute proof of the inclusion of Habakkuk in a "Joel-related layer" has not always found acceptance, an issue not essential to this paper.

[34] Nogalski, *Redactional Processes,* 201-12.

[35] Redditt, "Zechariah 9-14: The Capstone of the Book of the Twelve," 314-23.

[36] The name Sheshbazzar appears only in Ezra (Ezra 1:8, 11; 5:14, 16). It may have derived from an Akkadian phrase and have meant something like "may Shashshu (Šaššu) protect the father," Shashshu being the name of the Akkadian sun-god (cf. P.-R. Berger, "Zu den Namen שׁשׁרצב und שׁרצאנ," *ZAW* 83 [1971] 98-100). In any case it was Babylonian. Further, some scholars think he was the same person as Shenazzar, son of Johoiachin (1 Chr 3:18). (See David J. A. Clines, *The HarperCollins Study Bible* [ed. Wayne A Meeks; New York: HarperCollins, 1989] 702, note on Ezra 1:8.) If so, he would have been a son of Jehoiachin (Jeconiah in 1 Chr 3:16-17), the ruler exiled to Babylon in 597. As such he would have seemed a legitimate choice to Persians and Judeans alike to lead a group of repatriates back to Jerusalem as a Davidic prince. If he was not the same person as Shenazzar, his title *prince of Judah* is all the OT told about him. The book of Ezra, moreover, deemphasized his role in the rebuilding of the temple, possibly because he did not complete it. The task was left to Zerubbabel, presumably the nephew of Sheshbazzar (if he were indeed the same as Shenazzar). Even then, their relationship is not absolutely certain because Zerubbabel's father was said to be Pedaiah in one place (1 Chr 3:19), but Shealtiel elsewhere (Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 23; Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; and Neh 12:1).

[37] Zerubbabel typically has been understood as a Davidic prince (based partly on the genealogy in Matt 1:12), but neither Haggai nor Zechariah says so. On the other hand,

The prophet Haggai predicted the overthrow of the Persian Empire and the restoration of the Davidic monarchy in the person of Zerubbabel (2:20-23), who was the appointee of Darius. Haggai, however, never used the word "king" of Zerubbabel, though he did call Zerubbabel the פחת יהודה (the "governor" of Judah; 1:2, 14; 2:2, 21).[39] Instead, Haggai said that God would make Zerubbabel "like a signet ring," reversing Jeremiah's rebuke against Jehoiachin (Jer 22:24-27). Though an imperial appointee and the object of Haggai's hope for the future, Zerubbabel's fate is unknown. In any case, there is no evidence that Zerubbabel actually ruled over Jerusalem and Judah. What Haggai's prediction shows is only that the prophet anticipated that he would. Haggai had no illusions about Judah's puny power to improve its political situation. Rather, he foresaw such improvement as the work of God after Judah rebuilt the temple in Jerusalem (1:2-11) and God adorned it with the wealth of the nations (2:6-9). One should, therefore, read Haggai as a prophet hoping for the restitution of the God-ordained, pre-exilic institutions of monarchy and temple, which in his time were in ruins.

Zechariah 1-8 offers a series of visions and exhortations to the exiles in Babylon, with three passages being added somewhat later, two dealing with Joshua the high priest (3:1-10; 6:11-13) and one with Zerubbabel (4:6b-10a). Their purpose is to legitimate the status of the Zadokite priest Joshua as the new high priest in Jerusalem and Zerubbabel as the new David.[40] In Zech 4:6b-10a the prophet insists that Zerubbabel had founded the temple and would complete it. On the surface there is nothing political about this

---

1 Chr 3:16-19 lists him as the son of Pedaiah, the brother of Jehoiachin. Hence, while he may not have been in line for the throne, he still appears to have been a descendant of David. On this issue see John L. Berguist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 63-65. John J. Collins ("The Eschatology of Zechariah," *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* [JSPSup 46; ed. Lester L. Grabbe, Robert D. Haak; London, New York: T&T Clark, 2003] 77-80) argues that the point of the Zerubbabel passages in Zechariah is that the messianic Zerubbabel, who was already in Judah, was about to assume the monarchy.

[38] While this statement would enjoy widespread agreement among scholars, it is not without debate. Wolter H. Rose (*Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* [JSOTSup 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000]) challenges both conclusions, arguing instead that Zechariah had in view a person named *Zemah* (chap. 4) and that the word יחותם in Hag 2:2:23 did not mean "signet ring," but "seal" (pp. 230-38). Even so, Rose thinks that Zech 3 and 6:1 predict a future king: (cf. summary on pp. 140-41). For purposes of this paper, the identity of the anticipated king is not crucial.

[39] Cf. Paul L. Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (NCB; London: HarperCollins and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 5-8 and the literature cited there in connection with *peḥâ.* It was derived from an Assyrian word meaning "lord of a district," and was used in a number of pre-exilic OT texts to refer to military captains (BDB, p. 808).

[40] For more on this topic, see Paul L. Redditt, "Zerubbabel, Joshua, and the Night Visions of Zechariah," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 249-259; summarized in *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 38-42. The secondary nature of the Zerubbabel passage (4:6b-10a) and the second Joshua passage (6:11-13) is shown by the fact that they interrupt the flow of thought in their contexts.

statement. Yet "founding" temples was a function of kings, and Zerubbabel seems to have been a descendant of King David (regardless of whether he descended from Jehoiachin), so this statement may be a thinly disguised affirmation of Zechariah's hope for Zerubbabel. If so, Zechariah too was calling for the restoration of the pre-exilic monarchy (and the high priest in 3:1-10) as the means to restoring God's people religiously as well as politically. Ironically, however, the building of the temple resulted in the elevation of the priesthood in the absence of any reigning royalty.[41]

The Persian king Darius remains off stage, though it seems clear that he was the major player in authorizing the rebuilding of the temple (a practice of Darius elsewhere as well[42]) and the appointing of Zerubbabel. What is more, Darius had sent a massive army past Judah en route to Egypt in a show of force that was not likely to be lost on anyone in Judah. Berquist argues that Darius' appointment of Zerubbabel and Joshua, combined with the collusion of Haggai and Zechariah, resulted in Judah's recognition that imperial and divine power were closely aligned.[43] That view, however, perhaps aligns Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 too much with an international power play. Still, in all likelihood the appointments of Zerubbabel and Joshua and the rebuilding of the temple would not have occurred without Darius' intervention; nothing much had happened under Sheshbazzar. It is not clear, though, that Haggai and Zechariah saw Zerubbabel as the puppet of Darius, whatever the political reality might have been. Rather, they seem to have seen in him the first step toward the restitution of the monarchy.

The Missing King in Malachi. The hope for restitution of the monarchy, temple, and priesthood already had taken quite a turn by about 450 BCE.[44] Zerubbabel never became king. Instead, a Persian-appointed governor handled secular affairs (Mal 1:8), and the priests controlled the temple. Rebuilding the temple had not ushered in the new

---

[41] One indicator of that change appears in 6:11b, where scholars have long argued that the name "Zerubbabel" originally stood instead of or alongside of the name "Joshua," and was removed by a later editor. The entirety of 11b-13 looks like an addition, so that the crowns (the noun at the end of 11a is plural) were actually intended for the persons mention in 6:14, not Zerubbabel or Joshua. (See Redditt, "Zerubbabel, Joshua, and the Night Visions of Zechariah," 249-259, and *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 38-42, 76-79.

[42] Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 80.

[43] Ibid.

[44] The date of Malachi cannot be fixed precisely. The book presupposes a functioning temple, and the reference to the destruction of Edom (Mal 1:2b) seems to necessitate a date after the exile. (See Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 149-51. Cf. also A. E. Hill, "Dating the Book of Malachi: A Linguistic Reexamination," *And the Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* [ASOR Special Volume Series; ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns/ASOR, 1983] 77-89). Hill argues that the language points to a fifth century date for Malachi.) For a differing opinion, see Julia M. O'Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi* (SBLDS 121; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 113-33, who argues that Edom fell ca 605-550, making possible a sixth century date for Malachi. The majority of scholars, however, date the prophet and the sayings of Malachi toward the middle of the fifth century.

kingdom, and Malachi explained why. The priests had become functionaries (1:6,12-14), providing little ritual or moral direction for the people. They had divorced their "companion and … wife" under the covenant (2:14) and married "the daughter of a foreign god" (2:11).[45] God's punishment would be like a refiner's fire or a fuller's strong soap, ridding the "descendants of Levi," or the priests, of their sin (3:2b-3).

Once the priests were purified, God would turn to rid the people of sins like sorcery, adultery, bearing false witness in court, making oaths and not keeping them, and oppressing the poor, the orphans, widows, and resident aliens (3:5). This list of sins recalls not only the Ten Commandments, but also prophetic injunctions against oppressing the poor – the people with no economic clout, and hence no political clout (cf. Isa 1:17). In pre-exilic times, the king especially was responsible for insuring that justice was done in the land (Jer 22:3); in Malachi, God would take personal charge of that task!

Malachi's presentation, then, did not deal with issues of political government, perhaps opting instead for some kind of direct theocracy. Regardless, the collection studiously ignored the Persian king too, despite a good deal of Persian activity in or near Palestine.[46] Under Darius, temple building in various places in the Empire (including Jerusalem) had been favored by the Persians, but under Xerxes royal support of the temple may have been withdrawn, resulting in a poorer cultus robbed of imperial support.[47] By 445 Artaxerxes I ordered the repair of the city wall by Nehemiah (Neh 1-6). That rebuilding project has drawn significant scholarly attention,[48] but the best

---

[45] Some scholars understand this language to refer to idolatry, rather than divorce and remarriage. Cf. Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Warrior* (SBLDS 98; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 83-120, esp. pp. 113-20. The latter is more defensible, however, especially if the remarriages were entered to advance the priests politically or economically. If so, Malachi 2:16 is the only passage in the Old Testament to object to divorce, and there the objection seems to be based on unfair treatment of the marriage partner.

[46] This omission stands in contrast with Isa 44:28; 45:1, 13, which name Cyrus and call him God's "anointed."

[47] Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, 62-3, 91-4.

[48] Julian Morgenstern ("Jerusalem—485 B.C." *HUCA* 27 [1956] 101-79; "Jerusalem—485 B.C. ((continued))," *HUCA* 28 [1957] 15-47) argued that a prosperous Jerusalem had been destroyed by the Persians in putting down a Judean revolt. Despite Morgenstern's erudition, however, there is no real evidence of a sack of Jerusalem in 485, and few scholars have followed him. Exceptions include Yohanan Aharoni (*The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967] 358; and Ephraim Stern, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538-332 B.C.* [Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982] 253), but the date of any destruction in Judah has been placed at the beginning of the Greek period by Nancy L. Lapp ("The Stratum V Pottery from Balatah ((Shechem))," *BASOR* 223 [1985] 19-43), who dated the destruction of Palestinian cities ca. 480 B.C.E. The theory that the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah were Peresian efforts to induce greater loyalty in Judah in the face of destabilizing influences of an Egyptian Revolt (cf. Jacob M. Myers, *The World of the Restoration* [Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968] 109-11; and Peter R. Ackroyd,

assessment of Nehemiah's mission perhaps is that of Kenneth G. Hogland, who concludes that "Nehemiah was charged by the imperial court to rebuild Jerusalem's walls in order to provide an inland defense center."[49] It is impossible to say how much earlier than Nehemiah the Malachi collection was written, but regardless of when between 521 and 445 the collection exhibits no interest in the efforts of the Persian king, whose policies may have exacerbated conflict and tensions within the temple and the larger Judean community. Malachi appears to represent a group that had retreated from political into temple interests.[50]

The Missing King in Joel. Because Joel and Obadiah have been linked closely to the redactor(s) of the Twelve, this study will turn to them next. As already noted, in his study *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* Nogalski posits two early multi-volume corpora, one combining Hosea, Amos, Micah and Zephaniah, the other Haggai and Zechariah 1-8. In *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve,* he argues that "The majority of the editorial work related to the production of the Book of the Twelve occurs in [a] "Joel-related layer…, that merges Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Malachi into the pre-existing corpora."[51] He also suggests "the strong possibility that Joel and Obadiah were first compiled, by adapting existing material, as part of the literary production of the Twelve."[52] At a minimum one should note the textual interrelations between Joel 3:5 and Obadiah 17, which appear to this writer to suggest that the ultimate redactor of Joel had Obadiah in hand when he wrote 3:1-5, probably the latest part of Joel.[53] The issue of the role of Joel and Obadiah in the formation of the Twelve is not crucial to this paper. Hence, the two collections will be studied individually here.

Joel, which appeared probably about the same time as Malachi,[54] challenged the priests of Jerusalem for abdicating their duty, and predicted dire consequences if they did not lead Judah to repent. However, if the people were genuinely penitent (2:12-13), God would free them from foreign oppression (3:12-17,21), surely an anti-Persian wish. In

---

Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought in the Sixth Century B.C. [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968] 141) is plausible, but difficult to prove.

[49] Kenneth G. Hogland, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah* (SBLDS 125; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 243. To be sure, Hogland argues, Nehemiah had other items on his agenda as well, namely economic reform and the issue of mixed marriages.

[50] The group appears to be Levitical, but at odds with the Zadokite priests over their roles and income within the temple. On this issue see Paul L. Redditt, "The Book of Malachi in Its Social Setting," *CBQ* 56 (1994) 251-4.

[51] Nogalski, *Redactional Processes*, 275.

[52] Ibid., p. 276.

[53] See Paul L. Redditt, "The Book of Joel and Peripheral Prophecy," *CBQ* 48 [1986] 227-30, esp. 230-31.

[54] Joel, in its current form, probably originated between 515 and 445 B.C.E., because it too presupposes a functioning, post-exilic temple as well as the existence of the Sabeans (who went into decline about 450) as a viable threat to Tyre and Sidon (cf. Joel 4:4-8). (For a fuller discussion, see Redditt, "Joel and Peripheral Prophecy," 225-40, especially p. 235).

addition, God would restore fertility to the land of Israel (2:18-27; 3:18) and pour out God's spirit upon all people: male and female, old and young, slave and free (2:28-29):

> Then afterward
> I will pour out my spirit on all flesh;
> your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,
> your old men shall dream dreams,
> and your young men shall see visions.
> Even on the male and female slaves,
> in those days, I will pour out my spirit.

This promise is remarkable for its inclusiveness, embracing all classes and both genders of Judeans, though not foreigners. As such, it articulates the hopes of a sectarian group, not the monopolistic views of a hereditary priesthood. As with Malachi, this passage and the book as a whole expresses no hope for the restitution of the monarchy and ignores the Persian king except for the reference to freeing Judah from foreign oppression.

The Missing King in Obadiah. Nor is the king mentioned in Obadiah, despite its focus on the destruction of Jerusalem. The collection mentions violence done to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and strangers carrying off its wealth, but it does not mention the exiled king. On the other hand, it dares to hope for the restoration of holy Zion. "The house of Jacob" will rule Mt. Edom and possess the Negeb and all of Phoenicia, but the kingdom (of Judah/Israel) will be the Lord's (v. 21). The text mentions exiles that live in the Negeb, the Shephelah, Sepharad (location uncertain), and southern Phoenicia (vv. 19-20), but NOT in Babylon! Apparently, therefore, Obadiah envisioned no return from Babylon and expressed no hope for the restoration of the monarchy.

One may wonder if there is something of a *Rex Absconditus* here. Obadaiah 14 expressly mentions some fugitives Edom cut off at the crossings. Second Kings 25:3-5 recounts the flight from Jerusalem of Zedekiah and some of his soldiers, who were captured in the plains of Jericho. *If* those two verses refer to the same event, Obadiah 14 acknowledges the capture of the king, though not by name or title. Regardless, the king is ignored as a player in the final days of Jerusalem. In addition, the book expresses no hope that he will return from Babylon. Thus unlike the *Deus Absconditus* in traditional theology, who is active, though not visible, the king is neither visible nor active in Obadiah.

Summary of Findings in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8, Malachi, Joel, and Obadiah. In marked contrast with Haggai and Zechariah, where hopes for the restoration of the monarchy were expressed and debated, Malachi, Joel, and Obadiah seem not to envision a restoration of the monarchy. The king is not simply hidden, but irrelevant to their future hopes. Further, Joel at least seems to hold out hope that the Persians would be driven from the land (3:12-17, 21), but offers no vision of a renewed monarchy or any other kind of government. Instead, it speaks hopefully of an egalitarian outpouring of God's spirit, and Obadiah seems focused on Judeans in and around Judah.

The Missing but Criticized King in Jonah. The collection named for the prophet Jonah is unique in the Twelve in that it is almost entirely narrative. Moreover, it seems likely that the narrative was added to the other collections to bring the number of named prophets in the book to an even dozen. It takes the name of its hero from the eighth century, when a prophet by that name in the service of Jeroboam II predicted the

restoration of land Israel had lost to enemies (2 Kgs 14:25).[55] In the Twelve, however, the hero says nothing about God's restoring lost territory to *Israel*. Rather, he tells the people of *Nineveh* that God would destroy them in 40 days if they did not repent (Jon 3:3). When the king of Assyria received word of Jonah's message, he responded by mourning in sackcloth and ashes and ordering his people to fast.

What might this fairly detailed description of the behavior of the Assyrian king say about king Jeroboam II, the implied king of Israel in this narrative? Elsewhere in the Twelve, God directs the prophet Hosea to name his first son Jezreel, as a reminder that the dynasty of Jehu (of which Jeroboam II was a member) would soon end (Hos 1:4). Further, in a vision Amos hears God declare that God would rise against the house of Jeroboam with a sword (7:9), and Amos repeats publicly that Jeroboam would die by the sword. In the face of such warnings, does the king of Israel repent? No. Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, speaks on his behalf in banishing Amos from the temple. The result was that Amos' predictions came true. By contrast, however, the unnamed king of Assyria in Jonah repents with such thoroughness (3:6-9) that God determines to spare the entire city (to the chagrin of Jonah), and does so in language highly reminiscent of biblical descriptions of repentance by other Israelites.[56] Thus, the unnamed king of Assyria in his repentance stands as a foil to Jeroboam II the unnamed king of Israel in his defiance.

IV. The King and the Redaction of the Book of the Twelve

The combination of the precursors with the other collections (Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah) occurred some time after the writing of Malachi. It may well have centered around Joel, as Nogalski argues in his *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*, but nothing in this study requires reinvestigating his conclusion. For the purposes of this

---

[55] Determining the date of Jonah is notoriously difficult. Walter Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964) 359; Terrence E. Fretheim, *The Message of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 34-7; James Limburg, *Hosea--Micah* (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox, 1988) 138; Otto Eissfeldt, "Amos und Jona in Volkstümlicher Uberlieferung," in *Kleine Schriften* (eds. Rudolph Sellheim and Fritz Maass; Tübingen: Mohr, 1968) 4.137-42; Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville, New York: Abingdon, 1965) 442. Rüdiger Lux (*Jona: Prophet zwischen 'Verweigerung' und 'Gehorsam'* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994] 210-211) dated the book in the late Persian period, suggesting that Nineveh was a surrogate for Persia. Thus, the author of Jonah, unlike the author of Joel 2:13, believed that God's mercy was not limited to Israel, so he held out for positive relations with Persian power rather than its replacement by a Messiah. Jack M. Sasson (*Jonah* [AB24B; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1990] 26-28) prefers a date in the exilic or (better) the post-exilic period, though he properly points out that the "date" of Jonah could cover centuries, from the time the original narratives were told down to its main redaction. For purposes of this paper a post-exilic date is all that is required; the date it was added may remain open.

[56] See James Limburg (*Jonah* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993] 83), who comments specifically on the phrases "turn from their evil ways" and "who knows."

paper, it is sufficient to note that someone assembled the precursors and the other collections, probably choosing Jonah last in order to bring the number of named prophets to twelve.

The "Pro-Davidic Recension" in the Redaction of the Twelve. Mention has been made earlier in this paper of a "Pro-Davidic Recension" of the Book of the Four, dating from the post-exilic period. How does that recension fit with the redaction of the Twelve? It is possible that that recension occurred prior to the inclusion of the Book of the Four in the larger Book of the Twelve, but under the impetus of such hopes as those found in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 and other texts as well: Jer 30:9, 21 and Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25. Even Second Isaiah, well known for calling Cyrus the Great God's "anointed" (Isa 45:1), speaks of God's "covenant fidelity toward David" (Isa 55:3). It is also possible that the recension was part and parcel of the combination of the precursors with Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah, though none of those collections reveals any interest in a renewed Judean monarchy, Davidic or otherwise.

One other, more likely possibility is suggested by this study, and that is that the pro-Davidic revision of the Four was part of a slightly larger recension of the Twelve, a recension that led to one final treatment of the monarchy in Zechariah 9-14. The newly combined Twelve clearly experienced further growth in connection with the king in the verses that now begin Zechariah 9. The prophets Haggai and Zechariah seem to have expected the monarchy to resume under Zerubbabel, a hope/expectation that proved futile. Hope, however, dies hard, and sooner or later hopes for a renewed monarchy accrued to Zechariah 1-8, taking their place before Malachi with its interest in priests. Such a placement would maintain the twofold hopes of Haggai and especially of Zechariah for the monarchy and the priesthood/temple.

The most extended discussion of the king in those traditions is Zech 9:1-10. It opens with a proclamation of the punishing work of the hand of YHWH upon a series of cities in and around Judah.[57] It continues with a prediction of the return of the king to Jerusalem (vv. 9-10). That king would be triumphant but humble, and would cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the war horse from Jerusalem. (Other passages repeat the theme of God's protection of Jerusalem from the nations, especially in chapters 12 and 14). Here, as nowhere else in the Twelve, the king is "on stage." These hopes, however, underwent a significant reassessment in Zechariah 9-14 as it now stands.

Reassessing Hopes for the King in Zechariah 9-14. Zechariah 9-14, which probably dates from between the career of Nehemiah and 400 BCE,[58] repeats many of the hopes associated with the pre-exilic prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, including the restoration of the land of Canaan to Israel (Zech 9:1-8; cf. Isa 44:24-28; Jer 32; 30:18-20; 31:4-6; Ezek 36:7), the restitution of the monarchy (Zech 9:9-10; cf. Isa 3-5; Jer 30:9, 21;

---

[57] It has sometimes been claimed that these cities delineate the path taken by Alexander as he passed through Judah en route to Egypt. This suggestion will not stand up to comparison with what is known of Alexander itinerary. See Pierre Jouguet, *Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic World* (Chicago: Ares, 1985), 21-21; cf. Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 95-96.

[58] For the date of Zechariah 9-14 as soon after the career of Nehemiah (i.e., before 400 BC), see Paul L. Redditt, "Nehemiah's First Mission and the Date of Zechariah 9-14," *CBQ* 56 (1994) 664-78.

Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25), the return of all the exiles (Zech 9:11-12; 10:8-12; cf. Isa 43:1-7; Jer 30:10-11; 31:21-22; Ezek 36:8-12), the overthrow of foreign enemies (Zech 9:13-16; cf. Isaiah 45:1-4; 47:1-15; Jeremiah 30:11a; Jeremiah 50-51; Ezek 38-39), and the reunion of northern and southern Israel (Zech 10:6-7; cf. Jer 31:15-20, 27-30; Ezek 37:15-27).

Amazingly, Zechariah 9-14 challenges many of these hopes. As noted two paragraphs above, it opened utilizing verses expressing hope for a new king, "triumphant and victorious," who would yet be "humble" (9:9-10). Before the monarchy could be restored, however, the redactor of Zechariah 9-14 thought that the Davidides would have to repent and be cleansed (12:10-13:1). The same held true for the priests (12:13-14) and the prophets (13:3-6). Exiles might return, but they could be "scattered" again (13:7-9). God had overthrown the Babylonians, but other enemies would attack in the future (12:1-6; 14:1-5, 12). The north and the south would not reunite (11:7-11), at least not as long as the current leaders (the shepherds of 10:1-3a; 11:4-17; 13:7-9) remained in control and unrepentant.

The author apparently had struggled to understand why the glorious future the prophets had predicted and some followers had expected did not come to fruition and concluded that the fault lay with the leadership in Jerusalem, not with God and not even primarily with the populace as a whole. The "true" Israel that would reap the promises of God was not limited to those who returned from exile or who wielded power, perhaps because those people were thought to have "sold out" to the Persians. In contrast with the Zadokite view articulated by Ezekiel 40-43 and intimated in Second Zechariah's inherited traditions in which Jerusalem stood as the holiest place in Palestine (12:5; 14:8,10), the writer predicts that the holiness of the temple would extend throughout Judah (cf. 12:7; 14:21). Furthermore, "in that day" all nations would come to Jerusalem to worship God – or else![59]

Conclusion

It would press the evidence too far to say that the Redactor of Zechariah 9-14 was anti-monarchy (or anti-priest or prophet or opposed to reuniting north and south, for that matter), but he did think that such hopes would not come into fruition without serious soul searching and repentance among the leaders of the post-exilic community in Jerusalem. Beyond that, however, it is clear that the Twelve as a whole, the "pro-Davidic recension" notwithstanding, maintained serious reservations about individual kings. Beginning with Hosea, Amos, and Micah, the kings of Israel and Judah were viewed negatively, Hosea even maintaining that monarchy had been a mistake, and for the Redactor of the Four the fall of the monarchy was part of the necessary purification of the

[59] For a fuller discussion of this reading of Zech 9-14, see Redditt, "The Two Shepherds in Zechariah 11:4-17," *CBQ* 55 (1993) 676-686; and *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi,* 102-103. For a dissenting view, see Stephen L. Cook, "The Metamorphosis of a Shepherd: The Tradition History of Zechariah 11:17 + 13:7-9," *CBQ* 55 (1993) 454. Cook argues that a critique of the Davidides is compatible with ongoing messianic expectations. That is true, but the scribe behind those passages does not express such hopes. They are either missing or hidden, which is the point here.

land. The king is missing from Zephaniah, Nahum, Joel, Obadiah, and Malachi. In Jonah, a post-exilic narrative in a pre-exilic setting, the Assyrian king was a positive foil for the domestic king Jeroboam II. Haggai and Zechariah expressed hope for a new king, but that hope did not pan out and even what happened to Zerubbabel is shrouded in mystery.

The implication of these findings for the Twelve is this: the redactor responsible for assembling the precursors into the Twelve not only had limited use for a restored monarchy, but aside from a few texts he drew on (and reshaped) he chose collections more or less unconcerned with the king. Then, the redactor of Zechariah 9-14 had the last word in the Twelve on the king, and he held that no hopes for a renewed king and kingdom would come true without a thorough cleansing of the house of David (Zech 12:10-14).