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This research analyzes selected passages in Deuteronomy-Kings in order to determine the characteristics and roles of supernatural sub-divine beings within these books. Then this data is compared with the angelology of the Second Temple period in order to identify the similarities and the extent of the differences between them.

Deuteronomy contains references to supernatural sub-divine beings, such as “demons” and “holy one(s)”. While Deuteronomy affirms the existence of sub-divine beings, it forbids the Israelites to worship them.

In the books of Joshua and Judges, there is awareness of supernatural beings and their roles as warriors, messengers, and tormentors. However, in Joshua 5:13-15 and Exodus 3:2-6, appearances of the Prince of the Host (of YHWH) should be interpreted as
theophanies (cf. Daniel 8:10-11). Some “angel of the LORD” passages, such as Judges 6, can also be classified as theophanies.

The books of Samuel contain many references to supernatural sub-divine beings, including angels, cherubim, and spirits, providing a fuller picture of the supernatural world. The angelic messengers and evil spirits found in the books of Samuel bear strong similarities to those in the New Testament.

The books of Kings present a full pre-exilic picture of the supernatural world and humanity’s awareness of it. The “divine council” motif, the ministering angel, and chariots and horses of fire are found in these books. These books also portray a lying spirit and cherubim.

Exilic and post-exilic angelology have many interesting, pronounced features. Some beings are named, further roles (i.e. vision-interpreter) are assigned, and the Accuser/Satan’s role in the cosmos becomes clearer. However, the differences between exilic/post-exilic and pre-exilic angelology have been overstated. Many of the New Testament and intertestamental conceptions about the supernatural world have roots in the pre-exilic period. Angels function in similar ways, as messengers, punishers, and ministers; spirits can cause havoc, and the concept of a spiritual battle (worshipping YHWH instead of demons) is present. The building blocks for the Second Temple period concepts about angels and other sub-divine beings have their basis in Deuteronomy-Kings, and one does not need to search for foreign (i.e. Mesopotamian, Persian, or Greek) origins of these ideas.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Purpose

different celestial beings, while others compare angels to other ancient Near Eastern messenger deities. Still others focus on the rise of angelology during the exilic and Second Temple periods, the importance of angels and demons in Christian theology, or the influence of notions regarding these beings during the Middle Ages. However, comparatively little has been done to understand how the different sub-divine supernatural beings relate to God and to humanity in pre-exilic portions of the Hebrew Bible, including the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings.2

Background to the Problem

Traditionally, Christian theology has viewed angels as active members of the supernatural realm.3 The New Testament (NT) mentions angels over 80 times, and makes it clear that they are intimately involved in the workings of God, and that they are working for the good of God-fearing humans. Furthermore, Christian theology has understood Satan, a fallen angel, to be the one who orchestrated rebellion in heaven and

---

2 One important work on the subject is Alexander Rofè’s The Belief in Angels in Israel. His work is quite different from mine, in that he seeks to trace the development of angelology throughout the Deuteronomistic history, presupposing polytheistic influences were incorporated into the text, then edited out by zealous monotheists, then put back in again. Rofè, The Belief in Angels in Israel, x-xxvi.

on earth (Luke 10:18; Acts 26:18; Rev 12:9, 20:2).⁴ In fact, the New Testament hints that the fall of man in the Garden of Eden can be attributed to the work of Satan.⁵

Critical scholars maintain that traditional Christian beliefs regarding angels are not founded in the earliest parts of the Hebrew Bible. They argue that the phenomenon of independent angels, fallen angels, and demons, as seen in the New Testament, developed out of the exilic experience, due to Babylonian,⁶ Persian⁷ and to some extent, even Greek

---


⁵ As in Rev 12:9, 20:2, where the devil is called (δ ὁ ἄρχος ὁ ἄρχων) “the ancient serpent.”


influences. Thus, many key concepts about angels and demons are thought to be primarily exilic and Second Temple period developments. Although no one can deny that angels are present in pre-exilic texts, it has been assumed that pre-exilic authors were not particularly interested in the phenomenon of angels. Scholars have noted that God


10 Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:250. See also her statements on pages 249 under section “A. 2. Historic Development” and on page 251-252 under “D. Second Temple Period.”
often spoke to humans directly in the Hebrew Bible, thus obviating the need for intermediary angels.\(^{11}\) It has also been argued that in the Second Temple period, God was perceived as less approachable, thus necessitating intermediary messengers.\(^{12}\)

The apparent emergence of Satan and fallen angels in the Second Temple period and the New Testament is a touchstone for the scholarly community. In one of the first modern works on the subject, Leo Jung asserts that the angels in the Hebrew Bible cannot fall, and the concept of evil angels was not fully developed until the Christian Era, due to the influence of Greek and Persian thought on the NT.\(^{13}\) He also suggests that the serpent in Gen 3 was not identified as an evil being until after the exile, due to the influence of Hellenism and Zoroastrianism.\(^{14}\) Joines likewise says that Satan did not emerge until the post-exilic period, and that the serpent of Gen 3 is merely a symbol of chaos and man’s own evil desires.\(^{15}\) P. L. Day says that Satan (as a person) is not present in the Hebrew

\(^{11}\) S. A. Meier, “Angel (I),” *DDD*, 47.


\(^{13}\) Jung, *Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan Literature*, 12-34. His thesis is somewhat limited by the fact that the Dead Sea Scrolls were not yet discovered at the time when he wrote his book. However, his argument still has sway in the modern era. See Ellen White, *Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership*, Forschungen Zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 113.


Bible. Skolnick suggests that it was Christians who “developed an elaborate pantheon of angels” whereas “Judaism, however, recognized early on the dangers of these beliefs…”

In a more recent study, James Charlesworth looks at the use of serpentine imagery in both the Old and New Testaments and notes that the serpent was often used as a positive symbol in ancient Near Eastern literature as well as in the Bible, and he determined that the serpent of Gen 3 was not equated with Satan until the first century.

Auffarth and Stuckenbruck assert that the story of the fallen angels is only “hinted” at in the Hebrew Bible and was not actually developed until the Second Temple period. Annett Yoshiko Reed focuses on 1 Enoch, particularly the Book of the Watchers as the source for Jewish and Christian traditions regarding fallen angels and the origin of evil.

Both David Jackson and Elaine Pagels assert that supernatural evil beings are not

---


17 Skolnick, “The Hidden Mission of Biblical Angels,” 22. He makes these comments in reference to the interpretation of Genesis 6 and the “sons of God.” However, this ignores the evidence from Qumran, which cannot be attributed to Christians.


found in the Hebrew Bible. Sullivan says that the Second Temple period acceptance of the “fall of the angels” led to the development of demons in the latter part of the period. Martin asserts that fallen angels were not equated with demons and evil spirits even in the New Testament, and the phenomenon developed in the second or third century AD.

Apocalyptic literature is another topic strongly connected with angelology and its development, due to the numerous occurrences of angels within the genre. The leading authority in scholarship on apocalyptic literature, John J. Collins, has penned an influential definition of the genre “apocalypse”: “A genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.”

Jewish apocalypses are typically dated to 250-150 BC. The book of Daniel, the internal setting of which is placed in the exilic period, is considered by critical scholarship to be a work of the Persian and Hellenistic periods, with the latest material

---


roughly contemporary with 1 Enoch. Thus all data from Daniel, including the data on angelic hosts, Gabriel, and Michael, are assumed by critical scholars to have originated in the mid-Second Temple period.

Two similar but independent works have recently appeared. Heather Macumber has examined the motif of angelic intermediaries in Zechariah, Daniel, and 1 Enoch, and David P. Melvin has investigated the interpreting angel motif in Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, and 1 Enoch. Melvin focuses on the angelus interpres motif and sees a continued, though developing tradition from Ezekiel through Daniel. Macumber’s study looks at the angelic accounts and determines that the mediation motif was complex, involving several functions beyond the interpreter, namely the guide and the intercessor.

Some scholars look outside Second Temple period angelology. Gregory Boyd builds a case for a celestial conflict throughout the Bible. His work affirms a cosmic controversy theme, although his treatment of the subject in the Old Testament (OT)

---


28 Heather Macumber, “Angel Intermediaries: The Development of a Revelatory Tradition.”


32 Gregory A. Boyd, God at War: The Bible and Spiritual Conflict (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997), 143. This view shares some similarities with Joines, Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament, 26-27. Boyd recognizes the existence of Satan in the OT, and he identifies him with chaos.
largely focuses on the *Chaoskampf* motif.\(^{33}\) Spronk, rather than attributing demons to foreign influence, suggests that the fear of the dead and malicious ghosts in ancient Israelite religion was the precursor to the concern with demons in the Second Temple period.\(^{34}\)

Several works in comparative studies are of relevance. Alomía surveys the various types of lesser deities in the ancient Near East, both in texts and iconography, and draws parallels between them and the heavenly beings found in the OT.\(^{35}\) His study is vast in scope, covering Genesis to Daniel, as well as Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Egyptian writings, to draw comparisons between biblical and ancient Near Eastern literature. He maintains that Israelite angelology dates to the earliest texts,\(^{36}\) however he does not explore this as his study is synchronic rather than diachronic.

Lowell K. Handy, in his work on the Syro-Palestinian pantheon, also compares the biblical “lesser deities” with the Canaanite tradition. However, he does not date much material in the Hebrew Bible to before the exile.\(^{37}\) Nevertheless, he notes that מלאכים (angels) in the Bible have many similarities to the Ugaritic messenger deities, although

\(^{33}\) Gregory A. Boyd, *God at War*, 73-92. He does however note that E.G. White “integrated a warfare perspective into the problem of evil and the doctrine of God perhaps more thoroughly than anyone else in church history.” Ibid., 307 n. 44.


biblical “angels” had a broader function than those of Ugarit, and they did not “malfunction” until the Hellenistic period.38

Cho focuses exclusively on comparing the similarities of biblical supernatural beings with lesser deities in Ugaritic texts. This study is important because the Ugaritic materials are dated to before 1180 BC, thus correlating with aspects of early ancient Israelite angelology.39

J. L. Cunchillos argues that the various local gods were stripped of their divine status and made into angels when the Israelite Yahwists encountered them.40 Smith suggests that the biblical tradition regarding angels contains traces of a historical merging of two deities, namely the messenger deity and the “god of the fathers.”41

Alexander Rofé traces the different schools of Israelite thought and their attitudes towards angels. 42 According to him, the belief in angels dates to the tenth century BC, and it went through several stages of development. Angelology was introduced to help the Israelites transition from polytheism to monotheism. This process took deities and


42 Rofé, The Belief in Angels in Israel, x-xxvi.
demoted them to lesser beings. Then other strains of thought attempted to get rid of angels altogether. He concludes that the prophetic schools, D, and E² reject the angelology of J and E¹, relating angels to idolatry, as do early layers of P. Later, in the Second Temple period, there was a resurgence of belief in angels, as reflected in newer layers of P and various intertestamental works.

Others have used the “ןָבָה (angel) passages” (such as Exod 23:20-33, Judg 2:1-5) as a tool with which they have attempted to understand the redaction history of the OT text, arguing that the angel passages are later than the Deuteronomistic literature. However, such methods ignore the context and intent of the הָנָא passages by imposing pre-conceived ideas about the theologies of the alleged editors, and lead scholars into a cycle of circular reasoning.

---


Ellen White has examined several passages in the Hebrew Bible that she calls “Council of Yahweh type-scenes,” which she identifies with three criteria: the scene refers to multiple divine beings, depicts a judgment, and the name of the presiding deity is YHWH. As a result of her criteria, however, she does not consider the so-called “Council of El” texts (Deut 32; Ps 82) as relevant to her study.

Alice Wood has done a thorough study of cherubim in the Hebrew Bible. She argues that there is insufficient evidence to see the cherubim as a throne for God, based on her interpretation of the participle בֵּשׁ ("sit, dwell"; 1 Sam 4:4, 2 Sam 6:2) in the name formula and her rejection of what she views as an over-reliance on Late Bronze Age iconography. She disagrees that the cherubim function as a throne at all, and she favors the idea that they functioned as protective beings. Wood postulates that the "living

---

46 Not to be confused with Ellen G. White.

47 White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 14-17.


51 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 10-11, 139, 203-204.

52 Ibid., 30-31, 34.
ones” in Ezekiel might actually be closer to the seraphim of Isa 6 than to cherubim, and that these “living ones” should properly be understood as “beasts.” She attributes the text in Ezekiel 10, which connects the “living ones” to cherubim, to later editorial activity. Wood attributes the later notion that the cherubim were perceived as a moving throne to the emergence of merkabah mysticism.

Some works examine the larger biblical corpus on angels and demons in an attempt to arrive at a theology of these beings. For example, William Heidt examines different types of sub-divine celestial beings throughout the OT and Deuterocanonical books. Although he uses texts from Genesis to Maccabees in an attempt to create a cohesive theology, he does have a special chapter on post-exilic angelology. In this chapter, he states that it is undeniable that the post-exilic writings had a more developed angelology, but the difference between pre- and post-exilic angelology is not as great as most suppose.

As the above survey shows, there are few works that focus on pre-exilic angelology, and even fewer that include investigation of angels in Deuteronomy through Kings. While it is true that some works look at certain instances of angels within this section of the biblical canon, there is no one work that brings together the various

54 Ibid., 121-135.
55 Ibid., 45-46, 87-88, 139-140, 205.
56 Heidt, Angelology of the Old Testament, 102-103.
instances of angels and demons in this portion of the Hebrew Bible to draw a more complete picture of the sub-divine celestial beings in Deuteronomy and the so-called “Deuteronomistic history.”

As a result, many passages have been overlooked and there is room for a study that focuses on angels and demons in this section of the Bible. Although the secondary literature is rich and extremely varied, it is clear that more work needs to be done on the subject of angels and demons in the pre-exilic writings of the Bible. Most treatments of the subject of angels and demons assume or maintain that angels are not essential to pre-exilic theology and that any pre-exilic concept of a struggle between good and evil grows out of ancient Near Eastern creation narratives involving the Chaoskampf motif. Scholars also assert that the ancient Hebrews were not concerned with the role of angels, a cosmic conflict, or their relationship to the problem of evil until the post-exilic period, and even then the Hebrew Bible portrays Satan as an unfallen being who functions within the role God assigned to him.

58 Auffarth and Stuckenbruck say that the story of the fallen angels “presupposes, rather than lies behind, the Hebrew Bible and, thus, is to be regarded as a development, indeed interpretation, of what later came to be recognized as canonical.” Auffarth and Stuckenbruck, “Introduction,” 3.


60 Garrett, No Ordinary Angel, 115-122.

Problem

There is tension between traditional Christian theology and critical scholarship regarding angels, demons, and other sub-divine beings in the Hebrew Bible. Christian theology has traditionally understood angels to be active throughout human history, as early as the fall, but on the other hand, current critical scholarship views many of the concepts and assumptions associated with angels primarily as Second Temple period developments. The common consensus is that angels were not an integral part of the pre-exilic Hebrew Bible worldview,\(^{62}\) nor were they connected to the fall of man or a war between good and evil that began in heaven until much later.\(^{63}\)

Purpose and Justification

This dissertation seeks to identify and analyze key references to sub-divine supernatural beings in selected pre-exilic writings of the Hebrew Bible in order to determine their characteristics, functions, and roles and thereby ascertain whether or not current critical scholarship is justified in claiming that many characteristics associated with angels and demons are primarily Second Temple period developments. Such beings in the Hebrew Bible have been investigated before, but there has not been a study that focused primarily on the concept in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings,\(^ {64}\) which many scholars agree were composed primarily in the pre-exilic

---


\(^{63}\) Garrett, *No Ordinary Angel*, 115-122.

period, in order to critique the aforementioned assumption. Therefore, this study seeks to understand how the different sub-divine supernatural beings relate to God and to humanity in the books of Deuteronomy through Kings.

**Scope and Delimitations**

This research analyzes the final canonical form of the texts relating to sub-divine supernatural beings in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. For the purposes of this study, I define sub-divine supernatural beings as “supernatural beings that were created by YHWH, and as such are lower in status than God Himself, generally identified in English as ‘angels’ and ‘demons’ (or ‘fallen angels’).” My working assumption is that these texts were written in the pre-exilic period. The

---


The Anchor Bible Dictionary (ABD) defines the English word “Angels” as “heavenly beings whose function it is to serve God and to execute God’s will.” Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” *ABD* 1:248. However, this terminology can be problematic. See “A Note on Terminology” below.

Although my work will not engage in critical reconstruction or endorse any critical theory, my approach is designed to convince a maximum number of scholars that my conclusions are solid regarding sub-divine supernatural beings in pre-exilic biblical writings. As such, I have consulted with some moderate critical works such as Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (New York: HarperOne, 2003); and William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004). There is still debate as to post-exilic redactors for pre-exilic works; however, these theories are so greatly varied, that I will not attempt to deal with supposed editorial activity. Some scholars, known as revisionists/minimalists, argue that the entire Bible was composed in the Persian or Hellenistic Periods, and as such this dissertation will not be relevant to this school of thought. For a recent discussion on minimalism, see William G. Dever, *Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 69-70.
primary text for this study is the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS)* Masoretic text (MT) of the Hebrew Bible, although the Septuagint (LXX), Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) and other ancient witnesses will be consulted when they are potentially illuminating.

I will not attempt exhaustive exegesis of the selected passages where sub-divine supernatural beings appear, but will concentrate on factors that illuminate our understanding of these beings within this period. In order to assess the nature and contribution of the angelology in Deuteronomy-Kings, I will compare it with that of the exilic and post-exilic periods, drawing on secondary sources to summarize well-known features in the latter periods, rather than carrying out my own primary analyses of the relevant later texts.

**Methodology**

Individual passages from the books of Deuteronomy through Kings are chosen on the basis of their use of terms associated with sub-divine supernatural beings, such as מלאך ("angel, messenger"), חורב ("cherub"), etc., and also evidence of supernatural activity within their literary contexts. Not every passage that refers to מלאך ("angel, messenger") will be examined, as this word can also refer to a human messenger.\(^68\)

Textual exegesis, including lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and literary structural analyses as necessary, will be used to identify and analyze the characteristics of sub-divine supernatural beings in the selected passages within their contexts, including the appearance, abilities, and behavior of these beings toward others (God, each other, and/or

\(^{68}\) This usage is really quite common in Deuteronomy-Kings. See North, “Separated Spiritual Substances in the Old Testament,” 134.
human beings). Then I will assess how characteristics of these beings in the analyzed passages shed light on their roles in relation to God, humanity, and the cosmic conflict within Deuteronomy through Kings. Using these findings, I will synthesize a picture of pre-exilic angelology. Finally, I will compare the results of the investigation with what is generally known about post-exilic biblical attestations to sub-divine supernatural beings in order to determine whether there is a significant leap in the development of these ideas between the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods.

Through the methodology outlined above, I will seek to ascertain whether the ancient Israelites had a clear understanding of the nature of the conflict between God and Satan, as well as the role of angels in the affairs of YHWH and humanity, prior to the exile and major Jewish contact with Mesopotamian and Persian theologies.

Following the present introductory chapter, the subsequent chapters of this study will proceed as follows. In the second chapter I will examine sub-divine supernatural beings in the book of Deuteronomy, especially in relation to the book’s theology and polemics. This analysis will set the stage for further chapters.

The third chapter will cover sub-divine supernatural beings in the books of Joshua and Judges. They will be analyzed together due to the fact that there is only one mention of such a being in Joshua and because the two books share themes, and Judges continues the history of the conquest started in the book of Joshua. The fourth chapter will investigate sub-divine supernatural beings in the books of 1 and 2 Samuel, including iconographic references to cherubim and comparisons between humans and angels. The fifth chapter will look at sub-divine supernatural beings in the books of 1 and 2 Kings.
The sixth chapter will be a synthesis of the data in the previous chapters to draw a complete picture of pre-exilic angelology in the books of Deuteronomy to Kings. The seventh chapter will identify similarities and differences between pre-exilic and exilic/post-exilic angelology, including a consideration of angels and demons in the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, as well as the NT and other relevant texts from the Second Temple period, such as the LXX, Pseudepigrapha, and the DSS. Whereas characteristics of pre-exilic angelology will be drawn from the analyses in chapter six, features of exilic and post-exilic angelology will be summarized from readily available secondary sources that cover the topic during these periods. As mentioned above, the purpose of this comparison is to ascertain the extent to which aspects of angelology were innovations of the post-exilic period.

The eighth chapter will summarize conclusions and implications from the foregoing analyses on the subject.

A Note on Terminology

As with any study, the issue of terminology needs to be addressed. Words such as “angel” or “demon” are culturally loaded. Therefore, it can be difficult to discern when such words are being used in a technical sense or in their common usage. For example, in a technical sense “angel” should only be used when translating the Hebrew term מלאך or the Greek term ἄγγελος. Additionally, such a usage in English is only appropriate when translating מלאך or ἄγγελος in a context where those terms themselves designate supernatural messengers, as opposed to human messengers.
Perhaps more problematic is the use of the term “demon.” Unlike “angel,” there is no direct equivalent to the word “demon” in Hebrew. Nevertheless, the term “demon” is used quite often in biblical studies as well as fields outside biblical studies,69 which can lead readers to make false equivalencies between the purely evil demons of Christian theology and the morally ambivalent lesser deities of the ancient Near East.70

The purpose of this study is not to classify supernatural beings or to create a heavenly taxonomy.71 Rather, it aims to understand how supernatural sub-divine beings in general function. My usage of the term “demon” will be limited, but I will not restrict the term “angel” or “angelic being” to technical usage, that is, only to those beings that are designated as מלאך in biblical texts.72 I will frequently use Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek terminology in my analysis in order to provide clarity for those interested in the technical terminology of the passages.


71 This has been done by several authors: Lowell K. Handy, in his book Among the Host of Heaven, analyzes the structure of the Ugaritic pantheon and draws parallels with the biblical text. Also, White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 138-144; Smith, The Origins of Biblical Monotheism, 27-80. Additionally, Mark Smith discusses the divine hierarchy in Ugaritic literature, including the ml'ak in “Astral Religion and the Representation of Divinity,” 187-191.

72 This is not uncommon. For example, see Karin Schöpflin, “God's Interpreter. The Interpreting Angel in Post-Exilic Prophetic Visions of the Old Testament,” in Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings-Origins, Development and Reception, ed. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin, DCL Yearbook (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 192-193, 197-198; Schöpflin, “YHWH's Agents of Doom,” 125, 132; This trend actually begins in the LXX; see Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:249. For problems related to this see White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 147-149.
CHAPTER 2

DEUTERONOMY

Introduction

In many ways, the book of Deuteronomy lays the foundation for the theology and content of the section of the Hebrew Bible called the Former Prophets. This observation has been recognized by critical scholars within the last century, the most influential of whom was Martin Noth.¹ The designation of Joshua through Kings as the “Deuteronomic (or Deuteronomic) History” bears witness to this theory.² While this present study is not intended to critique or analyze this view, it does seem appropriate that a study of a topic in the books of Joshua-Kings should begin with an examination of the context and theology of sub-divine beings in Deuteronomy.

The word מלאך appears only once in Deuteronomy, referring to human messengers (Deut 2:26). However, there are other references to and hints of sub-divine beings within the book. “Demons” (שדים) are explicitly mentioned in Deuteronomy, as are “holy ones” (קדשים). Other possible oblique references include the mention of “the host

¹ Noth, The Deuteronomic History, 1-17, 26-35.
² For an overview of the history of this theory, see Campbell and O'Brien, Unfolding the Deuteronomic History, 1-13.
of heaven” (Deut 4:19, 17:3) and a seraph (Deut 8:15). This chapter will examine passages that explicitly refer to sub-divine beings in order to understand Deuteronomy’s views of these and how they fit into the theology and rhetoric of the Pentateuch.

Unlike the Former Prophets, Deuteronomy is a theological treatise rather than an historical account. The entire book, with the exception of the introduction and conclusion (1:1-5, 34:1-12), consists of a series of speeches that Moses delivered to the Israelites as he prepared them to enter the Promised Land. Thus, each of the texts examined is said to be the words of Moses as he spoke to the people, including the poetry of Deuteronomy chapters 32 and 33.

**Deuteronomy 32: Sacrificing to Demons**

**Context**

The genre of this chapter is poetry, and as such, it has a very different structure than the previous chapters of the book. The poem begins by exhorting both heaven and earth to listen (32:1) and recounts the manner in which the LORD saved Israel. He did it alone, with no help (v. 12). Israel, however, went astray and “they sacrificed to demons that were no gods, to gods they had never known, to new gods that had come recently, whom your fathers had never dreaded,” (v. 17) and “they have made me jealous with what is no god, they have provoked me to anger with their idols. So I will make them jealous with those who are no people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation,” (v. 21). As a result, the LORD will deliver the Israelites into the care of these gods: “Then he will say, ‘Where are their gods, the rock in which they took refuge, who ate the
fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink offering? Let them rise up and help you; let them be your protection!” (v. 37-38).

These verses clearly illustrate that YHWH abhors the worship of demons (שדים) and other beings who are not gods. They are said to eat and drink of the people’s offerings but are useless to protect the people. The LORD states unequivocally that He is God (v. 39).

Analysis

Critical scholars consider Deut 32 to be older than the previous chapters, and it is also thought to be connected to Judg 5 and 2 Sam 22, by virtue of age and genre. While I do not consider the age of Deut 32 to be older than the rest of the book, it is significant for this study that the text in question dates to much earlier than the exile. Deuteronomy 32 compares the “demons” (שדים) with “not-god(s)” (לא אל), “gods they did not know” (אלים לאידעו), “new ones who recently came” (יודו אתא), that their “fathers did not fear” (שמיד לאפורענאימ). Thus, the שדים are unworthy of worship and are not


4 Heiser prefers to translate this as “not God.” In Heiser, “Monotheism, Polytheism, Monolatry, or Henotheism? Toward an Assessment of Divine Plurality in the Hebrew Bible,” 8.

5 Cf. Judg 5:8.
legitimate gods. The Israelites are chastised for sacrificing to these beings, sacrifices which these שדים are depicted as eating and drinking. A similar text is found in Lev 17:7, which reads, “And they will no longer sacrifice their sacrifices to ‘goat-demons’ (שוריים).” Frey-Anthes disputes the common translation saying, “There are no ‘goat-demons’ in the Old Testament, whatsoever.” However, in favor of the translation, it is interesting to note that caprids are connected to gods and demons in Levantine iconography. In an early example, an MB IIB seal from Jericho depicts a ram-headed

---


goddess. The LXX translates ματάκιας, “vanities, idols,” though the Targum (Tg.) reads שדרים (demons). The term שדים is used only twice in the OT: here and in Psalm 106:37. The word שדים is typically translated into English as “demons,” chiefly because this is how it is translated in the LXX. However, the term does not have a direct correlation to what the NT calls “demons.” Thus, the difficulty in the context of this passage is deciding

---


9 The LXX uses δαίμονας “demon” to translate שדים “goat-demon” in Isa 13:21. For the instance in Isa 34:15, see chapter 7.

10 The Samaritan Pentateuch has שדך (gates).


exactly what the term שדַש means. Some scholars have argued that it is problematic to translate various Hebrew words with the English term “demon.” However, other fields within Near Eastern Studies use the term “demon” to mean lesser gods who may or may not serve the desired higher deities.

The Hebrew word שדַש is thought to be related to the Akkadian term šēdu, which indicates a type of lesser deity or spirit. This word is often used to describe a protective deity in Mesopotamian theology, and is also associated with the aladlammu or “human-headed winged bull.” Although the aladlammu is Mesopotamian, the image is attested

However, there is an allusion to Deut 32:17 in 1 Cor 10:20. See G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008), 225-226; 1 Cor 10:21 may also refer to the issue in Deut 32:37-38.


16 “šēdu,” *CAD* 17.2:256-258.

in the pre-exilic Levant. In inscriptions, the šēdu is sometimes associated with the lamassu (another hybrid creature) as well as the utukku (ghost), who may sometimes be described as malevolent. However, as with most “demons” of Mesopotamia, these beings are considered good or evil depending on the perspective of the human who is being affected, rather than in a moral sense.

The Deir ‘Alla inscription offers an alternative interpretation, though perhaps it is not mutually exclusive with the one just described. The word šdyn is used of the gods in the heavenly assembly. This in combination with the name “El Shaddai” (הַשָּׁדַּי) in

Comprendre Le Moyen-Orient, ed. Jean-Paul Chagnollaud (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2011). Martin, “When Did Angels Become Demons?” 658. However, Constance Gane notes that the term aladlammu may also refer to winged humanoid genii, so the connection with the bull-colossus is not certain here. In Gane, “Composite Beings in Neo-Babylonian Art,” 48.


Hebrew (Gen 17:1, Exod 6:3, etc.) has led some scholars to identify the root meaning of שִׁדְּשֵׁלָה (šēluʾāh) as "deity," which is not much different from the primary meaning of δαίμονας (daimōn), "god, lesser deity" in Greek. If the word שִׁדְּשֵׁלָה is related to the Akkadian šēdu, then the idea of a composite creature is the most likely candidate as the origin of the biblical שִׁדְּשֵׁלָה. Iconography from the Late Bronze age through the Iron IIB period gives us some indication of the kinds of beings that the biblical text may have intended. The aladlammu is a strong candidate; other creatures represented in the iconographic corpus include composite creatures such as griffins, sphinx, the winged uraeus, and various man/animal combinations.

Ultimately, whichever of these beings are signified by שִׁדְּשֵׁלָה, the text regards them and the other "not-gods" as useless beings who only eat and drink the offerings of the people but do not aid them in their time of need (v. 37-38). Thus, though the text does not deny that they are real supernatural beings, worshipping/sacrificing to them is


23 The English word “demon” is ultimately derived from the Greek words δαίμων (masc. noun)/ δαιμόνιον (neut. adj.), meaning “malevolent supernatural being” (in NT usage), or simply “god, lesser deity” in Greek literature (W. Foerster, “δαίμων,” TDNT 2:2-9). G. J. Riley notes that the semantic range includes “spirit” or “divine being” in G. J. Riley, “Demon,” DDD, 235-236.


25 This is probably a way of saying that they accepted the sacrifices made to them. Cf. Lev 17:7 in which the Israelites are to cease from sacrificing to “goat-demons” (עָשַׁיְרִים).

prohibited. Earlier in Deuteronomy, these practices are linked with the occult: divination and consulting the dead. These are all unacceptable practices, and thus the religions of the other nations are dangerous (Deut 18:9-12). The Israelites are warned to avoid these other supernatural beings, or they will be led away from YHWH.

Deuteronomy 32:24 is relevant here. This verse lists a number of disasters that will befall those who sacrifice to demons: “hunger” (רענה), “plague” (ר作った), “destruction” (קטון), and attacks from wild animals (בהמות). Some scholars have suggested that all of these could be names of deities or demons outside the Bible. Thus the punishment for worshipping “demons” (שדים) in Deut 32:17 is to be destroyed by evils that are regarded as malevolent beings, including demons (v. 24).

Excursus: Sons of Israel or Sons of God? (Deut 32)

Deuteronomy 32:8 is relevant in the context of angels in the book. Although the MT has “sons of Israel” in this verse, in agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Tg., the DSS (4Q37 12:14) reads “sons of God,” while the LXX instead reads “angels

---


of God.” Cunchillos argues that the DSS reading is older than the MT reading. Tigay and Heiser likewise prefer the DSS reading, and this study adopts this view as well.

A similar situation is found in Deut 32:43, in which the MT has “Rejoice nations, His people,” as does the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Tg. is similar. The DSS reads “Heavens rejoice with him and bow to him all gods” (4Q44 f5ii:7-8). The LXX is quite


30 This raises questions about the manuscript tradition behind the LXX, which one wonders if the LXX reading is an interpretation of “sons of God” (as seen in Job 1:6, 2:1) or represents a different manuscript tradition altogether. Tigay believes that it is the same manuscript tradition. In Deuteronomy, 546 n. 2. Newsom states that in the LXX, the term ἄγγελος began to have a meaning of “heavenly being.” In “Angels,” ABD 1:249. Cf. Rofé, Deuteronomy, 9-10; Rofé, The Belief in Angels in Israel, 66-68; Tigay discusses Targum Pseudo-Jonathan’s assertion that the number of these beings are 70. Tigay, Deuteronomy, 514-515. Cf. Mark S. Smith, “Astral Religion and the Representation of Divinity: The Case of Ugarit and Judah,” in Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World, eds. Scott Noegel, Joel Walker, and Brannon Wheeler (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 189; Wyatt, “The Seventy Sons of Athirat,” 552-553; J. J. Collins, “Prince,” DDD, 663; Henten “Angel (II),” DDD, 52; K. van der Toorn, “God (I),” DDD, 353; S. B. Parker, “Sons of (the) God(s),” DDD, 796-799.


33 Rofé, Deuteronomy, 9-10, 47-54. Alexander Rofé says that Deut 4:19-20, as well as other passages in Deuteronomy (i.e. 6:10-15; 7:1-11), indicate that D is so determinedly monotheistic that he denies even the existence of any other supernatural beings besides YHWH and rejects the Heavenly Host. On the other hand, he says that Deuteronomy 32:1-43, which he dates earlier than chapter 4, acknowledges that the nations are given other, lesser beings to worship. Rofé, Deuteronomy, 9-11, 22; Rofé, The Belief in Angels in Israel, 75-78. Cf. Heiser, “Monotheism, Polytheism, Monolatry, or Henotheism? Toward an Assessment of Divine Plurality in the Hebrew Bible,” 9-10; B. B. Schmidt, “Moon,” DDD, 591. Miller argues that Deut 4:19, 29:26 and Deut 32:8 are in harmony, and seem to affirm that the nations worship other, lesser beings. Miller, “Cosmology and World Order in the Old Testament,” 66-68.
different from the MT, including the additions of the “sons of God” and “angels of God.”

Thus, a potentially older manuscript tradition contains more references to supernatural beings within Deuteronomy. Again, the texts (in this case DSS and LXX) do not deny that these are real beings, nor are they characterized as worthless (unlike in 32:17). Rather, the focus is on the supremacy of YHWH and the covenant between YHWH and Israel.

**Deuteronomy 33: Holy Ones**

**Context**

Chapter 33 is a blessing in the form of a poem, which opens with a reference to “ten thousand holy ones” (verse 2; תבבר שדק). The next verse mentions “his holy ones” (v. 3; Hebrew: שדק ויה). These verses contain the only obviously positive reference to sub-divine supernatural beings in the book of Deuteronomy. Here they are mentioned only in passing, but they are seen in the company of YHWH as part of His heavenly court.

---


Analysis

As with chapter 32, this text is thought to be older than the earlier portions of Deuteronomy, and it has possible connections to Judg 5 and 2 Sam 22. Deuteronomy 33:2 seems to be a reference to the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, though commentators have suggested otherwise. Michalak views Deut 33:2-3 as alluding to military activity. Although the text of Exodus does not mention these heavenly beings at Sinai, the passage from Deuteronomy is alluded to in several later texts and is apparently the basis for later claims that the law was given by angels.

In Deuteronomy 33:2 שדוק (here a noun) is in the singular where one might expect the word to be plural, as the number modifying שדוק is in the plural. Indeed, many scholars believe that the text probably should be read as “holy ones” (taking the

36 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 519-520. Cross and Freedman date Deut 33 to the eleventh or tenth centuries in Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, 3-4, 64; Robertson, however, classifies Deuteronomy 33 as “Standard Poetry” which he dates to the eighth century or later in Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry, 17, 49-50, 155; Cf. Tigay, Deuteronomy, 524. However, Vern suggests that linguistic evidence is an unreliable method of dating the text and prefers not to date the “Archaic Biblical Hebrew” corpus at all. In Vern, Dating Archaic Biblical Hebrew Poetry: A Critique of the Linguistic Arguments, 229-241.

37 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 319.


39 Cf. Ps 68:16-18; Dan 7:10; Jude 14-15; Rev 5:11; 1 En. 1:17, 14:22, 71:8-9, 13. See also texts regarding the parousia: Matt 24:30-31; Mark 8:38; 1 Thess 3:13; 2 Thess 1:7; Heb 12:18-24, etc.


singular noun as a collective),\textsuperscript{42} not “Holy One,” or a place name.\textsuperscript{43} The MT reading here is the same as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, while the DSS is fragmentary (4Q45 f42_43:1). Both the LXX (\textit{Codices Alexandrinus} and \textit{Vaticanus}) and the \textit{Tg.} differ from the MT tradition. The Targum says “ten thousand holy ones” (רבחות קדישין). The LXX treats קדש as a place name (Καδης), but then adds “from his right, angels with him” (ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ). What is significant is that all of these textual traditions provide evidence of multiple lesser beings in the company of YHWH.

\textbf{Summary and Synthesis}

Deuteronomy contains references to sub-divine supernatural beings such as “demons” (שדים) (Deut 32:17) and “holy one(s)” (קדש) (Deut 33:2). It is perhaps significant that these beings represent both positive and negative supernatural beings.

There are also numerous references to other “gods,” whom the LORD denounces (i.e. Deut 7:4, 8:19, 11:16, 17:3, 29:26, 32:17-17, 32:37-38). The Israelites must accept that YHWH is the only true God and their savior. This makes sense within the polemic of the book against idolatry, and also lays the groundwork for subsequent writings and their

\textsuperscript{42} This is not unusual following a number. See \textit{A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar}, eds. Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999) (\textit{BHRG}) §24.3.2.iii, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{43} The singular קדש can mean a variety of things from YHWH himself (Holy One), a sacred place or sanctuary, or a cultic prostitute. See F. van Koppen and K. van der Toorn, “Holy One,” \textit{DDD}, 415, 417-418. However, none of these fit here. Rofé, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 11: “D consistently refrains from using the root קדש with reference to YHWH...” Cf. ibid., 20 n. 13.

33
treatments of the subject of sub-divine beings in relationship to both God and human beings. Although some scholars contend that there are several disparate layers in the book, in fact, the book works nicely as a unified theological unit on this subject.

44 Rofé, *Deuteronomy*, 6-10.
CHAPTER 3
JOSHUA-JUDGES

Introduction

Joshua contains only one reference to an angelic being, which is found in chapter 5. By contrast, the book of Judges contains several mentions of these beings: supernatural messengers (רוח חאלמ), stars (כוכבים), and an evil spirit (חור) appear in Judges, and the Angel of the LORD (מלאך יהוה) is featured prominently.

The Hebrew word rendered “angel” is מלאך, which means “messenger,” and scholars indicate that the word derives from the Semitic verbal root l’k, which means “to send a messenger.”

As mentioned above in Chapter 2, the word מלאך can be used to describe human messengers, but this study is interested in the usage of the word to describe supernatural beings. In Joshua-Judges we also find beings who are described simply as “a man,” but who turn out to be much more.

---


2 For a study on angels appearing as humans, see Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 37-83; Cf. Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 192-193,197-198; Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125-126, 132-133; “A Note on Terminology” in chapter 1 of this work.
Joshua 5: The Prince of the Army of YHWH

Context

This chapter follows the account of the Israelites crossing the Jordan (ch. 4) and chapter 5 begins with the circumcision of the second generation of Israelite wanderers. Joshua commissions flint knives and proceeds to have the company circumcised at Gilgal. The Israelites observe the Passover together, and then they begin to partake of the bounty of the land, at which point the manna stops. There is very little transition as the next story proceeds rather abruptly, when “it happened that Joshua was by Jericho, and he lifted up his eyes and saw a man standing before him and a sword was in his hand” (Josh 5:13). The man declares that he is the “captain of YHWH’s host” (שדיא אישו סדום), and then orders Joshua to remove his sandals, similar to the way that YHWH commands Moses to remove his shoes in Exod 3.

Analysis

The Hebrew of this passage is fairly typical of a narrative, using the wayyiqtol construction. The passage has a strong bearing on the next story, the fall of Jericho, but initially it seems unconnected with the previous story. Perhaps it is intended to chiastically mirror the stories in Exod 3-4, which first report Moses’ burning bush encounter and then a circumcision incident, whereas here the order is reversed: there is a circumcision event and then a meeting with a heavenly figure.³

³ Thank you to Roy E. Gane, who pointed out the connection to circumcision in Exod 4 in a private communication. Many have noted the connection of Joshua 3-5 with the Passover pericope in Exodus: J. Alberto Soggin, “Gilgal, Passah Und Landnahme: Eine Neue Untersuchung Des Kultischen Zusammenhangs Der Kap. III-VI Des Josuabuches,” in Volume Du Congrès Genève 1965, eds. G. W. Anderson et al., VTSup 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 270-272; Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 103-
The passage (Josh 5:13-15) contains the only possible mention of an “angelic”
being in the book of Joshua. Although this being is generally interpreted as the pre-
incarnate Christ in Christian theology, it is still worth including this passage in a study
about angels. In this fairly detailed account, the being is described as a man standing
before Joshua, who carries a sword in his hand, indicating that the being can be
classified as a warrior of some sort. Several scholars have observed the similarities
between the man in Josh 5:13-15 and the angels in Num 22:23, 31 and 1 Chr 21:16,
while Soggin points to the similarity of this text with 2 Sam 24 (and 1 Chr 21:16).

Joshua may not discern that this is a superhuman man when he asks if this person
is “for us” or “for our enemies.” The being simply states “no,” apparently declining to

4 Jiří Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,” Journal of the Adventist
International Bible Commentary, Jacques B. Doukhan, ed. (Nampa, ID/Hagerstown, MD: Pacific
Press/Review and Herald, forthcoming), on verses 8:11 and 10:5; Günther H. Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel
Divinity School, 2001), 113-117.

5 On the concept of angels appearing as men see Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 37-83.
Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125-126, 132-133; Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 192-193, 197-
198; Melvin, The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, 30 n. 5. Cf. Heidt, who
classifies the various words used to designate “angels” in Heidt, Angelology of the Old Testament, 1-18; Cf.
Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him, 15-18. Contra White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and
Membership, 128-129. Cf. “A Note on Terminology” in chapter 1 of this work.

6 Cho suggests that “he is dressed in his full military attire as a highly ranked officer.” Cho, Lesser
Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible, 240 n. 237.

7 Robert G. Boling and G. Ernest Wright, Joshua, AB 6 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982),
197; Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Satan, God, and the Angel(s) in 1 Chronicles 21,” in Angels: The Concept of
Celestial Beings-Origins, Development, and Reception, Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin
Schöpflin eds., DCL Yearbook (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 145; Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,”
116.

8 Soggin, Joshua, 78. The MT of 2 Sam 24:16 does not mention a sword, but DSS manuscript
4Q51 f164 165:2 does.
answer the either/or question. He is not for “us” or “our enemies,” but rather for YHWH. He is the “captain/prince of the host of YHWH” (שְׁרָם צבאות יהוה), and he states, “Now I have come,” implying that now that the prince of the army of YHWH has arrived, the battle can begin.

One might conclude that this being is an angel because angelic beings are often associated with weapons and warfare (e.g., Num 22:22-23; 2 Kgs 6:17; 2 Chr 32:21). However, there are indicators that this being is unique. The phrase “Prince of the host of YHWH” (שְׁרָם צבאות יהוה) is only found here in this passage. Additionally, this is the only place in the Hebrew Bible that uses the phrase צבאות יהוה in singular. Furthermore, identification of a being in the role of a military commander, none other than the YHWH army, is unprecedented in the biblical text.

---


10 Contra Soggin who says, “The angel’s reply is affirmative with regard to the first half of the question, and consequently implicitly negative with regard to the second half. The commander of the army of Yahweh can only declare himself to be favourable to the people of the promise.” In *Joshua*, 78.

11 Boling and Wright suggest that the being had hurried there, and they ask, “Has the commander arrived only in the nick of time?” In *Joshua*, 198.


14 The other text that uses the phrase (Exod 12:41) has צבאות in the plural.
than the prince of the host of YHWH, is rare in the OT and not seen again until Daniel (Dan 8:11),\textsuperscript{15} indicating this being’s uniqueness.\textsuperscript{16}

Some commentators have suggested that the host of YHWH (referred to in the phrase בְּמֵסָה יְהוָה) may be identified with the stars.\textsuperscript{17} Linguistically, the phrase בְּמֵסָה is sometimes used in connection with, or inclusive of, the sun, moon, and stars (Deut 4:26, 30:19, 31:28, 32:1),\textsuperscript{18} and at other times it is simply used to mean stars or planetary bodies (Deut 17:3, Ps 148:3, Dan 8:10).\textsuperscript{19} However, in the Hebrew Bible, the phrase “the host of heaven” בְּמֵסָה also refers to created heavenly powers, which are not simply viewed as inanimate material objects. Rather, the host of heaven consists of created beings who participate in the covenant as a collective witness, along with the earth (Deut 4:26, 30:19, 31:28, 32:1),\textsuperscript{20} and who demonstrate what Cooley calls “agency.”\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{15} Collins, “Prince,” DDD, 663. See also Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:249-250; Soggin, Joshua, 78. Miller, “Cosmology and World Order in the Old Testament,” 58. Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 56. In Daniel 10:13, 20, 12:1 there is a being named מֵסָה who is called a רָשׂ. Newsom observes that the Josh 5 text is “one of the rare instances in which an individual angelic being with a clearly defined office is mentioned.” Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:249

\textsuperscript{16} Doukhan, Daniel, forthcoming, on verses 8:11 and 10:5.


\textsuperscript{21} Jeffrey L. Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East: The Reflexes of Celestial Science in Ancient Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, and Israelite Narrative, History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant (HACL) 5 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 289-292, 317-320, 329. His definition of agency is “the ability of something both to have intention and to act on this intention.” Ibid., 289. He bases his
Thus, in other passages, the host of heaven explicitly refers to YHWH’s attendants (see 1 Kgs 22:19, 2 Chr 18:18). YHWH is known as both YHWH of Hosts and the God of Heaven, making Him the ruler of the host of heaven (See Gen 24:3, 1 Sam 4:4, 2 Sam 6:2, Jonah 1:9, Ps 136:26). The “prince of the host of YHWH” (שְׂרֵךְ הַשֵּׁמֶשׁ) is also the commander of “the host of heaven” (Deut 4:19, 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:16, 21:3, 23:4; Ps 148:2-3; Dan 8:10-11).

Boling and Wright compare the role of the “prince of the host of YHWH” (שְׂרֶך הָיְهוָה) with that of the מלאך יהוה messengers in Judg 6:11-32 and Mal 3:3, calling them “forerunners” who are distinct from YHWH but carry His authority. However, many Christian interpreters see this figure as Christ. For example, Moskala equates this man with Christ, on the basis that Joshua bowed before the being, and he is not rebuked.


25 Boling and Wright, Joshua, 198-199.
for doing so.\textsuperscript{26} Furthermore, the man commands Joshua to remove his shoes,\textsuperscript{27} creating a strong parallel between this incident and the burning bush account in Exod 3:5, which uses some of the same wording.\textsuperscript{28}

There are similarities with variations of wording between Jos 5:15 and Exod 3:5. Exodus has יִהלִּים, יִהלָל, “your feet,” and נְעִיִּים, נְעָלִים, “your shoes.” Joshua has יִהלִל, יִהלָל, “your foot,” and נְעִיִל, נְעָל, “your shoe.” Exodus has the mater lexiones עֵמֶד, while Joshua has the defective עֵמֶד. Exodus has אָדַמְתָּכְס, while Joshua has simply כָּדָש.\textsuperscript{29}

Additional differences in the larger passage can be found; Moses is forbidden to approach the bush, but the man gives Joshua no such equivalent instruction to not approach. Additionally, the event in Exodus is clearly supernatural from the outset (flame in burning-but-not-consumed bush), while the encounter in Joshua appears ordinary at first.\textsuperscript{30} The Exodus passage indicates that it is the מלאך יהוה, “angel of YHWH,” who initially appears to Moses (Exod 3:2), and YHWH begins speaking with Moses (Exod 3:4). In Jos 5:13-15 we have a similar shift in discourse, and the text specifically

\textsuperscript{26} Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 264. Cf. Boling and Wright who compare the role of this being to that of Jesus in John 1. In Joshua, 199. Soggin suggests here that this is seen as a de facto hypostasis in the Hebrew text, whereas the LXX removes mention of this occurrence because of its view of angels (Joshua, 78).

\textsuperscript{27} Lit. “shoe.”


\textsuperscript{29} See Soggin, Joshua, 77-78. He states that the angel is not “distinct from Yahweh, but in a sense one of his hypostases, to the extent that the worship paid to him is directed to Yahweh himself.” (Ibid., 78). Smith, “Remembering God,” 636. Cho, Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible, 240-241.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Alter, Ancient Israel, 29 n. 15.
mentions YHWH speaking directly with Josh in 6:2, although this is not generally regarded as the same pericope. 

Although we find a strong tradition of “angelic refusal of worship” in later literature, bowing before someone is not an absolute indicator that that person is God (e.g. Gen 19:1; 23:7, 12; 33:3; Exod 18:7; 1 Sam 24:9). Nevertheless, when comparing Josh 5:13-15 with the similarities in terminology and instructions in Exod 3, and further comparing the “prince of the host of YHWH” in Josh 5 with the one called “the prince of the host” (i.e., “the host of heaven,” (חזקנו השמש) in Dan 8:10-11, a being who is clearly divine, the appearance of this individual in Josh 5 is to be interpreted as a theophany or a Christopha. Thus, this text speaks of Christ leading the heavenly host in battle on behalf of the Israelites, a theme we will again see in Judg 5.


34 Stuckenbruck points out that in many of the Old Testament passages bowing or trembling was considered acceptable and did not undermine the exclusive worship of YHWH. Ibid., 682-684, especially n. 23; Richard Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus,” in The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 122-123 and n. 15. Woudstra, The Book of Joshua, 105; Boling and Wright note that bowing was a normal element of “etiquette,” and they do not agree that this is a hypostasis (Joshua, 198-199; cf. Alter, Ancient Israel, 28-29).

Judges 2: Angel of YHWH

Context

Judges 2 is a narrative that begins with the statement that the “angel of YHWH” (יְהוָהַנָּא) went up from Gilgal to Bochim. He comes bringing a message of judgment from the LORD: Because the Israelites have not been faithful in eradicating the Canaanites, they have lost their chance to rid themselves of the Canaanites, so they will be forever tormented by them and tempted by their foreign gods (2:1-5).

Analysis

The story begins in typical narrative fashion, using the wayyiqtol construction. However, there is a paragraph break in the MT (indicated by פ) between the angel’s journey in Judg 2:1a and his speech beginning in 2:1b.36 The reason for this break is unclear, although the LXX fills the gap with more information, having the angel go to Bethel and the house of Israel.37 The mention of Gilgal brings to mind the account in Josh 5 in which Gilgal is the site of the mass circumcision performed by Joshua (Josh 5:2-9) and the first Passover in Canaan (Josh 5:10-12). It is perhaps no accident that the angel was initially at Gilgal, a covenant location, raising the possibility that the angel was “stationed” there, perhaps to observe whether or not the Israelites were keeping the covenant that they made back in Josh 5. The angel is thus obliged to travel from one

36 See BHS note a.

earthly place to another to deliver a message of judgment. As Sullivan has noted, the mention of travel by the angel might signal that this is not a supernatural being, but rather a human. However, he has determined that the evidence is in favor of him being a supernatural being. Newsom, who briefly acknowledges the problem, also apparently feels that this being is supernatural, while Meier is ambiguous. In fact, the mention of an angel traveling hardly disqualifies him from being supernatural. The Hebrew text contains other examples of this phenomenon, such as Gen 18-19. Furthermore, this passage is an explicit reference to the promise that YHWH makes in Exod 23:20-33, in which he promises to send his angel before the Israelites. Additionally, when comparing Judg 2 with Judg 6, it becomes apparent that the author of Judges knows how to distinguish a prophet from the angel of YHWH, as chapter 6 uses those terms to denote different people/beings.

In Judg 2:1b, the angel begins his speech with a yiqtol verb (יָדַע, “I went up”), which is unusual because one would expect a wayyiqtol verb, so this feature has been


39 Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” *ABD* 1:248-249, and especially the last paragraph on 249 under section “B. 3. Agents and Messengers.”


noted as such by several grammarians and commentators. However, the context dictates that this verb be translated as a past, rather than a future. Within the speech, the angel speaks for the LORD in the first person and he, again called the “angel of the LORD” (מַלֵּאךְ הָיְהוָה) in verse 4, addresses all of the Israelites. The angel’s role in this passage is clearly that of a messenger. Alter calls this angel “God’s mouthpiece,” and Boling points out that the angel functions as YHWH’s representative in a diplomatic capacity.

Ausloos rightly notes that this is one of only a few passages in the Hebrew Bible in which the angel is specifically connected to the exodus event (i.e., Exod 23), a theme that will be taken up in the Second Temple period. However, in contrast to the depiction of the angel in Exod 23, the angel in Judg 2:1-5 is a threatening character. Thus, the function of the angel here is to remind Israel of its failure and announce the judgment of God (cf. Judg 5:23).

---


44 In the LXX, this first-person voice is not retained in *Codex Alexandrinus*, which has the third person; the *Codex Vaticanus* uses the first person, preceded by “Thus says the Lord,” presumably to avoid ambiguity. Cf. S. A. Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” *DDD*, 56.


48 See chapter 7 of this work.

Judges 5: Fighting Stars and Angel of YHWH

Context

In the Song of Deborah, Judg 5 celebrates Israel’s battle with Sisera and the valor of Jael in killing him. Many critical scholars regard this poetic text as very old, and it was probably sung during the pre-monarchic period. In the poem, “the stars” are said to fight from heaven against Sisera (v. 20). Additionally, the “angel of the LORD” is mentioned in verse 23, where he curses Meroz for the non-participation of its men in the military campaign against Sisera.

Analysis

Analysis of Judg 5:20 reveals an interesting poetic structure. Smith aptly calls verse 20 a sonant-morphological parallelism. In regard to the MT, the *atnach* seems to be out of place, and many translations follow the LXX. The verb לוח, “fight,” is used twice, both times as a *niphal* perfect 3cp. The subject of the entire verse is “the stars” (םיבכוכיס).

---


51 Boling, Judges, 117. Smith suggests that it was initially composed before the monarchy but was later refined during the monarchy. In Smith, Poetic Heroes, 220. He also states that “the tenth century seems to be a particularly important divide in the production of warrior poetry in ancient Israel.” Ibid., 309. Soggin favors the theory that it is from the early monarchy. In Judges, 80-81, 92-94.

52 Smith, Poetic Heroes, 229-230.

53 Cf. apparatus in BHS; Smith, Poetic Heroes, 229.
The stars are personified heavenly bodies, depicted as able to fight from heaven against God’s foe, thus implying that these are heavenly beings on the side of Israel. This type of personification is not unique in the ancient Near East, as evidenced in the Old Babylonian text, “Sargon, The Conquering Hero,”54 which has both the forest and the stars fighting against Sargon of Akkade (ca. 2310-2273 BC).55 In the Hebrew Bible, stars can be personified, but they are depicted as subordinate to YHWH Himself.56 This is not unexpected, because stars are associated with angels or other heavenly beings in other places within the Hebrew Bible (Job 38:7, Isa 14:13, Ps 103:20-21, Dan 8:10-11).57

Regarding Judg 5:20, Alter states, “The fact that in Hebrew idiom the clustered stars are referred to as the ‘army’ or ‘host’ (tzava’) of the heavens encourages this representation of the stars battling on behalf of Israel.”58 Smith suggests that this verse says nothing of YHWH’s intervention or direction and that “the verse suggests only that


55 Joan Goodnick Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade: The Texts, Mesopotamian Civilizations 7 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 3, 61, 70-71; AO 6702 Column ii lines 59-64.


the stars collectively (possibly the gods generally) were on the side of the tribal coalition. Within Israelite tradition, the motif of the stars fighting is exceptional and seems quite old.”

On the other hand, he does suggest that v. 4-5 are connected to this verse as a sort of introduction and “commentary.” Thus, when looking at the entire text, YHWH is obviously involved in the battle through his agents.

Scholars have speculated as to the method by which the stars fought. Some have suggested that the stars could be viewed as the source of rain, as in Canaanite mythology. Similarly, Boling suggests that the stars fought by means of weather disruptions and flooding. Cooley wonders whether the poem suggests that the stars left the sky to fight or if they stayed in the heavens; In either case, he notes that the stars are perceived in the text to be agents fighting in concert with the tribes of Israel and the


60 Smith, Poetic Heroes, 246-247. Quotations his.


62 Boling, Judges, 113, 116-117.

63 Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 300-303.
personified flooding wadi, which washes the kings away (v. 21). Therefore, the exact method of warfare that the stars wage is unknown.

Because the stars are fighting from heaven on behalf of the Israelites and their God, this verse should be compared with Josh 5:13-15. In that passage, Joshua meets the prince/chief of the host of YHWH (שֵׁרָצֶבְנָא יְהוָה) who was sent to lead Israel to victory. In Joshua, the host of YHWH comes to the aid of Israel. Here in Judges, heavenly beings assist in the victory against Sisera. It is likely that these also are included within the host in the phrase שֵׁרָצֶבְנָא יְהוָה, because can also mean stars. If that is the case, then the same army or group that fought for Joshua now fights for Israel in the time of Deborah and Barak.

In Judg 5:23, the “angel of YHWH” (מלאך יהוה) is mentioned briefly delivering a curse upon a town/region for not joining in the fight against Sisera. The text uses the verb

---


67 Soggin, *Joshua*, 78.
“curse,” three times, twice as *qal* masculine plural imperative and once as a *qal* infinitive absolute. The passage consists of two statements made by the angel, the first of which is simple (“Curse Meroz”), and the second of which is more complex (“Surely curse those who dwell there, for…”). This angel speaks for the LORD in the third person, in contrast to the angel in chapter 2. Smith notes that the emphasis of the text is on Yahweh and the divine element, not the angel, which may be the reason for the shift in person.

Many scholars doubt the originality of this statement by the angel because it seems out of place. For example, Cross and Freedman removed all reference to the angel in their analysis of the poem, evidently because they felt that it was a problematic interpolation. Gray sees this as a corruption of the text and theorizes that the angel was not originally in the text. However, eliminating part of the text (in this case the words מָלָאך הוהי as original because it does not harmonize with one’s idea of the theology of the biblical author or redactor is methodologically invalid and leads to circular reasoning. A scholar who encounters something “problematic” in the text should question his/her interpretation rather than editing the textual data.

68 Smith, *Poetic Heroes*, 262-263.

69 Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” *DDD*, 57.


Soggin is likewise puzzled by the use of מלאך יוהי here and does not believe that it applies to an angel.\textsuperscript{73} Similarly, both Boling and Gaster suppose that this is not a reference to a heavenly angel, but to a “human diviner,”\textsuperscript{74} possibly even Deborah.\textsuperscript{75} However, we do not have any examples of a human female who is called a “messenger (masc.) of YHWH,” so this is unlikely. Additionally, there is no evidence that the phrase מלאך יוהי is used to denote a human prophet in Judges (see above).\textsuperscript{76}

When one considers the account in Judg 2:1-5, the statement by an angel in Judg 5:23 is not out of place at all. The angels in Judg 5:23 and Judg 2:1-5 are both threatening characters\textsuperscript{77} who each speak of consequences for the people of God for their non-participation in the divinely orchestrated military campaigns. This is keeping within the theology of Judges and the text’s concern for the theological and political integrity of pre-monarchic Israel.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{73} Soggin, \textit{Judges}, 91. The Targum removes the reference to the angel all together, changing it to “prophet.”
  \item \textsuperscript{74} Boling, \textit{Judges}, 114. Theodor Gaster, \textit{Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament: A Comparative Study with Chapters from Sir James G. Frazer’s Folklore in the Old Testament} (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 303, 419. This idea is not new: Cf. Tg.
  \item \textsuperscript{75} Implied by Boling in \textit{Judges}, 114.
  \item \textsuperscript{76} See Block, \textit{Judges, Ruth}, 110 regarding Judg 2.
  \item \textsuperscript{77} Ausloos, “The ‘Angel of YHWH’ in Exod. xxiii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5. A Clue to the ‘Deuteronom(ist)ic’ Puzzle?” 10-11.
\end{itemize}
Judges 6: Angel of YHWH

Context

The background to the narrative in Judges 6 is that the Israelites have offended the LORD, and so God delivers them up to the Midianites (v. 1-6). When they cry to the LORD for help, he responds by sending a “prophet” (עִימוֹנֵא שַיָּא) to pronounce judgment upon them (v. 7-10). Nevertheless, it appears that God is willing to answer their pleas for help, because the next story tells of Gideon and the “angel of the LORD” (מַלְאךָ יְהוָה), who comes to speak with him (v. 11-13). He appears to Gideon and speaks for the LORD in the third person, much as the prophet did in the previous passage. He gives a positive message: “The LORD is with you” (יְהוָה עִמָּךְ).

Gideon answers the angel by questioning this statement and wondering when YHWH will grant the Israelites deliverance from the Midianites. At this point the LORD is actually present and speaks to Gideon himself (v. 14-16). After YHWH’s speech, the “angel of God” (מַלְאךָ גֹּדֵה) commands Gideon to put on a rock the food that he presents. The angel uses a staff to miraculously set the food on fire, consuming the meat and broth, and then he disappears (v. 20-21). After the angel’s disappearance, the LORD continues speaking to Gideon (v. 23). In the following story, the LORD speaks directly with Gideon (v. 25-32), rather than through an intermediary.

Analysis

Chapter 6 is a complex passage written in a typical wayyiqtol narrative construction. Smith rightly identifies Judg 6 as part of the sub-genre that he designates as
“call-narrative.” Judges 6 is reminiscent of Abraham’s encounter in Gen 18, but there are key differences. In Judg 6, the account of the angel is prefaced by a message from the LORD via a man who is a “prophet” (אֲנִי יִשְׂכֹּר) (v. 8). The message borne by this prophet is similar in content to that delivered by an angel of YHWH in Judg 2, although Judg 6 is shorter (v. 9-10). Verse 11 then switches to the account of the angel of YHWH. He is depicted as sitting under the אלֹהַיָּאץ tree, evoking the account in Gen 18, in which YHWH appears to Abraham near the אלֹהַיָּאץ trees of Mamre (Gen 18:1). The text implies that the angel seems to be waiting for the right time. He then appears to Gideon and declares that YHWH is with him (v. 12).

Gideon questions this statement (v. 13), asking אֶתணָּנַי אֲלֹהַיָּאץ "where (are) all of his wonders (wondrous deeds).” YHWH himself “turns” (רָכַּב) to Gideon in response to his question, to speak with him directly (v. 14). The verbal exchange is between YHWH and Gideon in verses 14-18, as YHWH promises to use Gideon to deliver the Israelites (v. 14-16) and Gideon asks YHWH for a sign (v. 17).

Gideon requests that he not depart until food is brought, and he promises to wait (v. 18). Gideon brings a goat, cakes, and broth (v. 19), again evoking the meal that Abraham provides for his guests in Gen 18. It is unclear to whom Gideon is speaking in

---

78 Smith, “Remembering God,” 634.


80 López, “Identifying the ‘Angel of the Lord’ in the Book of Judges,” 8-9. Boling says, “Yahweh has caught up with his envoy, and Gideon is in a three-way conversation without realizing it.” In Judges, 131. Smith suggests that this phrase may be introducing a new speaker, though the distinction is not consistent throughout the narrative. See Smith, “Remembering God,” 636-637.

Judg 6:17-18 and who it is that promises to wait for the food. Although YHWH was speaking in v. 16, in v. 20 the “angel of God” ( המלאך האלוהים) commands Gideon to put the meat, unleavened cakes, and broth on a rock (v. 20), and the “angel of YHWH” ( המלאך יהוה) uses the staff in his hand to touch the food, which results in a fire coming out of the rock to consume it. The angel then vanishes (v. 21). When Gideon realizes that he has seen the angel of YHWH, he is fearful (v. 22). However, the LORD is still there and he speaks words of comfort and peace to Gideon (v. 23). This is a further parallel with the account in Gen 18, in which the two angels continue on the Sodom while YHWH stays and talks with Abraham.

In Judg 6 we see that the angelic being appears (possibly miraculously) and vanishes (definitely miraculously), is described as sitting under a tree, and carries a staff. Although he is brought food, he does not eat it. This being is called both the “angel of the LORD” ( המלאך האלוהים) and “angel of God” ( המלאך יהוה). As in other texts, the “angel of the LORD” ( המלאך יהוה) at times seems to be distinct from YHWH himself, and yet he is so closely identified with YHWH that the text seems ambiguous. In antiquity, the LXX

---

82 On the connection between fear, worship, and angels, see Stuckenbruck, “An Angelic Refusal of Worship,” 682-687. Stuckenbruck points out that in many of the Old Testament passages bowing or trembling was considered acceptable and did not undermine the exclusive worship of YHWH. Ibid., 682-684, especially n. 23; Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus,” 122-123 and n. 15.

83 Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, 55; Boling suggests that Yahweh was preparing Gideon to speak with Him directly by first using an angel and then a three-way conversation, and then a one-on-one conversation. Judges, 129-134.

84 MT and Codex Vaticanus have “angel of God.” Codex Alexandrinus has “angel of the Lord,” as does the Tg. DSS is fragmentary and does not indicate which reading it prefers.

85 On the ambiguity of the figure(s) see: Meier, “Angel (I),” DDD, 49; Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, 55, 57-58. Smith, “Remembering God,” 636-637. Boling, Judges, 130-134; Coppedge, The God Who Is Triune, 68-69; Newsom says that “the explanation that seems most likely is that the interchange between Yahweh and mal’āk yhwh in various texts is the expression of a tension or a paradox: Yahweh’s authority and presence in these encounters is to be affirmed, but yet it is not possible for human beings to
smoothed out the translation of this passage by supplying the phrase “angel of the Lord” in v. 14 and 16.  

Are the angel and YHWH two separate beings in this passage, or are they the same? López has attempted to show that these are two separate beings (YHWH and his angel) by stating that Gideon uses a different address for each, calling the angel “my lord” (יהוה) in v. 13 and YHWH “my Lord” (יָנֹדֲא) in v. 15. Boling attempts to solve the issue by proposing that the angel was sent ahead of YHWH (as in Mal 3:1-2) to meet with Gideon, and afterwards YHWH himself arrived so that Gideon began speaking with both the angel and YHWH, and López makes a similar suggestion.

Other scholars see a merging of the angel and YHWH. Malone sees no significance in the differences of address. Soggin states the following:

“the ‘messenger’ is a being who is interchangeable with Yahweh, identical to him, and does not exist in a separate form, being his visible manifestation. It is thus quite


Contra the MT and Tg. These verses are not included in DSS 4Q49 f1.

López, “Identifying the ‘Angel of the Lord’ in the Book of Judges,” 8-9. López suggests that the difference between adoni (עבד) and adonai (ָנֹדֲא) is the key to understanding the confusion. Cf. Marc Zvi Brettler, God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 40-44. Brettler holds that there is some ambiguity as to the referent with the term שמה. (God is King, 42).

Boling, Judges, 131.


possible, and not a sign of different traditions, that Yahweh and the *malʿāk*
interchange within a short space; there is no particular significance to this."

Gane suggests that Gideon is asking the angel if he is YHWH, and for a sign to that
effect.\(^9\)

Smith concludes that there is confusion in the text due to “a fragmented
recollection of older Israelite tradition about the world of its divinity,”\(^9\) and that “Judges
6 does not maintain a clear delineation of divine figures; perhaps the narrator felt no great
need to do so.”\(^9\)

In analyzing the passage, I favor the view that the angel of YHWH should be
identified as a theophany or a Christophany.\(^9\) The ambiguity of the passage is
comparable to that of Exod 3, which features YHWH first revealing himself as the “angel
of YHWH” (מַלֵאך-יוֹהֵיה), and then simply as YHWH (יהוה). Thus, the apparent ambiguity
appears to be intentional (see further the excursus below on “The Identity of the Angel of
YHWH”). Furthermore, it is quite possible for YHWH to appear both as a man/angel and
as a spirit (cf. John 16:7), which seems to be what is happening when the angel
disappears in v. 21 but YHWH continues to speak with Gideon in v. 23.

---


\(^9\) Smith, “Remembering God,” 637-638.

\(^9\) Ibid., 649.

On the angel as the pre-incarnate Christ see Jacques B. Doukhan, *Genesis*, Seventh-day Adventist
International Bible Commentary, Jacques B. Doukhan, ed. (Nampa, ID/Hagerstown, MD: Pacific
Press/Review and Herald, 2016), 232; Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,”
262-263.
Judges 9: An Evil Spirit

Context

This passage tells the story of Gideon’s son Abimelek and his attempt to become king. After Abimelek rules Israel for three years (Judg 9:22), “God sent an evil spirit” (ויהוה רוחוֹחֵד) to come between Abimelek and the inhabitants of Shechem (v. 23), starting a war that ultimately leads to the death of Abimelek.

Analysis

Within Judges, the word רוח appears several times, usually within the collocation “spirit of YHWH” (רוח יהוה). This spirit comes upon various leaders and influences them (Othniel in 3:10, Gideon in 6:34, Jephthah in 11:29, and Samson in 13:25, 14:6, 14:19, 15:14). Some other instances of “spirit” in Judges do not indicate supernatural influence. In 8:3, the word is used to describe the subsiding outrage of the men of Ephraim against Gideon: “then their spirit lowered from upon him” (אֲנָא רָפְתָּה רְוחָם מְעַלְיוֹ). In 15:19 the word describes the return of Samson’s vivacity after quenching his thirst: “and his spirit returned and he lived” (וַחֲשֹׁב רְוחָיו וַיְיָי). However, the majority of the uses of רוח, “spirit,” in Judges seem to indicate a supernatural influence.

The force in 9:23 is called an “evil spirit” (רוח עַרָה) and it is sent by God to create strife. All of the references to an evil spirit within the MT occur in Judges and 1 Samuel. The unique feature of 9:23 is that the text is unclear about what exactly this spirit is

---

97 Compare use of רוח in the book of Joshua, where we find two more instances of “spirit” (2:11 and 5:1). In both of these, the word is used to mean courage.
doing, the context indicates that the spirit was probably influencing the masters of Shechem to act treacherously toward Abimelek, but the spirit does not “fall on” or “overcome” anyone in particular (cf. 1 Sam 16:16, 23; 1 Sam 18:10; 1 Sam 19:9) nor is it said to be “doing” anything specific. It is clear that the spirit functions as a punishing agent, but it is not personified in any obvious way.100

Thus Boling proposes that the “spirit of YHWH” in Judges is “an impersonal power or force which can be absorbed or can so envelop a man that he becomes capable of extraordinary deeds.” 101 In accordance with that view, he determines that the evil spirit here is a simply a narrative device that is used to explain the strange events.102 However, Hamori notes that the spirit affects more than one person, thus it is “not merely a use of the term חֹרֵם to signify mood or inclination.”103 She further states that, “The covert, disembodied nature of the חֹרֵם in most texts should not be assumed to indicate an

98 However, Esther J. Hamori suggests that it is “an instigator of deception.” In “The Spirit of Falsehood,” CBQ 72 (2010): 21.


100 McCarter, “Evil Spirit of God,” DDD, 320. Jackson says that this spirit “would better be described as . . . a ‘destructive relationship’” in Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars, 33.

101 Boling, Judges, 81, cf. 25-26. However, Reiling classifies the Judg 3:10 occurrence as indicating “a more or less personal being…” J. Reiling, “Holy Spirit,” DDD, 419.

102 Boling, Judges, 175-176.

impersonal force. Although חור usually has been interpreted as an impersonal power, this would in fact be quite odd in ancient Near Eastern terms.\textsuperscript{104}

Hamori’s assertion is quite correct. Spirits were thought to cause diseases and afflictions in the ancient Near East,\textsuperscript{105} much like demons in ancient Near Eastern literature and in later biblical literature.\textsuperscript{106} In fact, many scholars of ancient Near Eastern literature do not make much, if any, distinction between “evil spirits” and “demons,”\textsuperscript{107} although biblical scholars often find the word “demon” problematic.\textsuperscript{108} In any case, it seems that the two concepts are certainly related, though perhaps not identical.

---

\textsuperscript{104} Hamori, “The Spirit of Falsehood,” 30. She notes that the Mesopotamian spirits are portrayed as beings. Ibid., 16-17. Cf. Soggin who suggests that the evil spirit has some degree of independence. In Judges, 181.


\textsuperscript{107} Black and Green do not make a distinction between spirits and demons. See Black and Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols, 63, 85-86, 93, 179. Cf. Green, “Beneficent Spirits and Malevolent Demons,” 80-87. Hutter does not make a large distinction either. Hutter, “Demons and Benevolent Spirits in the Ancient Near East,” 23-25, 31. G. J. Riley notes that demons were understood to be a type of spirit or divine being in Riley, “Demon,” DDD, 235-236; Cf. Tigay, Deuteronomy, 306.

The biblical text speaks of the Spirit of God/the LORD who comes upon people for the purpose of doing good (Exod 31:3, 35:31; Judg 3:10, 6:34, 11:29, 13:25; 1 Sam 10:10). However, the evil spirit in Judg 9 functions differently and is more similar to punishing/destroying angels (2 Sam 24, 2 Kgs 19) who act as agents of God’s judgment.

The idea that God would send an evil spirit (רוח רע) would seem to raise a problem of theodicy: How could a good and righteous deity commission an evil agent? However, as Daniel I. Block has pointed out, Judg 9 does not require the reader to interpret רע as moral evil, but rather as a morally neutral negative effect for punishment, such as calamity in Isa 45:7, where God says that he makes “well-being” (שלם) and creates “calamity” (רע; ESV), i.e., the opposite of well-being. In this light, the problem of theodicy evaporates.

Although the account in Judg 9 lacks many details about the “evil spirit” (רוח רע), this passage lays the groundwork for more complex depictions of antagonistic spirits, such as those found in 1 Sam 28 and 1 Kgs 22.

---


110 Spirits are also associated with angels/messengers (Ps 104:4, Job 4:15-21) and the Host of Heaven (1 Kgs 22).


112 Daniel I. Block, personal communication on March 8, 2019.
Judges 13: Angel of YHWH

Context

This passage relates the story of the annunciation of the birth of Samson. The “angel of the LORD” (מלאך יהוה) appears to the wife of Manoah and foretells the birth, giving detailed pre- and post-natal instructions. The angel is described by the woman as a “man of God” (איש האלהים) and “very frightening” (נורא מאד). The angel appears a second time, this time to both Manoah and his wife.

Analysis

In chapter 13, the angel appears twice and to two individuals. The “angel of YHWH” (מלאך יהוה) first appears to the wife of Manoah, and he gives her the good news that she will bear a son (v. 3). When she relates the encounter to her husband, she describes the angel as a “man of God” (איש האלהים),\(^{113}\) with an appearance like “an angel of God” (מלאך האלהים),\(^{114}\) and “very frightening” (נורא מאד).\(^{115}\) The man-likeness of the angel is notable, but not unique, as we saw a supernatural being described simply as a “man” in Josh 5. The woman remarks that the man gave no place of origin or name to her

---

\(^{113}\) MT, LXX. The Targum has “prophet of יהוה.” No DSS data. Same in v. 8.

\(^{114}\) MT, LXX. The Targum has “the angel of יהוה.” No DSS data. Same in v. 9.

\(^{115}\) Alter suggests that the woman did not realize this was an angel in Ancient Israel, 175. Cf. Smith, “Remembering God,” 638; On the equation of a prophet and Man of God see C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes (London: Rivingtons, 1918), 345; Robert R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 140.
The “angel of God” (马来ך האלוהים) appears to the woman a second time, this time in a field, and he also gives an audience to Manoah (v. 9-12).

It has been observed that the angel speaks more softly to Manoah’s wife than he did in chapter 6 (to Gideon). Also, the angel is gentler to Manoah’s wife than to Manoah himself: the angel uses אֲנָ, the particle of entreaty, with the woman, but when he repeats the instructions to Manoah he uses the phrase בְּכָל עַשָּׁר, “everything that” (e.g. 13:13 “everything I said to the woman;” 13:14 “everything I commanded her”), emphasizing that he has already told Manoah’s wife all of this information.

When Manoah asks to detain the “angel of YHWH” (马来ך יְהוָֹה), the angel agrees to wait, but he says he will not eat the food, and that Manoah should offer it to the LORD (v. 15-16). Manoah asks for his name to honor him, and the angel replies “What is this that you ask my name? For he/it is wonderful.” (v.17-18). It is unclear here whether the name is being described as “wonderful,” or if his name is actually “Wonderful,” or if his name is “He (i.e. God) is Wonderful.” The usage of the

---

116 Newsom notes that verse 6 suggests that there is a difference between a “man of God” and an “angel of God.” Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” AB 249.

117 She is in a field but there are no trees mentioned. This differentiates this text from Gen 18 and Judg 6.

118 Boling, Judges, 219.

119 Ibid., 222; Soggin, Judges, 235; Niditch, Judges, 146; Block, Judges, Ruth, 413. Meier does not think this is a name. Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, 53.


adjective “wonderful” ( מלא) is a linguistic connection to chapter 6, in which Gideon asks
where “all of his [YHWH’s] wonderful (מלא niphal ptc.) deeds” (מלא niphal ptc.) are
(6:13), and it is also a connection to the birth annunciation in Gen 18, in which YHWH
asks if anything is too difficult/wonderful (מלא niphal impf.) for the LORD. Doukhan
observes that the name “Wonderful” is an epithet of the Messiah (Isa 9:6 [=9:5 MT]),
thus potentially identifying this angel with Christ.

The angel waits as Manoah prepares a goat and then sets it with a grain offering
upon a rock, offering it up to YHWH “and the one who does wonders” (מופלא לעשׂהו) (Judg 13:19; cf. 6:19-20). It is unclear if this is a description of YHWH or if it is
connected with the next clause, מופלא לעשׂהו ומותו ועשהו ראים, “and the one who does
wonders, and Manoah and his wife were watching.” If the former, then the “one who
does wonders” is God Himself; if the latter, it may be designating the angel.

As the sacrifice burns, the angel of YHWH ascends in the fire and vanishes
(13:20; similar to the vanishing of the angel in 6:21). At the disappearance of the angel,
Manoah panics (as Gideon did in 6:22), and he is reassured, not by the LORD, as Gideon
was, but by his wife (v. 22-23).

---

Heroentum in Israel Und Seiner Umwelt: Eine Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zu Gen. 6, 1-4 Und
Verwandten Texten Im Alten Testament Und Der Altorientalischen Literatur (Zürich: Theologischer
Verlag, 1979), 92.

the root אָמו (here a noun) in regards to a birth announcement.


125 Against the attanach. Cf. Boling, Judges, 222.
Within Judg 13, the text alternates between the “angel of YHWH” ( מלאך יהוה) and the “angel of God” ( מלאך האלהים).\textsuperscript{126} The angel speaks of the LORD in the third person and of himself in the first person. He refuses to eat food and drink\textsuperscript{127} and will not give his name because “it/he is wonderful,” ( הוהי אלהים). The angel then goes into the flames and ascends to heaven, never reappearing.\textsuperscript{128}

After the angel disappears, Manoah exclaims that they will die because they have seen אלים (v. 22), which can refer either to God or to a lesser superhuman being (Exod 15:11; Ps 82:1; 95:3),\textsuperscript{129} although “God” is consistently the meaning of אלהים earlier in the chapter. Smith notes that in verses 8-9, Manoah and the narrator both seem to have assumed that the angel and YHWH are not the same person/being because Manoah prayed to YHWH to send the “man of God” again, and God heard Manoah, so the “angel of God” returned.\textsuperscript{130} In response to Manoah’s exclamation, his wife reassures him by telling him that if YHWH had wanted to kill them, he would not have accepted their

\begin{footnotes}
\item[128] Alter notes that this is unique in annunciation scenes. Ancient Israel, 177.
\end{footnotes}
sacrifice or revealed his plan for their son. It was the angel who revealed to them the plan for their son and who showed acceptance of their sacrifice by ascending in the flame. Again, the angel is so closely identified with YHWH\textsuperscript{131} that the two seem indistinguishable.

Many authors have noted a close relationship between Judg 6 and 13.\textsuperscript{132} Smith highlights the connections between the two chapters (in addition to their connection with Exod 3 and Gen 32).\textsuperscript{133} He notes the linguistic connections through the use of the verbs שלח, ירה, and מים, as well as the nouns מָלָאך and מִשְׁפָּחַת, and usages of sanctuary/cultic ideology.\textsuperscript{134}

It is notable that both in Judg 6 and Judg 13, the angel is associated with fire, a quality that is also associated with God and his servants in general (i.e. Exod 3:2, Ps 104:4).\textsuperscript{135} Additionally, Judg 6 and 13 are the only two instances in which Malka'a and

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{131} Or Christ in view of NT identification of YHWH with Christ (e.g., John 10:30; 17:11, 22). See Gane, {	extit{God's Faulty Heroes}}, 100-101; Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 263.
\bibitem{133} Smith, “Remembering God,” 633-636. He says that, “For the practical purpose of looking at the overlapping sets of motifs in these four narratives, the broader characterization of ‘foundation stories’ may serve...all four narratives are foundational in terms of both the individuals’ identity and the location at the sanctuary. Finally, the term ‘foundational’ covers a third aspect of these texts, namely, the relationship between their past context and contents, and the present time of the monarchic audience posited for them below—in short, their functions as recollections of early Israel and its divinity.” Ibid., 636.
\bibitem{134} Ibid., 634-635; 637, 641-645, 649-650.
\end{thebibliography}
are mixed together. Both chapters likewise contain similarities with Gen 18, including the mention of food (Judg 6 and 13), a tree (Judg 6), a birth announcement (Judg 13), the root פָּלַא (verb and adjective; Judg 6 and 13), and the persons present (man/woman/angel/YHWH). Thus, the visits from heavenly messengers and the human responses to them appear to follow a similar pattern throughout the OT.

**Excursus: The Identity of the Angel of YHWH**

Because of the difficult nature of the angel narratives in Judges, there has been quite a bit of discussion as to the identity of the “Angel of the LORD.” The issue arises from the angel’s use of the first person to describe acts that God Himself has performed, such as in Judg 2:1-5, and the apparent interchangeability between the angel and YHWH in Judg 6. In favor of the idea that the angel is simply an angel sent by God, some have suggested that messengers in the ancient Near East do in fact speak for their masters in the first person, thus allowing the angel to be a separate and distinct entity.

---


A possible analogy to the relationship between YHWH and his angel is found in Exod 4:16. When Moses protests that he cannot be an adequate spokesman, God offers the following solution: Aaron will be like his הפ, “mouth,” and speak for him, while Moses will be לאלדים, “like God.” Later, in 7:1, God says that he has made Moses לאלדים, “like God,” to Pharaoh and Aaron is his נביא, “prophet.” In these passages, the line between God, Moses, and Aaron are blurred, but they are all distinctly different persons. Similarly, in Hag 1:13ff., Haggai is clearly the messenger (“angel”), but he delivers the message of YHWH, retaining the first-person voice of YHWH’s own words: אני Abram, “I am with you.”

López notes that one of the issues is whether it is an angel of YHWH or the angel of YHWH; in other words, whether or not the angel is one unique being or a generic office that can be held by different beings. He plausibly argues that this is a generic office, correctly noting that a noun in construct with a proper noun is not necessarily definite, and Malone concedes that the grammar supports this theory. On the other hand, Doukhan argues that the entire construct phrase should be treated as definite (which is also grammatically possible), and that this signals a “unique individual.” However,

---

140 Unsurprisingly, the Tg. has difficulty with this concept and changes “mouth” and “prophet” to מדריך, “interpreter,” and “God” to ברי, “prince.” The LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and DSS fragments align with the MT.

141 López, “Identifying the ‘Angel of the Lord’ in the Book of Judges,” 2-3, 14-15; Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, p. 54, 57, 59. He notes that the LXX data on the subject is mixed. Ibid., 54-55. Newsom states that either is grammatically correct, but that the text is not particularly interested in distinguishing the angel. “Angels,” ABD 1: 250.


143 Doukhan, Genesis, 232.
because the grammar is ambiguous, such translational decisions must rely on other contextual clues.

Malone favors Douglas Stuart’s hypothesis that there is an appositional relationship between יהוה and מלאך. Stuart suggests that this is an appositional construct, what some grammars call “genitive of association” or an “equalizing (construct) relationship,” found in constructions such as נחל הפרת, “River Euphrates” (Gen 15:18). However, the phrase מלאך היה, “angel of the LORD,” can be applied to human prophets, such as Haggai (Hag 1:13). Thus, an appositional construct usage of this phrase, if it exists, would depend on context alone.

Malone suggests that it is impossible to prove that the angel of YHWH and YHWH himself can be distinguished from each other, further stating that YHWH can speak of himself in the third person (2 Sam 7:11, Hos 1:7, Mal 3:1), which means that if the angel speaks of YHWH in the third person, this does not preclude the possibility

---

144 Malone, “Distinguishing the Angel of the Lord,” 301, 308.

145 Douglas K. Stuart, Exodus, NAC 2 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 110-111. He equates this with the NT Greek appositional genitive. Ibid., n. 17.


147 BHRG §25.4.4, p. 198-199.

148 Waltke and O’Connor, IBHS §9.5.3h, p. 153; BHRG §25.4.4.iv, p. 199.


that the angel is YHWH.\textsuperscript{151} Others have made similar arguments, supporting the idea that the angel of YHWH is simply a manifestation of God.\textsuperscript{152}

Christian theologians through centuries have maintained that the appearance of the angel of YHWH is, more particularly, a Christophany.\textsuperscript{153} For example, Moskala states that “this ‘Angel of the Lord’ is a divine being, the pre-incarnate Christ appearing as God’s Messenger.”\textsuperscript{154}

From a Christian theological viewpoint, it makes sense to identify Christ in some or all of the “angel of the LORD” texts.\textsuperscript{155} Of course, this reading is not explicit in the Hebrew text, but in some instances, it is the best interpretive option.\textsuperscript{156} For example the


\textsuperscript{155} Though this is not without its own theological difficulties. See MacDonald “Christology and ‘the Angel of the Lord,’” 224-335.

\textsuperscript{156} For the Angel of the LORD in Judges 6 see Kaiser, \textit{The Messiah in the Old Testament}, 228; Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 261; Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 232.
angel of the LORD in Zech 3 is generally regarded as the pre-incarnate Christ by Christian interpreters. However, not every instance of the angel of YHWH can be immediately classified as a Christophany. The NT mentions the equivalent term “angel of the Lord” (ἄγγελος κυρίου) in contexts where the angel cannot be Christ (Matt 1:20-24, 2:13, 19; Luke 1:11-19, 2:9). Thus, contextual clues are needed to determine if the passage refers to a Christophany or a “regular” angel.

Summary and Synthesis

Within the framework of Joshua-Judges, there is awareness of sub-divine and other supernatural beings and their roles as warriors, messengers, and tormentors. What is consistent is that they all operate under the direction of YHWH and do His bidding. They are not granted license to act and do as they please. Boling observes that angelic stories come into play when the “customary” avenues for choosing a leader no longer work and there is an “absence or malfunction of the tribal assembly.”

These passages do lay the foundation for themes found in later biblical material. The host of heaven with a commander correlates to the scene in Dan 8:11. The angelic messenger is found throughout the biblical text, and evil spirits are seen in post-exilic

---


158 Both the NT and LXX use the phrase ἄγγελος κυρίου with and without the article somewhat interchangeably. Often the first use of the term in a passage will not have the article but subsequent mentions of the angel in the passage will use the article. See Matt 1:20, 24; Gen 16:7-11; Judg 2:1, 4; Judg 6:11-22, etc.

159 Boling, Judges, 136-137.

literature, including the NT (Luke 7:21, 8:2; Acts 19:12-13, 15-16). These beings all become important for the later understanding of sub-divine beings in both Jewish and Christian theology.
CHAPTER 4

1 AND 2 SAMUEL

Introduction

Samuel contains numerous references to spirits, angels, and for the first time in this study, cherubim (plural of כְּרוּב). At first glance it may seem that these accounts have little value for our study, because many of the references are in passing, and even used rhetorically. In essence, many of these passages do not contain accounts of these beings doing anything. Nevertheless, the invocation of their imagery within a title or a comparison, or their appearance within a story tells us something about the way in which these beings were understood at the time. Thus, valuable information regarding sub-divine beings in ancient Israelite accounts can be gleaned here.

1 Samuel 4: Cherubim

Context

This narrative recounts the capture of the ark of God by the Philistines in battle and the subsequent deaths of Hophni, Phinehas, his wife, and Eli. The ark is mentioned several times in this narrative, called variously “the Ark of the Covenant of the LORD,” (1 Sam 4:3, 5), “the Ark of the Covenant of God,” (v. 4), “the Ark of the LORD” (v. 6), and “the Ark of God,” (v. 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22). The full name of the object is given as: “the Ark of the Covenant of the LORD of Hosts Who Sits on the Cherubim” (ארון הברית והוהי תירב תואבצ בשי נורא) (1 Sam 4:4).
Analysis

Cherubim are frequent features in the OT, appearing both as images (i.e. on the ark, in the sanctuary on the walls and curtains), as well as living creatures (i.e., Gen 3:24, Ezek 9-11). Meyers categorizes the cherubim as: 1) two-dimensional, such as those woven into fabrics and carved into the temple, or 2) three-dimensional, including sculptures and living beings. Within Samuel we find three references to cherubim, all of which are three-dimensional.

The Hebrew term בורכ, “cherub,” is only found in the Bible, with no known occurrences in ancient Near Eastern inscriptions. It is widely thought that the word is related to the Akkadian verb karābu, but not all scholars agree. For example, Cogan finds the connection between the Hebrew and Akkadian terms to be a bit strained, arguing that the Akkadian terms are late and appear to be used differently than in the Bible. Alter states that “keruv means ‘mount’ or ‘hybrid,’” although he offers no support for this definition. Thus, the origins of the word are still obscure.

---


3 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 5 n. 8.


5 Mordechai Cogan, 1 Kings, AB10 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 244.

6 Alter, Ancient Israel, 633.
Cherubim are most often mentioned in connection with the ark and the temple. Exodus 25:18-22 and 37:7-9 tell us that two cherubim were to be placed on the “ark cover” (תֹּרֶכֶך), with their wings touching. Haran has convincingly argued that the cherubim/ark cover and the ark were seen as separate (though related) cultic objects, and that the cherubim, not the ark, were the throne of God,\(^7\) while the ark itself was viewed as a footstool.\(^8\)

In 2 Sam 22:11, a cherub functions as a mount for YHWH,\(^9\) so it may be inferred that the cherubim on the ark also serve as mounts for the glory of YHWH within the tabernacle/temple.\(^10\) Some scholars closely identify cherubim with the sphinx-like winged


\(^10\) Cogan, *1 Kings*, 244.
lion with a human head, attested in the Phoenician artistic tradition. Although the connection with cherubim is still uncertain, there are many such images that have survived, which illustrate these creatures serving as a throne for a king or a deity.


Against this ancient Near Eastern background, the ark is often seen as both a cult object and as a throne for the LORD.15

In 1 Sam 4:4 (and later in 2 Sam 6:2) we find that the ark is called the ark of “the LORD of Hosts Who Sits on the Cherubim.”16 Wood argues that the use of “enthroned/sits upon” or “dwells between” is inadequate as this translation requires supplying a preposition not present in Hebrew. Based upon the usage of the participle בֵּשׁי in Num 21:2 and Num 34:40, she suggests that it is used in the sense of “ruler of the cherubim.”17 Alternately, she suggests that the meaning of the phrase could be “cherubim dweller/inhabitant,” in reference to the temple (which is filled with images of cherubim) as God’s dwelling place.18 Thus, Wood argues that there is insufficient evidence to see the cherubim as a throne for God, based on her interpretation of the participle בֵּשׁי in the name formula and her rejection of what she views as an over-reliance on Late Bronze iconography in general, and the Megiddo ivories in particular.19

Wood’s arguments are not without merit, but there are usages of the participle בֵּשׁי without a preposition with the sense of “sit” rather than “dwell” (i.e., Gen 18:1, Ps 69:13;


16 H. Niehr suggests that this title, along with the temple system and the cherubim themselves were of Phoenician origin. In “God of Heaven,” DDD, 370.

17 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 12-14, 139.


19 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 10-11, 139, 203-204.
possibly Isa 42:7, Ps 107:10). Additionally, the existence of the cherubim-type iconography on the Megiddo ivories in the Late Bronze age,\(^{20}\) coupled with the exilic writing of Ezekiel’s cherubim-throne (Ezek 1, 10-11) lends credence to the theory of continuity of the tradition.

Within these earlier texts, beyond the description of wings, we are not told what the cherubim looked like.\(^{21}\) The Israelites were told to include them in the Tent of Meeting (Exod 26:1, 31), on the ark (Exod 25:18 ff.), and then later in the temple (1 Kgs 6:23 ff.), which implies that they knew exactly what cherubim looked like and felt no need to describe them further.\(^{22}\) A similar argument may be made regarding the lack of explanation of the function of the cherubim.\(^{23}\) A detailed physical description of cherubim is not provided within the biblical accounts until the book of Ezekiel (i.e., Ezek 1, 10; cf. Rev 4).\(^{24}\)

Unlike the term מלאכ, which can be used to describe both human and heavenly messengers, cherubim are always supernatural, sub-divine beings, and they are linked

---

\(^{20}\) See n. 14, above.


\(^{22}\) McGuire-Moushon, “Divine Beings,” *LTW*; Sarna, *Genesis*, 375; Wood, *Of Wings and Wheels*, 1-2. However, by the time of Josephus, it seems no one was sure what they looked like. *Ant*. 8.3.3 §73.

\(^{23}\) Wood, *Of Wings and Wheels*, 42.

\(^{24}\) Rev 4:6ff. calls these beings “living ones” (ζωον), a term that Ezek 10:20 uses to describe the cherubim (רוח). McGuire-Moushon, “Divine Beings,” *LTW*. Cf. Wood, *Of Wings and Wheels*, 95-140. If they were ever conceived as being winged humanoids, then they might be analogous to Mesopotamian genii. On these beings see Gane, “Composite Beings in Neo-Babylonian Art,” 48-66.
with the physical presence of YHWH\(^25\) and the kingship of YHWH.\(^26\) Thus cherubim were likely understood to be different from angels.\(^27\) Cherubim do not deliver messages, and their interactions with humans seem to be limited to keeping humans away from the sacred\(^28\) as cherubim are considered to function in protective roles, based on their location in the boundaries of sacred spaces.\(^29\) In addition, they are typically associated with both thrones and trees.\(^30\) Perhaps the most well-known biblical example of the guardian function of cherubim is found in Gen 3:24, when cherubim and a flaming sword are set at the entrance to the Garden of Eden to prevent humans from reentering it.\(^31\) Of the Garden of Eden and the temple Wood says, “In each case, the cherubim are boundary markers and guardians of what is sacred,”\(^32\) a function that is important for protecting the

\(^{25}\) Cunchillos, *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses*, 159-160.


\(^{28}\) Wood, *Of Wings and Wheels*, 27 n.41, 32-33, 37-39, 49, 57-61, 91-92, 94-95, 139-140.


\(^{32}\) Ibid., 61. See also 37-38, 40, 49, 52-53, 91-92, 94-95, 136-137, 139-140. Cf. Cunchillos, *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses*, 159-160.
sacred from the profane and the sinner from the all-consuming holiness of God (cf. Exod 19:21-25, 2 Sam 6:6-7).

1 Samuel 16: Evil Spirit of God

Context

In the second half of 1 Sam 16, after Samuel anoints David (v.13), Saul is “terrorized by an evil spirit from the LORD” (v. 14). Saul’s servants suggest that he find someone to play the lyre for him, to soothe him whenever an “evil spirit of God” comes upon him (v. 15, 16). As a result, David enters Saul’s service and plays for him whenever this spirit (רוח האלוהים حرַע) comes upon him (v. 23).

Analysis

Before 1 Sam 16, we find that the (good) spirit of YHWH/God “rushed upon” (חַלָצ) Saul.33 In 1 Samuel the “spirit of YHWH” (רוח יהוה/רוח אלוהים) rushes upon Saul to prophesy (10:6, 10) and to stir him to action (11:6). However, 1 Sam 16:13 is the turning point. It is in this verse that “the spirit of YHWH rushed upon David” (חלצתו הרוחה אלוהים) instead of Saul.34 Then verse 14 states that the “spirit of YHWH” (רוח יהוה) has “turned away” (ricanes) from Saul, and “an evil spirit from YHWH”

---

33 The meaning of the verb חַלָצ is difficult to translate. Hausmann has “attain” or “rush upon” or “succeed, complete.” J. Hausmann, “חַלָצ,” TDOT 12:383.

34 As McCarter notes, “the evil spirit serves in the narrative as an objectification of Yahweh’s abandonment of Saul; especially in contrast to David who has been chosen to supplant him.” McCarter, “Evil Spirit of God,” DDD, 319.
(רוחו יבש וערל) comes in its place. Unlike Judg 9:23, where the spirit comes between people to create strife, this spirit terrorizes Saul (v. 14-15) and is described as being “on” him (v. 16) until David’s music incites the spirit to “turn away” (הרס) from Saul (v. 23). Thus, both the opening and closing of the account of 1 Sam 16:14-23 use the verb “turn away” (הרס) to describe the (good) spirit of God turning away from Saul (v. 14) and the evil spirit leaving him at the end of the chapter (v. 23). 35

Spirits are associated with heavenly beings. For example, they are equated with angels/messengers in Ps 104:4; a spirit functions like an angel and speaks of angels in Job 4:15-21; and a spirit is found among “the host of heaven” (עבצ השמים) in 1 Kgs 22. The spirit in this text is not personified in any obvious way 36 and has been interpreted by some as more of a clinical madness 37 than an agent working upon Saul. However, spirits were thought to cause diseases and afflictions in the ancient Near East, 38 much like demons in ancient Near Eastern and later biblical literature. 39 Wahlen agrees: “The

35 Alter, Ancient Israel, 333.
irrationality of Saul’s behaviour makes it more likely that the evil spirit in these passages is understood in personal terms,” because this more closely mirrors the behavior of possession seen later in the NT. In the NT, unclean spirits are associated with demons and insanity.

Hamori states that several texts in the Hebrew Bible (including 1 Sam 16:14-23) are part of a “tradition of הרוח♦ as divine agent, specifically associated with bringing destructive justice by means of falsehood.” She draws further comparisons between this passage and 1 Kgs 22, particularly noting that when Zedekiah mocks the idea that the spirit of YHWH moved from himself to Micaiah (v. 24), he uses language that is similar to that which describes the spirit of YHWH moving from Saul to David in 1 Sam 16. A further interesting feature of 1 Sam 16:14 is that the spirit is from YHWH (רוח הרעה מטא נוהי, “the evil spirit from with YHWH”), meaning that this spirit is sent from YHWH’s company to terrorize Saul (cf. 1 Kgs 22:22, Job 1:12, 2:6-7). When the text further calls the spirit an “evil/harmful spirit of God” or (in 1 Sam 19:9) an

40 Wahlen, Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 26.


43 Hamori, “The Spirit of Falsehood,” 19-20. She further states “For biblical authors, it seems to be a basic rule of cosmic physics that no two spirits can occupy the same space at the same time.” Ibid, 20. On the connection between 1 Sam 16 and 1 Kgs 22 see also White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership, 120; Gwilym H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings Volume II: 1 Kings 17:1-2 Kings 25:30, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 368.

“evil/harmful spirit of YHWH” (רוח אלוהים רעה/רוח יהוה רעה), it seems that these are abbreviations for the initial phrase (רוחדרכעה מסת יהוה). Thus, the “evil/harmful spirit of God” is referring to a destructive spirit sent by God, not an evil moral quality or attribute of God himself (see the previous chapter of this dissertation). This concept will be explored further later in the present work.

1 Samuel 18: Evil Spirit of God

Context

In this narrative, Saul’s jealousy of David gets the better of him when he hears the praises that the women sing for David (1 Sam 18:7-9). As a result, an “evil spirit of God” (רוח אלוהים רעה) rushes to Saul, who reacts by attempting to kill David (v. 10-11). David escapes and Saul becomes fearful because YHWH was with David and not himself (v. 12). Later, Saul plots to kill David by using the promise of marriage to his daughter for the price of one hundred Philistine foreskins (v. 21, 25).

Analysis

In 1 Sam 18:10, התצלת רוח אלוהים רעה אלישעאול, “the evil spirit of God rushed to Saul,” in a similar manner as the (good) spirit of YHWH does in previous passages (Judg 14:6, 14:19, 15:14; 1 Sam 10:6, 10:10, 11:6, 16:13). Generally, the presence of God’s spirit indicates that the individual is a divinely chosen leader or the spirit is a catalyst for

45 As seen in Isa 45:7, as pointed out by Daniel I. Block (personal communication on March 8, 2019).

46 Although אלוהים can mean “divine beings” or “gods” (i.e. not God himself), when one compares this verse with 1 Sam 16:14 and 1 Sam 19:9, it seems that אלוהים here means God.
prophecy. In this text, however, the spirit rushes on him causing him to go into a murderous rage. Wahlen suggests that this is an indicator that “spirits could be conceived as distinct forces which drive people to evil.” Indeed, it is curious that an “evil spirit of God” (רוּחַ אלהים רֵעָה) would incite Saul to try to kill David, and one wonders at the intent of the spirit here.

It seems that the spirit was sent by God (see above) to rush onto Saul, but his reaction was not one that YHWH condoned. This is an example of a phenomenon that we see described in great detail in a passage outside of our study: Job 1-2. In that passage YHWH allows harmful and destructive action by a sub-divine being. This will be explored further below.

1 Samuel 19: Evil Spirit of YHWH

Context

In the continuing story, Saul is still unsuccessfully attempting to kill David. He tries to get the servants to do it, but Jonathan intervenes (1 Sam 19:1-7). Then Saul tries to kill David when he is playing his lyre. The text says that an “evil spirit of YHWH” (ルー רֵעָה) falls upon Saul (v. 9-10). David flees Saul with the help of Michal (v. 11-17), and when Saul discovers his whereabouts, he sends messengers to retrieve him (v. 18-20). The “spirit of God” (רוּחַ אלהים) then comes upon the messengers and upon Saul himself and they prophesy (v. 20-24).


48 Wahlen, Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 26.
Analysis

Perhaps what is strangest about this story is that in 1 Sam 19:20-24, the spirit of God comes upon the messengers of Saul and eventually Saul himself, causing him to prophesy and generally make a fool of himself. However, this is a narrative structure that forms a kind of thematic chiasm with 1 Sam 16. In 1 Sam 16:14 (A) the Spirit of YHWH departs from Saul, and (B) an evil spirit of (from) YHWH come upon Saul. In 1 Sam 19:9 (B) an evil spirit of (from) YHWH comes upon Saul, but in verses 23-24 (A) the Spirit of God49 comes on Saul and he prophesies. Unfortunately for Saul, this final experience with the Spirit of God is not an indicator of God’s forgiveness or Saul’s return to favor.

Although in 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19 we find an “evil spirit,” each time it is said to be from/of God/YHWH. As mentioned above, the “evil/harmful spirit of God” is referring to a destructive spirit sent by God (1 Sam 16:14; cf. 1 Kgs 22:22-23, Job 1:12, 2:6-7), not an evil moral quality or attribute of God himself. Thus, it seems that the spirit is “from YHWH” in the sense that God has granted permission to this spirit for a specific task in punishing Saul, but this spirit is also a separate being who attempts to follow its own agenda by inciting Saul to attack David. That YHWH is fully in control of the situation is never in question, although he repeatedly delivers David from Saul when Saul is under the influence of the evil spirit. We are not told much about the spirit(s) itself, but it would seem that it is only allowed to afflict Saul; thus, the limited scope of its actions

49 Although אלлись can mean “divine beings” or “gods” (i.e. not God himself), when one compares this verse with 1 Sam 16:14 and 1 Sam 19:9, it seems that אלynı here means God.
resembles the story in Job 1-2, in which YHWH allows Satan to test Job, but with limitations. Any other action outside of the specific mission is not permitted by YHWH.

Although it might seem strange that YHWH would use a destructive spirit for his purpose, we have seen that it is not an isolated occurrence in the Bible. Within the human realm, YHWH called both Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and Cyrus of Persia his servants (Jer 25:9, 27:6, 43:10; Isa 44:28, 45:1) and he used Assyria as a method of punishment (Isa 10:5; 1 Chr 5:6). However, the fact that YHWH utilized these people/powers as tools to carry out certain tasks did not indicate that they were not sinful; YHWH also punished these nations for their own wickedness (Isa 10:5; Jer 50:18).

The evil spirit passages in 1 Sam 16, 18 and 19 lay the groundwork for more complex depictions of antagonistic spirits, such as those in 1 Sam 28 and 1 Kgs 22. Additionally, 1 Sam 16, 18 and 19 lay the foundation for the understanding of demonic possession and exorcism, as seen in the NT.

1 Samuel 28: Ghost of Samuel

Context

In this story, the Philistines come against Saul and Israel. Saul, in distress, tries to consult the LORD, but his inquiries go unanswered. The text says that Saul had


51 On the connection between the evil spirit in 1 Sam 16:14 and the ANE understanding of demons see Riley, “Demon,” DDD, 236.

previously expelled “the ghosts” (נחשובת) and “the spirits” (.addObject) (v. 3, 9). In desperation he seeks a “sorceress” (אנשים בנטליאובה) (v. 7) to call up a “ghost” (בוא) (v. 8). When Saul requests that a בוא, “ghost,” be brought up for him (v. 8), the woman replies that Saul has cut off all of the בוא and “the spirits” (ируетנות) (v. 9). She does, however, comply. She declares that she sees “god(s)” (אלוהים) coming up from the earth (v. 13). The description she gives is of an old man, wrapped in a robe. Saul is certain that this is Samuel, and he prostrates himself. A conversation ensues, and the news is given to Saul that he will die in the upcoming battle.

Analysis

McCarter suggests that this passage was originally about a nameless ghost and that Samuel’s name was only added in later, due to what he calls “prophetic reworking.” Although this is an attractive idea, in that it would eliminate the problem


54 Gray suggests that אשת בנטליאובה is collective. In Gray, I and II Kings, 707. Alter translates this phrase as “ghost-wife.” In Ancient Israel, 405.


56 Alter, Ancient Israel, 406-407.


58 McCarter, 1 Samuel, 421-423.
that the dead prophet Samuel could be called up to a dialogue by an occult medium,\textsuperscript{59} there is no evidence to support this assumption.

This passage implies that only the woman could see Samuel (v. 12), though later in the passage the being and Saul speak to each other (v. 15-19),\textsuperscript{60} possibly through the woman herself.\textsuperscript{61} Some LXX manuscripts read “Saul” for “Samuel” in verse 12 (rendering “when the woman saw (that it was) Saul”),\textsuperscript{62} which actually makes more sense, but the majority of the manuscript evidence has the name of Samuel here.

McCarter states that the use of the term אָלֹהִים for a ghost-type spirit is unusual for the OT.\textsuperscript{63} However, some scholars take for granted that the dead were regarded as deities.\textsuperscript{64} Heiser defines אָלֹהִים as any spirit or disembodied being; therefore, the inclusion

\textsuperscript{59} Cf. Eccl 9:5, which states that the dead do not know anything.


of a ghost in this category is not unexpected. Nevertheless, the usage of אֱלֹהִים in this passage is difficult, as is the grammar. The statement is: “I see gods coming up אֱלֹהִים וְאָרַחַי עֲלָמָה from the earth.” Here אֱלֹהִים must be plural because it should agree in number with the plural participle עָלָמָה, which describes the אֱלֹהִים. Alter prefers to interpret the participle as a singular meaning with a plural form, commonly seen with אֱלֹהִים. This interpretation can be supported on the basis of the next verse in which Saul asks about “his (singular) form.” However, in that case the reader might mistake the words to mean “I see God coming up,” which, presumably the text is trying to avoid.

Against Alter’s position, Schmidt argues that these אֱלֹהִים are not the dead themselves, but the netherworld deities upon whom the necromancer calls to bring up the dead. He further argues that Saul’s question references Samuel, named in verses 11-12, and not the אֱלֹהִים of verse 13. However, a better explanation is put forth by Kent who argues that this shift from אֱלֹהִים to Samuel is a narrative acknowledgement of both the polytheistic perspective of the woman and the Yahwistic perspective of Saul.

The exact etymology for בוא is unknown, though it is thought by some that it is related to Sumerian ab, Akkadian apu, and Hittite/Hurrian api, terms which mean “hole,”

---


66 Alter, Ancient Israel, 406.

67 Schmidt, Israel’s Beneficent Dead, 150, 211-220.

68 Ibid., 217.

69 Kent, “‘Call Up Samuel:’ Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25),” 145-146.
or “pit.” However, Tropper is convinced that the term references a person and not an object. Alternate theories regarding the etymology relate the Hebrew term to the Arabic word 'āba meaning “return.” Thus, when it is associated with the dead, it would mean “returned one.” Another theory is that it is derived from the Hebrew word 'āb, “father.” Thus the word would then carry the meaning of “ancestral spirit.” The usage in our

---


Schmidt, Israel’s Beneficent Dead, 151. Schmidt rejects the definition “hole” or “pit” on the basis of the frequent use of the plural form of בות, the lack of “holes” in the Samuel narrative, and the uncertain connection between Sumerian ab, Akkadian apu, and Hittite api with the biblical term. See Israel’s Beneficent Dead, 151-152.

Seidel notes that the various ancient translations used so many different terms that it is possible that the original meaning was unknown by the dawn of the Common Era. In Seidel, “Necromantic Praxis in the Midrash on the Séance at En Dor,” 99, 104.


The noun נִעְדִי is used in a similar way, and is thought to be derived from the Hebrew verb עָדֵי, "to know," with the apparent meaning "all-knowing one," indicating the great knowledge that the spirits of the dead supposedly possessed.  

Tropper suggests that in Lev 20:27 the בֹּא was assumed to be inside the medium, and this concept explains the use of the term ἐγγαστρίσως, "ventriloquist," in the LXX for בֹּא. However, he sees this as disconnected from the earlier ancestor cult and notes the shift from the spirit to the human agent from the LXX onward, with the latter being designated a magician or witch. Schmidt rejects this theory, stating that בֹּא and יֵשׁ עַN refer to spirits of the dead, and he observes that the human agent is only mentioned with respect to his/her relationship to the ghost (such as בֹּא־תלעב תשׁא).

The woman is

74 Schmidt, Israel’s Beneficent Dead, 147, 152-154, 209. Hoffner suggests that the word originally meant a “ritual pit,” but eventually also came to signify the spirit as well. In Hoffner, “Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew בֹּא,” 401.


called an “owner of an ob” (v. 7), and it has been pointed out that this term has an equivalent in Sumerian: lú giddim-ma.

The identity of the spirit has long been debated. The heart of the issue seems to be that this account is inconsistent with the rest of the Hebrew Bible’s prohibition against necromancy. Smelik notes that:

Although the general tendency of this narrative is clear enough, it contains many difficulties, when read from a more logical point of view. Some of these are even impossible to solve. Therefore this pericope gave expounders of every age much trouble, but especially those from Antiquity, when Biblical exegesis was more strictly determined by dogmatic and logical considerations.

Block suggests that YHWH allowed Samuel himself to be brought up, despite the fact that the practice of necromancy was forbidden, as this seems to be the natural reading. However, according to Kent’s analysis, the use of the name of Samuel for the spirit is “focalization,” which he defines as “the technique in which the narrator

81 Kent translates this as “a woman who controls a familiar spirit” in Kent, Say It Again, Sam, 138; Alter translates this phrase as “ghost-wife.” In Ancient Israel, 405. Hamori states that “We do not have enough information, in historical or literary terms, to judge whether a medium was more likely to be female, or whether this was just Saul’s preference.” Esther J. Hamori, “The Prophet and the Necromancer: Women’s Divination for Kings,” JBL 132.4 (2013): 831.


85 Daniel I. Block, personal communication March 8, 2019.
temporarily adopts the point of view of a character.” Thus he concludes that this spirit is not the deceased Samuel but a demonic entity or evil spirit.

1 Chronicles 10:13 does not mention the name of Samuel, only noting that Saul died in part because he had consulted a בֹּא. While the account of 1 Sam 28 does not state that Saul died for consulting a medium, that is in fact what happened in the end.

Saul, taking the words of the בֹּא to heart, killed himself after he was wounded in battle (1 Sam 31:4). Although most commentators state that the spirit’s prophecy came true, which they take as evidence that the spirit was Samuel himself, Kent notes that there are some elements of the prophecy in 1 Sam 28 that did not come true: Saul was not really killed in battle, but committed suicide, and not all of his sons were killed the next day. Kent says, “This leaves the unsettling feeling of having been tricked by an occult practitioner.”

Whomever the spirit being was, calling it up was an illegitimate activity, condemned in the Hebrew Bible as idolatrous and worthy of death (Lev 19:31, 20:6, 20:27; Deut 18:11; 2 Kgs 21:6, 23:24; Isa 8:19, 19:3; 29:4; 1 Chr 10:13; 2 Chr 33:6). It is

86 Kent, “‘Call Up Samuel:’ Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25),” 157.


89 Daniel I. Block, personal communication March 8, 2019; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 421-423; Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, 219-221; Alter, Ancient Israel, 406-408.

90 Kent, “‘Call Up Samuel:’ Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25),” 153-154. One survives: Ish-boshet/Eshbaal (2 Sam 2:8-10; 1 Chr 8:33). Ibid.

91 Ibid., 153.
therefore unlikely that YHWH would have broken his own rules to bring up Samuel through an idolatrous occult practitioner, especially since he refused to communicate with Saul at all in 1 Sam 28:6. Kent’s solution to the identity of the ūḵ seems to be the most logical interpretation that preserves both the integrity of the text and the internal logic and theology of the Hebrew Bible.

Within the life of Saul, we see a decline in faithfulness to God. Once the (good) spirit of God leaves him, an evil spirit torments him, and once the prophetic word leaves him, he consults an illicit spirit which ultimately drives him to despair and suicide. This is consistent with other accounts of evil/punishing spirits who cause chaos (Judg 9:23; 1 Sam 16:14-16, 18:10-11, 19:9-10), and this account in 1 Sam 28 also bears some similarity with the account in 1 Kgs 22. As we shall see in the next chapter, a “lying spirit” (חֲרֹן שֶׁקֶר) is sent to the prophets of Ahab in order to lead him to death. That is essentially what the illicit spirit of 1 Sam 28 does. The difference is that in 1 Kgs 22, the actions of the lying spirit are authorized by YHWH, but in 1 Sam 28 there is no indication that YHWH is involved in or has authorized anything that occurs during the course of this occult practice. This silence speaks volumes; YHWH has not led Saul to Endor, nor has he sent “Samuel.” Although Saul was afflicted and tormented by the evil spirit from YHWH in chapters 16 and 18-19 (see above), God put limitations on the

---

92 As suggested by Daniel I. Block, personal communication March 8, 2019.

93 Kent calls the spirit’s prediction a “self-fulfilling prophecy.” In Kent, “‘Call Up Samuel:’ Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25),” 152-153.
spirit. This time the evil spirit was not sent by YHWH, but conjured at Saul’s own request; YHWH did not intervene, and Saul sealed his own fate.94

1 Samuel 29: As an Angel of God

Context

In this narrative, Achish tells David that he cannot join in the battle with the Philistines against Saul and Israel (v. 6-7). David protests (v. 8), and Achish declares that he knows that David is faultless. He calls David “good in my eyes, like an angel of God” (ךאלמכ אלוהים) (v. 9). However, the other chiefs of the Philistines have reservations.

Analysis

While this passage does not contain an actual angel, David is compared with an angel of God. Thus, it is important for our study in regard to the perception of angels in our passages. North notes that this type of comparison with angels is unique to the books of Samuel.95 The device here is used to suggest that David is perceived as good and loyal by Achish.96 Smith goes further, suggesting that since the angel is equated with a warrior, Achish is making a statement regarding David’s battle skills,97 although this is conjecture.


95 North, “Separated Spiritual Substances in the Old Testament,” 134. However, cf. Gen 23:6 in which Abraham is called a “prince of God/the gods” by the Hittites.

96 McCarter follows Codex Vaticanus and omits this phrase here, as it is, in his opinion, “inappropriate.” McCarter, 1 Samuel, 426.

97 Smith, “Remembering God,” 642-643.
This passage uses the phrase “angel of God” (מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִים) and not “angel of YHWH.” It is not surprising that a Philistine would use the generic “God” rather than the proper name of YHWH. Furthermore, Malone notes that it (מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִים) means an angel of God, not the angel of God. Thus, within this phrase there is no ambiguity about whether or not the angel is referring to God himself; rather it is clearly talking about an unspecified angel.

**2 Samuel 6: Cherubim**

**Context**

This chapter is also a narrative. It tells the story of David retrieving the ark of the covenant from Baalim of Judah (v. 1-5) and reports the death of Uzzah (v. 6-9) which resulted in the subsequent re-routing of the ark to the home of Obed-Edom the Gittite (v. 10-11). Three months later, David retrieves the ark and brings it to Jerusalem (v. 11-19).

In this story the ark is called “the Ark of the LORD” (v. 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17) and “the Ark of God,” (v. 3, 4, 6, 7, 12). An even longer name for the ark is found in verse 2: “the Ark of God Which is Called by the Name, the Name of the LORD of Hosts Who Sits on the Cherubim Above It” (אָרוֹן הַמְּלָאֵךְ אֱשֶׁר עֵנָּהָשׁ שְׁמְ שֵׁהוּ עַבְרָא שֵׁב בְּכוּרֵי).

---


99 Eynikel finds it significant that David is compared with the angel, who in this context is clearly not the same as God, noting that “angels are now more clearly distinguished from God and comparison with an angel is not the same as comparison with God himself.” In Eynikel, “The Angel in Samson’s Birth Narrative-Judg 13,” 115.
Analysis

As with 1 Sam 4, in 2 Sam 6 we find that YHWH is called “the LORD of Hosts Who Sits on the Cherubim,” in reference to the ark.100 No further information is given to us about the cherubim, but the story makes it clear that the ark is sacred, and it is dangerous for a human to violate the boundaries of a sacred place or object associated with the presence of YHWH (cf. Gen 3:24).

2 Samuel 14: As an Angel of God

Context

In this tale the woman from Tekoa is sent by Joab to David to convince him to allow Absalom to come home (v. 1-3). She tells a story and calls on David for justice (v. 4-18) saying that she knew the king was “like an angel of God” (בְּמַלְאֵךְ הַאֲלָהִים), “discerning good and bad, and the LORD your God is with you” (v. 17). She then flatters him by saying that his wisdom is like that of an angel (תִּנְERM בְּמַלְאֵךְ הַאֲלָהִים) (v. 20).

Analysis

Again, we see that David is compared with an angel of God. Here the phrase is spoken by the woman of Tekoa to suggest that David possesses superior wisdom and discernment. McCarter dismisses these statements as “rhetorical cunning—flattery not

100 See above. Wood argues that the use of “enthroned/sits upon” or “dwells between” is inadequate. She suggests rather “ruler of the cherubim” or “cherubim dweller,” in reference to the temple as God’s dwelling place. Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 13-14, 139. Cf. Brownlee, “The Ineffable Name of God,” 38; Albright “Review of B.N. Wambacq,” 377-381 for the formula “The One Who Creates the Hosts…”
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Certainly, the woman is flattering David, but the question is: Why does she use this phrase? As we saw in 1 Sam 29, Achish uses a similar statement to emphasize David’s loyalty. Newsom plausibly suggests that the invocation of an angel when speaking about wisdom may derive from an idea that because angels were thought of as part of the divine council (1 Kgs 22), they were also regarded as wise.¹⁰²

**2 Samuel 19: As an Angel of God**

**Context**

This chapter tells the story of David’s triumphant return as king over Israel (v. 16-24). Mephibosheth, though he had done nothing wrong, looks guilty in the eyes of the king (v. 25-29). After he explains how he was deceived, he tells David to do as he wishes with him, for David is “like an angel of God” (ךאלמה מעדס) (v. 28).

**Analysis**

A third time David is compared with the angel of God. This time it is Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan, who uses the phrase to imply that David possesses superior wisdom and discernment. McCarter again dismisses the statement as “routine flattery,”¹⁰³ though it is certainly more than that. Mephibosheth and David had a good relationship for Jonathan’s sake, and it seems that Mephibosheth was truly distressed by the events that had taken place (1 Sam 19:25 [MT]).

---

¹⁰¹ McCarter, 2 Samuel, 347; Cf. Ibid., 422.


¹⁰³ McCarter, 2 Samuel, 422. Cf. Ibid., 347.
Eynikel finds it significant that in all three passages (1 Sam 29, 2 Sam 14 and 2 Sam 19), David is compared with an angel, not God himself, and he sees this as evidence that by this point the angel and God were clearly differentiated. Malone notes that in all three passages the expression should be translated as “an angel of God,” not “the angel of God,” even when the definite article is present. Thus, these passages all compare David to a “generic” angel, rather than a specific being.

It is also significant that all of these passages use the formula “angel of God,” rather than “angel of YHWH.” As noted above, it is hardly surprising that Achish would prefer “God” over “YHWH,” but both the woman of Tekoa and Mephibosheth are Israelites who could, theoretically, prefer “angel of YHWH.” There are a couple of possibilities for this usage. It could be a set phrase used at the time, but as previously noted, this usage seems to be unique to Samuel. Another possibility is that the phrases “angel of God”/“angel of YHWH” were so interchangeable that it does not make a difference (cf. Judg 6, 13). The third option is that this specific phrase was used by the author to ensure literary continuity of these three passages. As a result, we see a unified picture of angels as exemplars of loyalty and wisdom.

---


2 Samuel 22: Cherubim

Context

2 Samuel 22 is a poem, which Albright dates to the tenth century BC. This text is frequently associated with Deut 32 and Judg 5 in scholarly literature due to its supposed age and genre. 2 Samuel 22 is nearly identical to Ps 18.

The introductory statement says that David sang this song to YHWH after he was delivered from Saul and his other enemies (v. 1). The psalm recounts David’s distress and his subsequent deliverance by the intervention of YHWH. YHWH is seen mounted on and “riding on a cherub” (וּבָכֹר לְעֹבְרָכָה) to descend to earth (v. 11). The text says, “Riding on the cherub, he flew; he was seen on the wings of the wind/spirit.”

---


108 Block classifies this instance ofруз here simply as “wind.” In Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament,” 61. The weather imagery is often compared with Baal as pictured in Ugaritic literature. See Alter, Ancient Israel, 567; McCarter, 2 Samuel, 466, W. Herrmann, “Baal,” DDD, 137.
Analysis

Within Samuel, we find cherubim as statues (1 Sam 4, 2 Sam 6) as well as the one here in 2 Sam 22, which is depicted as a living creature. Here in 2 Sam 22, the cherub functions as a mount for YHWH, so it can be inferred that the cherubim on the ark serve as mounts for the glory of YHWH within the tabernacle/temple. Cherubim are also considered to be protective beings, based on their location on the boundaries of sacred spaces. As mentioned earlier (see above), they are typically associated either with a throne or with a tree.

---

109 The MT has cherub (singular) in both 2 Sam 22 and Ps 18. The LXX has cherubim (plural) in both places, with the exception of Codex Sinaiticus which has a singular cherub in Ps 17 [=MT Ps 18]. The Targum has cherubim (plural) in both places. Cross and Freedman prefer to emend the text to read “cherubim” in Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, 99; Contra Wood who argues that the singular reading is to be preferred. In Of Wings and Wheels, 86-88.


112 Cogan, 1 Kings, 244.


There are many surviving images that illustrate cherub-like creatures.\textsuperscript{115} However, the Bible does not provide a detailed physical description of cherubim until the book of Ezekiel (i.e. chapters 1 and 10; cf. Rev 4).\textsuperscript{116}

Nevertheless, 2 Sam 22 presents a cherub as a living being, a flying mount for the living, acting YHWH. YHWH pictured as a deity riding on a cherub has led to the suggestion that cherubim were more like celestial animals,\textsuperscript{117} possibly quadrupeds.\textsuperscript{118} Alter suggests that the cherubim are “fierce winged beasts imagined as God’s celestial steeds.”\textsuperscript{119} Hartenstein suggests that the word 


As noted above, Wood rejects these images as cherubim because she views Late Bronze iconography as unreliable for depicting Iron Age cherubim. Wood, \textit{Of Wings and Wheels}, 10-11, 139, 203-204.


\textsuperscript{117} Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” \textit{ABD} 1:251. Handy, \textit{Among the Host of Heaven}, 156, n. 22. Keel and Uehlinger, \textit{Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God}, 172. However, at some point they must have been viewed as capable of handling a sword (Gen 3:24); however, some commentators take the sword to be another entity for example, Sarna, \textit{Genesis}, 375; Hendel, “The Flame of the Whirling Sword,” 672-674; Wood, \textit{Of Wings and Wheels}, 56-57.


\textsuperscript{119} Alter, \textit{Ancient Israel}, 259. Cf. Ibid., 567.

\textsuperscript{120} Hartenstein, “Cherubim and Seraphim,” 160.
cherubim were associated with God’s chariot, i.e. “moving throne,” even outside the book of Ezekiel. However, Wood rejects this idea, suggesting that the 1 Chr 28 occurrence is probably related to the later emergence of merkabah mysticism, and instead argues that 2 Sam 22 should be interpreted as riding directly on the cherub like a mule, rather than in a chariot.

In fact, the text is ambiguous on this point. The verb רכב can be used to mean “ride on” an animal (i.e. 1 Sam 30:17, 2 Sam 19:27, etc.), or simply “drive/ride (on a chariot).” Thus 2 Sam 22 could either be indicating that YHWH rode on a cherub like an animal or like on a chariot.

2 Samuel 24: The Destroying Angel

Context

This passage is also a narrative text. In it, the LORD is angry with Israel and incites David against them (v. 1). David commits a sin when he conducts a census (v. 2-9). The exact nature of the sin is unknown, but it seems that he does not follow the law found in Exod 30:12, which requires a payment to the tabernacle for each person in the census. When he repents of his sin, he is given a choice of punishment: famine, flight

---


122 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 45-46, 87-88, 139-140, 205.

123 Ibid., 87-88.

124 The verb can appear both with the preposition and object, and without them (i.e. Lev 15:9, 1 Kgs 18:45, 2 Kgs 9:16, Jer 17:25). Cf. BDB, 938.

or pestilence (v. 10-14). As a result of David’s choice, a pestilence comes upon Israel (v. 15), apparently through the agency of an angel (v. 16). When “the angel” (מלאך) stretches out his hand to punish Jerusalem, the LORD tells “the destroying angel” (מלאך המשיח) to refrain (v. 16). The “angel of the LORD” (מלאך יהוה) stops at the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite (v. 16). When David sees “the smiting angel” (袍אל המכה), he pleads for mercy (v. 17).

Analysis

This narrative has a parallel passage in 1 Chr 21, which is told a little differently. 1 Chronicles says that the one who incites David is a נטש,126 rather than YHWH. Though this may at first seem problematic, in light of our other passages (Judg 9; 1 Sam 16, 18, 19; 1 Kgs 22) it is not so strange. YHWH allows sub-divine beings to deceive humans (as we will see in the next chapter) as a method of punishment, or to test the faithful (as in Job 1-2). Additionally, we find throughout the biblical text that YHWH takes responsibility for the actions that these beings commit (1 Kgs 22:23; Job 2:3).127 Theologically, this is important for the biblical texts that emphasize that there is only one true God, and he is the sovereign being.128

126 Beentjes states that this is not a definite noun, so it should be translated “an adversary.” Beentjes, “Satan, God, and the Angel(s) in 1 Chronicles 21,” 140. Breytenbach and Day are ambiguous as to whether it is a name or not. Breytenbach and Day, “Satan,” DDD, 729-730. However, the Tg. translates it at “the satan.” The LXX translates it as “devil” (διάβολος). Malone says that the angel of YHWH in 1 Chr 21 is indefinite based on 2 Sam 24 in Malone, “Distinguishing the Angel of the Lord,” 300.

127 Job 1-2 states that the satan (השען) was the one that came up with the idea to test Job and he is the one that carried it out. Nevertheless, YHWH states that he (YHWH) was incited against Job in 2:3. Later in the text, YHWH affirms his right to test Job as he has (Job 28-41).

In this case, it seems that it was YHWH’s intention to punish Israel because he was angry with them (2 Sam 24:1). Within the context of YHWH’s judgment, angels often function as executioners or instruments of punishment. Second Samuel 24 is one of the most detailed texts in describing the function and role of a punishing angelic being. This passage calls the being “the angel” (מהלך), “the angel of the LORD” (מלאך יהוה), “the destroying angel” (מלאך המחרה), and “the smiting angel” (מלאך המכה). In this account there is no problem distinguishing the angel from YHWH because YHWH commands the angel to stop his work (v. 16). The angel, although fulfilling a task assigned by God, exhibits some individual agency because when he was about to strike Jerusalem, God stopped him via a verbal command. In this respect, the exchange is comparable to Zech 3:2, where YHWH rebukes “the satan” (השט).

---

129 Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” *ABD* 1:250. Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125-128. Schöpflin notes that this passage is different from 2 Kgs 19, Gen 19, and Exod 12 in that the activity of the angel is directed at the Israelites instead of foreigners. Ibid., 127. This becomes more important in later literature, such as Ezek 9:1-10:7. On this see Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 128-133. Henten, “Angel (II),” *DDD*, 52.

130 It has been suggested that this passage does not fit here and may be from another source. Alter, *Ancient Israel*, 581, 584, Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 124-125 n. 3; Cf. Campbell and O’Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History*, 315. Rofé also says that the angel was a later addition. In *The Belief in Angels in Israel*, 184-203, 218.

131 The MT of 2 Sam 24:16 does not mention a sword, but DSS manuscript 4Q51 f164 165:2, which is similar to the 1 Chronicles account, does. Beentjes notes that this phrase occurs in 1 Chr 21, and is probably alluding to the account in Josh 5:13-14 (and possibly Num 22:23, 31). Beentjes, “Satan, God, and the Angel(s) in 1 Chronicles 21,” 145 and n. 15. Cf. Alter, *Ancient Israel*, 584.


133 Beentjes notes the contrast with 1 Chr 21. “Satan, God, and the Angel(s) in 1 Chronicles 21,” 150-151.
It is unclear whether or not the angel is visible to David before verse 17. Hertzberg makes an interesting, and plausible, suggestion:

In saying that he [David] wishes to erect an altar, to stay the plague, David makes it clear that he knows as little about the scene between the Lord and the angel as Job does of the council of God in heaven. In both cases, however, it is this scene in heaven which is vital for the understanding of the consequences.134

The word is a *hiphil* participle derived from the verb הַשָׁרַה, “to destroy, ruin.”135 The word’s use in this passage connects this story with the account of the Passover, which uses the term “the destroyer” (הַמָּשָׁרַת) in Exod 12:23.136 In Isa 54:16 God says that he created a מָשָׁרַת in order to destroy.137 Thus, we see that this being is a created agent of Yahweh.

Some have suggested that this destructive angel/the “destroyer” (מָשָׁרַת) is a personification of pestilence.138 McCarter notes that many commentators have assumed the influence of a foreign pestilence god behind this account, but he disagrees that this is so because he feels that “the traditional associations of Yahweh with plague are so strong… as to make this unlikely.”139 However, in Hab 3:5 the “pestilence” phenomenon


136 Exod 12:23. S. A. Meier, “Destroyer,” *DDD*, 241-242; Eynikel “The Angel in Samson’s Birth Narrative-Judg 13,” 114-115, n. 11. Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125, 128; Schöpflin, however, feels that Exod 12 is “ambivalent” about who is doing the destroying, whereas 2 Sam 24 is more concrete about the angel’s function. In Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125, 127. On the other hand, Ps 78:49 says that God sent out evil angels (מָשָׁרַת מַלְאָכֶנָּא רַע) who acted in the Passover account. Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 125 n. 2.


is called “Deber” (דֶּבר), who is seen as a supernatural being who joins Resheph in YHWH’s entourage. YHWH protects his followers from both Deber and from Qeteb, another plague being (Ps 91:6). On the other hand, the “destroyer” (מחמש) is interpreted as an angel in 2 Sam 24, so it is unnecessary to connect him with a plague.

Summary and Synthesis

The books of Samuel contain many references to sub-divine beings, including angels, cherubim, and spirits. Through the biblical text, a fuller picture of the supernatural world becomes clear, and the attitudes that the people have to these beings also becomes evident.

Cherubim, apparently belonging to a separate class of beings, are representative of the presence of God, and his title as “the LORD who sits/dwells” above them invokes the idea of the Holy of Holies both on earth and in heaven. The angel of God is held up as an exemplar of wisdom and loyalty (1 Sam 29, 2 Sam 14, 19). However, the text also refers to evil spirits and the destroying angel, all of whom bring disaster upon human beings, apparently allowed by God himself as an act of judgment. Thus, the picture in Samuel is complex and multi-faceted. It shows the God of Israel working, not only directly and through human agencies, but through supernatural ones as well.


141 Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 159-160.
CHAPTER 5

1 AND 2 KINGS

Introduction

The books of 1 and 2 Kings provide some of the most exciting and dynamic interactions between humans and sub-divine beings in the former prophets. Here all manner of supernatural beings roam the pages, interacting primarily with the prophets and kings of the era. Most of these beings have been mentioned in previous chapters of this work, but an analysis of 1-2 Kgs will offer more information that can be mined from these passages. In addition to beings that previously have been described, 2 Kgs offers the first glimpse of the heavenly animals known as the “horses of fire” (סוסים אש). As with most of our previous passages, the texts which will be examined here are primarily narrative accounts.

1 Kings 6-8: Cherubim

Context

This long section describes the detailed construction and iconography of the temple that Solomon built. Cherubim are mentioned 20 times in this section. Verses 6:23-28 describe the two free-standing cherubim, covered in gold. They are 10 cubits in height, each with an outstretched wingspan of 10 cubits each (5 per wing). Thus, the two cherubim stretched from one wall of the Most Holy Place to the other. Additionally,
cherubim are carved into the walls and doors together with palm trees and flowers, and overlaid with gold (6:29, 31-32, 35).

Chapter 7 mentions that stands were made and carved with lions, cattle, palm trees, and cherubim, and then cast in metal (7:29, 33, 36). Chapter 8 describes the ark being placed under the wings of the free-standing cherubim so that they covered the ark and its cherubim, and also its poles (8:6-8).

Analysis

As mentioned in the previous chapter, cherubim are found frequently in the Hebrew Bible, appearing both as inanimate figures (i.e. on the ark, in the sanctuary on the walls and curtains), as well as living creatures.¹ Within Kings we find several references to cherubim, both two- and three-dimensional, but none are portrayed as living beings.

As we have previously seen, cherubim are most often mentioned in connection with the ark and the temple. Exodus 25:18-22 and 37:7-9 tell us that two cherubim were to be placed on the “ark cover” (נ GLint), with their wings touching. The free-standing cherubim in 1 Kgs 6 are proportional; that is, the height is equal to the wingspan, similar to most humans, whose height is roughly equal to their arm-span.² Gray suggests that the cherubim in 1 Kgs 6:23-28 serve both as guardians and as a throne.³ He favors the view


that their arrangement was diagonal,\(^4\) though it is more likely that they are simply side-by-side.\(^5\)

Hurowitz suggests, on the basis of the silence of Deut 10:1-3 regarding cherubim, that the ark itself did not have them, and that the free-standing cherubim served as the throne of God and the ark as His footstool. This is because he dismisses Exod 25:18-22, saying that the ark and the cherubim of 1 Kgs 6-8 were conflated by P in the Exodus account.\(^6\) However, ignoring evidence in one text simply because another text is silent on the point is not convincing.

Haran strongly supports the idea that the cherubim were seen as a throne, and that their “covering” function was incidental,\(^7\) which is supported by the later text of Ezek 1. Wood disagrees that the cherubim functioned as a throne at all, and she favors the idea that they functioned as protective items.\(^8\) However, on the basis of Ezek 1 and Gen 3:24, it seems that the cherubim can function in both capacities, so the two are not mutually exclusive.

---


\(^5\) Cogan, *I Kings*, 245. He also notes that 2 Chr 3:13 indicates that they are facing out toward the Holy Place.

\(^6\) He says that the two things were conflated by P in the Exodus account. Although he says the ark was a footstool when it was inside the temple, he sees it as a movable throne outside of the temple (i.e. in battle situations). Hurowitz, “YHWH’s Exalted House,” 86-87, 96-97.


It has been suggested that the cherubim with palm trees in relief are meant to evoke the Tree of Life and the Garden of Eden. In support of this idea, there is iconographic evidence that there was a connection between cherubim, trees, and animals. The most famous biblical example of the association between cherubim and trees is found in Gen 3:24, where cherubim and a flaming sword are set at the entrance to the Garden of Eden.

The verb ככס, found in 1 Kgs 8:7, is also used in Ezek 28:14, 16. It is quite striking that there are many parallels between 1 Kgs 6-8 and Ezek. Aside from the descriptions of the temples in 1 Kgs 6-8 and Ezek 40-48, the cherubim and their settings are described in 1 Kgs and Ezek in much the same way. For example, the stands that have cherubim carved into them are also described in 1 Kgs as having “four” (ארבעה) “wheels” ( pewności), “rims” (מעוות), “hands” (ידות), “lions” (אורות), “cattle” (בכר), and “palm trees” (רמת), and they are made of “bronze” (נחשת). In Ezek 1 and 10, we also

---


11 Sarna, Genesis 375-376; Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 51-61. Cherubim guarding the deity and/or sacred tree, see Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 55-56. Kagmatche, Étude comparative entre les lamassu et les chérubins bibliques, 14. What is interesting about this passage is that there is more than one cherub here, and yet only one sword. Strengthening the overall connection of the temple to Gen 3, Hurowitz has suggested that the iconography of the basins is also related to the Garden of Eden. Hurowitz, “YHWH’s Exalted House,” 80-82. Cf. Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 39-40

12 Gray, I and II Kings, 209-210; Cogan, 1 Kings, 279. See discussion on the meaning of ככס in Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 26-28.
see “four” (“wheels”) (אברועה), “rims” (אفكرות), “hands” (ידים), “lions” (למל), “bronze” (نزחת), and “oxen” (שור). Although physical descriptions of cherubim are lacking, it seems that they are guardians, as many have suggested. Therefore, their appearance may have been frightening or at least intimidating. Certainly, the size of the free-standing cherubim would have been impressive to the few who would get a chance to see them. What is clear from these passages, however, is that cherubim are associated with the presence of YHWH, the temple, and Eden.

1 Kings 13: An Angel

Context

In this narrative, a man of God journeys to Israel to give Jeroboam a message. He is instructed by God to return without eating and drinking, and to go home by a different road (v. 1-9). On the road, the man of God meets a prophet who deceives him by telling him that an “angel” (ךאלמ) gave the prophet a message that the man of God should eat with him (v. 18). The man of God does as the lying prophet says (v. 9-23). As a result of his disobedience, the man of God is killed by a lion on the road home (v. 24-32).

13 Wood also notes the possible connection between the wheels in 1 Kings 7 and Ezek 1 with the wheels in Ezek 10. In Of Wings and Wheels, 113-114, 116. Boustan suggests that the basis for the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice angelic beings called ophanim are derived from either 1 Kings 7 or Ezekiel. Ra’an S. Boustan, “Angels in the Architecture: Temple Art and the Poetics of Praise in the Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” in Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions, Ra’an S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 204.
Analysis

North rightly notes that the usage of “angel” in 1 Kgs 13 is unusual.\textsuperscript{14} It seems that this usage emphasizes what the text states: the old prophet is lying (1 Kgs 13:18). The text implies that the man of God had received his orders directly from YHWH (v. 9, 17), so it is striking that the man of God believes the prophet simply because he invokes an angel with a message from YHWH. This might be related to the concept of angels in 1 Sam 29, 2 Sam 14, 19, in which angels are seen as wise, loyal, and good.\textsuperscript{15} It seems that they were also considered trustworthy. However, Meier observes that the Hebrew text is occasionally skeptical of the trustworthiness of the heavenly messengers (Job 4:18, 1 Kgs 22:19-22, 2 Kgs 19:7), and that this text may reflect that idea.\textsuperscript{16} This seems possible, given that we have already seen evidence that certain sub-divine beings have destructive tendencies.

A theme of this passage is that the word of YHWH himself carries the most authority. The man of God should have listened to God, rather than the message of the (alleged) angel through a prophet. Because he did not obey the words that, presumably, YHWH spoke directly to him, he committed a fatal error.

\textsuperscript{14} North, “Separated Spiritual Substances,” \textit{CBQ}, 134.

\textsuperscript{15} Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” \textit{ABD} 1:249.

\textsuperscript{16} Meier, “Angel (I),” \textit{DDD}, 48.
1 Kings 19: Angel of YHWH

Context

In this story, Elijah runs to the wilderness beyond Beer Sheba to escape the wrath of Jezebel. He lies under a tree and sleeps. He is awakened by an “angel” (ךָאלָמ) who gives him a bread cake and water (1 Kgs 19:5-6). Elijah then returns to lie down. Then the “angel of YHWH” (ךָאלָמ יְהוֹה) again wakes him to eat and drink (v. 7). This sustains him to walk for 40 days to the mountain of God, Horeb, where he encounters the LORD himself.17

Analysis

The “angel of YHWH” (ךָאלָמ יְהוֹה) in 1 Kgs 19 is sent by God to sustain an exhausted and depressed Elijah (v. 7) who is reeling from the message from the “messenger” (ךָאלָמ) of Jezebel (v. 2).18 The angel not only provides food and water to Elijah, but he also cooks the food (v. 6). The function of the angel here is to care for Elijah, the human, at the behest of YHWH. Protecting a traveler is not an unusual function for an angel,19 but the provision of food and drink is exceptional,20 especially when comparing this account to 1 Kgs 13 (see above). The manner in which the angel

17 The parallels of the Elijah story with the Moses story are noted in Cogan, 1 Kings, 456-457; Cf. Alter, Ancient Israel, 707.


19 Meier, “Angel (I),” DDD, 47. Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:250. See also comments by Smith, “Remembering God,” 645, connecting this function to a conflation with an older tradition about the “god of the father(s).”

20 However, as Cogan notes, Elijah has already received substance earlier in 1 Kgs 17. Similar vocabulary is used as well. Cogan, 1 Kings, 452.
cares for Elijah reverses the roles in Judg 6 and 13 (and Gen 18), in which the human provides food (and rest in Gen 18) for the angels. In 1 Kgs 19 the angel’s role is to comfort, encourage, and sustain Elijah. He gives no message, nor does he execute judgment. In this respect, this account is unique within the context of Deuteronomy-Kings. Later, in the NT, we find a similar function for the angels who minister to Jesus in the wilderness and the Garden of Gethsemane (Matt 4:11, Mark 1:13, Luke 22:43).

1 Kings 22: The Host of Heaven and the Lying Spirit

Context

This chapter is a narrative passage in which Ahab and Jehoshaphat are considering going to war together against the king of Aram so that Ahab can recover Ramoth-gilead (v. 1-3). Jehoshaphat agrees, but he wants to consult the LORD on the matter first (v. 4-5), so 400 prophets are brought in to reassure him (v. 6). However, Jehoshaphat is not convinced, so Ahab calls Micaiah son of Imlah (v. 8-9). After some back and forth, Micaiah finally tells the kings about their impending failure (v. 17), and then about a vision in which he saw the LORD sitting on His throne, surrounded on the left and the right by “all the host of heaven” (כלצבァ השמימים) (v. 19).21

In the vision, YHWH asks those in attendance who of them will go and entice Ahab to go into battle. The host discusses the matter, but the reader is not told what they say (ואמר להם המアウト אמר להם) (v. 20). Finally, “the spirit” (רוחו) volunteers for the job

21 Schmidt notes that the Host of Heaven may be the celestial bodies. See Schmidt, “Moon,” DDD, 591-592. See also Lelli, “Stars,” DDD, 813.

22 Cooley prefers to translate this term as wind, owing to its relationship to the celestial bodies. See Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 290-291, and n. 7.
(v. 21). When the LORD asks how the spirit will accomplish this task, the spirit answers that he will be a “lying spirit” (חרות שקר) (v. 22) and enter the mouths of the prophets. YHWH agrees and sends the “lying spirit” (חרות שקר) in the mouths of the prophets (v. 22-23).

Analysis

First Kings 22:5-18 is a prelude to the vision of the Council of YHWH. The 400 prophets deliver a message, which Ahab interprets favorably and of which Jehoshaphat is suspicious. Cogan notes that this is the first time that a prophet is consulted before a battle instead of a priest. Block has suggested that the prophecy given by the 400 was worded in an ambiguous way, so that Ahab’s interpretation was different than the true meaning. Although this is an intriguing interpretation, I believe that Michaiah’s vision report negates this interpretation (see below).

White notes that there is a connection between the Council of YHWH and the prophets, and she points out that prophets can be either participants who take on the “commissioned” role or non-member observers of the Council. In this case, Michaiah is


25 Block, “What Has Delphi to Do with Samaria? Ambiguity and Delusion in Israelite Prophecy,” 189-216. His argument is that the Hebrew is unclear what will be given to which king. He interprets it so that it is Ahab who will be given into the king of Aram. Ibid., 198-200.


merely an observer and he reports on the interaction between God and His supernatural subjects.

The passage in 1 Kgs 22:17-23 is one of the most important for analyzing the “divine council” motif in the Hebrew Bible. In this chapter, YHWH is pictured seated on His throne, among the host of heaven who are the celestial agents serving as His advisors. Newsom notes that this passage is “The most extensive description of the [divine] council and its tasks in the OT.” Eynikel suggests that at this time the Israelites were beginning to view YHWH as more than a local deity: he was recognized as the universal God, which would explain the cosmic tone of the passage.

This passage shows, for the first time in our study, the gathering of more than one supernatural sub-divine being in the celestial realm, and this passage is comparable to the


material found in both Job 1-2 and Isa 6, as well as Zech 3 and Dan 7. Additionally, we see here evidence that these beings interact with each other (v. 20), a feature that becomes more regular in later literature.

In the Hebrew Bible, the phrase “the host of heaven” (נְמוֹדֵד הַשָּׁמָיִם) frequently refers to celestial bodies (Deut 4:19, 17:3; Ps 184:2-3, etc.), but in this context it seems to refer to God’s heavenly army of personal beings (Cf. 1 Chr 18:18). As we have already seen, “stars” (תֵּלֵב) are sometimes personified, though they are always portrayed as subordinate to YHWH Himself. In other biblical texts, the stars are identified with sub-divine beings or angels. For example, in Job 38:7, the MT has “morning stars” in parallelism with “all the sons of God.” Other texts use “His angels”

---


34 White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership, 86-104.


and “his hosts” in parallelism (Ps 103:20-21, 148:2). YHWH is known as YHWH of Hosts and the God of Heaven, making him the ruler of the host of heaven.

“The spirit” (הרוח) in 1 Kgs 22 is in and among the host of heaven, much as “the satan” (השטח) is with the “sons of God” (בני האלהים) in Job 1-2. White states that the use of the definite article with the word “spirit” suggests that this is an office within the divine council, while Walsh suggests that the article indicates that this is the only spirit within the council, shorthand for “the spirit of Yahweh.” While both possibilities are grammatically possible, I do not think that the definite article indicates that there is only one spirit in the council, nor do I think it indicates that it is a specific office. The use of the article here serves to differentiate this particular spirit from the other beings in the council, including other spirits.

---


43 This is akin to what Joüon calls “Imperfect determination” Joüon §137m-n.
White designates the spirit’s role here as both an advisor and also what she calls “the commissioned.” Indeed, both of these descriptions are accurate. The spirit demonstrates that he is a distinct person, who distinguishes himself by being willing to deceive Ahab, leading him to his death.

The term “lying spirit” (חור רקש) is only found in this passage in the Hebrew Bible. The noun הרקש generally means “deception, falsehood.” Hamori states that several texts in the Hebrew Bible (including the ones I covered in the previous chapters) “demonstrate the existence of a recurring biblical tradition of aوح as divine agent, specifically associated with bringing destructive justice by means of falsehood.” Cogan asserts that this passage is anti-spirit, in that the word of the LORD is portrayed as more

44 White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 141-142.

45 Although the word “spirit” is feminine, the verb is inflected for 3ms. Wahlen suggests that this is an indicator that the spirit is to be taken as a personal being in both this passage and in Hos 4:12, though he does not present evidence to support this statement. In Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 26. See Boling, Judges, 81.


reliable than that of a spirit.\textsuperscript{50} However some scholars such as Gray associate this spirit with the spirit of God or the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{51}

Handy states that YHWH allows and authorizes the spirit to enact its plan, so ultimately God is the figure responsible for these events,\textsuperscript{52} although as Müller points out, God then allows Micaiah to see this and tell the kings, showing that his purpose is to warn regarding the truth, rather than to deceive.\textsuperscript{53}

Many of the issues that arise from this text are theological rather than textual. Scholars are left wondering about the implications for the character of God when he commissions a lying spirit to deceive Ahab.\textsuperscript{54} In the NT, spirits can be sources of false prophecy, but in such instances, they are associated with Satan.\textsuperscript{55} How, then, are we to interpret 1 Kgs 22?


\textsuperscript{53} Müller, “Falsehood,” \textit{DDD}, 326.

\textsuperscript{54} For a summary of the major views, see Block, “What Has Delphi to Do with Samaria? Ambiguity and Delusion in Israelite Prophecy,” 189-191.

\textsuperscript{55} 1 John 4:1; Rev 16:13. Wahlen notes that the unclean spirits of the synoptic gospels cannot be included in this statement because they tell the truth. In \textit{Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels}, 6.
First, it is important to make the distinction between the חור שקר, “lying spirit,” and YHWH himself. Although YHWH commissions the spirit to execute its plan, the quality of שקר is an attribute of that spirit, not of YHWH.\(^{56}\)

Second, Job 1-2 is highly instructive for understanding the dynamics in the heavenly court. In that passage, the satan (חưן) makes the case that Job should be tested to see if he is truly loyal to YHWH (1:9-11). YHWH replies that all that is Job’s is in his (Satan’s) hand (1:12). A similar exchange is found in 2:3-6. Like the spirit in 1 Kgs 22, “the satan” (ח干事创业) responds to a question posed by YHWH (1:8, 2:3) with his own idea about how to treat the human in question. Both the spirit and “the satan” (ח干事创业) act under the authority of God, but show evidence of individuality and initiative. The accounts differ from each other as well. Much like the angel of YHWH, it seems that the spirit in 1 Kgs 22 is used by God to punish the wicked,\(^{57}\) while in Job 1-2 the satan is used to test the righteous. Nevertheless, all of these calamities come upon the humans because the lying spirit and Satan are eager to wreak havoc in their lives (1 Pet 5:8).

God allows a certain measure of this as part of the plan of salvation (1 Pet 4:12-17), and just as humans have freedom of choice, so do the celestial beings. However, there is never any doubt that YHWH has the ultimate control over these situations (1 Kgs

\(^{56}\) Block argues that it is not an attribute of the spirit, but rather the effect that the spirit will have on Ahab. Block, “What Has Delphi to Do with Samaria? Ambiguity and Delusion in Israelite Prophecy,” 206. However, the spirit says he will be a חור שקר in the mouths of the prophets, not a חור שקר in the ears of Ahab (1 Kgs 22:22-23). Therefore, I believe that the emphasis is on the words spoken, not the interpretation of the prophecy by Ahab.

22:23, Job 2:3) and he imposes limitations on how far spirits/Satan can go. Any other action outside of the specific mission is not permitted by YHWH. And just as YHWH used Babylon, Assyria, and Persia (Jer 25:9, 27:6, 43:10; Isa 10:5, 44:28, 45:1; 1 Chr 5:6) as instruments to punish his people and yet also punished these nations for their own wickedness (Isa 10:5; Jer 50:18), so shall the spirits/angels be punished for their wickedness (Ps 82:6-7). Additionally, we find throughout the biblical text that YHWH takes responsibility for the actions that these beings commit (1 Kgs 22:23 Job 2:3). Theologically, this is important for the OT, emphasizing that there is only one true God, and he is the sovereign of all and the only one worthy of worship (Deut 32:39; Isa 45:7).

2 Kings 1: Angel of YHWH

Context

An “angel of YHWH” (ךאלמ יוהי) (v. 3) tells Elijah to give Ahaziah a message of judgment for inquiring of Baal-zebub about his illness, instead of YHWH. When Ahaziah’s messengers bring him the message from Elijah, he is furious and sends a military unit of 50 men to arrest Elijah. When the captain demands that Elijah come down from the hill on which he is sitting, fire comes down from heaven and consumes them.


59 YHWH states that he (YHWH) was incited against Job in 2:3. Later in the text, YHWH affirms his right to test Job as he has (Job 28-41). 1 Kgs 22:23 says that YHWH put the lying spirit in the mouths of the prophets.

60 Thank you to Daniel I. Block for pointing out Isa 45:7, and to Jacques B. Doukhan for noting the relevance of Deut 32:39 to this discussion (personal communication on March 8, 2019).
This happens a second time. Then the third time, the captain of the third unit begs Elijah to spare him and his men. The “angel of YHWH” (ךָ֣לִ֣ם הֹוָ֖ה) (v. 15) tells Elijah to not be afraid and to go with the captain.

Analysis

In 2 Kgs 1 we see a distinction between the “messengers” (מלאכים) of Ahaziah (v. 2-3, 5) and the “angel of YHWH” (ךָ֣לִ֣ם הֹוָ֖ה), much like the contrast between the messengers of Jezebel versus the angel in 1 Kgs 19. The narrative is essentially a dialogue, and the angel here is functionally equivalent to the word of the LORD in other passages (i.e. 1 Sam 15:10; 1 Kgs 17:2). Thus, the angel is portrayed as simply delivering messages from God to Elijah, and the angel has no defining features of his own, although Meier finds it significant that the angel speaks to Elijah, rather than God speaking directly to the prophet. Some scholars, such as Rofé, claim that this text is

61 This contrast has been noted by Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 25; Arnold B. Ehrlich, Mikráki-Pheschutô, 3 vols. (New York: Ktav, 1969), 2:330-331.

62 Alter, Ancient Israel, 731.

63 Gray, I and II Kings, 463-464. In fact, Ackerman has argued that the two phrases are nearly synonymous in many passages of the Hebrew Bible, and that the difference is whether the revelation is subjective or objective. H. C. Ackerman, “The Principle Differentiation Between ‘The Word of the Lord’ and ‘The Angel of the Lord,’” The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 37.2 (1921): 145-149. See also discussion in Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, 57. Alter does not even include the angel in his translation of verse 3 Alter, Ancient Israel, 731.


65 Meier, “Angel of Yahweh,” DDD, 57.
postexilic,⁶⁶ but Cogan and Tadmor disagree, correctly noting that the content is unified and consistent with preexilic material.⁶⁷

Both 1 Kgs 19 and 2 Kgs 1 have human messengers and the Angel of YHWH,⁶⁸ who oppose each other and give conflicting messages. A unifying theme in many of these passages is the accuracy of the messages given. In 1 Kgs 13, the man of God should have listened to the message given him directly from God, rather than the message of the old prophet. In 1 Kgs 19 and 2 Kgs 1, the message from the angel of YHWH is more accurate than the messages of men. In 2 Kgs 19, the word of the Lord through His prophet is more trustworthy than the messages of men.

2 Kings 2: Chariots of Fire

Context

This narrative passage tells of Elijah, who is about to be taken to heaven in a “whirlwind” (йтесь השם) (v. 1). He and Elisha leave from Gilgal and cross the Jordan River together (v. 2-8). Elijah offers to do something for Elisha, and Elisha petitions to receive a double portion of Elijah’s spirit (v. 9-10). As the two are walking and talking together, “a fiery chariot and horses of fire” (רכב אש ומשה את) (v. 11) sweep Elijah away and into heaven. Upon seeing this, Elisha cries out about “the chariot of Israel and its horsemen” (רכב ישראל ומשה) (v. 12), and he watches Elijah until he disappears.

---

⁶⁶ Rofè, Prophetical Stories, 33-40.
⁶⁷ Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 28.
⁶⁸ Ibid., 239.
Analysis

These passages contain several points of interest for this study. Firstly, 2 Kgs 2 mentions the existence of heavenly animals, which also appear in later literature, such as Zech 1 and 6, and Rev 6 and 19. Secondly, it seems that heavenly charioteers are driving these chariots of fire (2:12).69 What is perhaps most interesting about these passages is that the existence of heavenly horses is mentioned here in a narrative context, rather than an apocalyptic, semi-apocalyptic/prophetic, or poetic context. These horses are not portrayed as symbolic, as some have argued about the horses in Zech 1, 6 or Rev 6, 19.70

The supernatural chariot and horses whisk Elijah away to heaven.71 Gray suggests that the reference to the chariot and horsemen is related to a title that belonged to Elisha, found in 2 Kgs 13:14: אבֵי אוֹרֵב יִשְׂרָאֵל וּשְׁרוּפוֹ and his horsemen,”72 which likely came about as a result of these episodes (2 Kgs


71 Alter sees the passage as fitting with the theme of Elijah and fire. He also suggests that this passage is fairly unique in the Hebrew Bible, and that it contributed to the development of the idea of Christ’s resurrection. Ancient Israel, 732, 737. (Cf. Spronk, Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel, 258, 263-264.) This is not the first time that Elijah is whisked away. See 1 Kgs 18:12. 

He also postulates that this passage is somehow related to the horse and sun cult later referenced in 2 Kgs 23, a topic explored later in this chapter.

Conceptually, there is some similarity between this passage and Ezek 1. Although the description of 2 Kings 2 is short, there are two words that feature prominently in both passages: רעָס, “whirlwind” (2 Kgs 2:1, 11; Ezek 1:4), and אש, “fire” (2 Kgs 2:11, Ezek 1:4, 13, 27). Additionally, there are animal elements (horses in 2 Kgs 2, lion/ox/eagle in Ezek 1), human observers (Elisha and Ezekiel), and rivers (Jordan (2 Kgs 2:7-8, 13) and Chebar (Ezek 1:3)) However, the passenger in 2 Kgs 2 is Elijah, whereas the passenger in Ezek 1 is God himself. Thus, we see some continuity and some adaptation of these themes through time.

2 Kings 6: Chariots of Fire

Context

This narrative follows the account of the floating axe head (2 Kgs 6:1-7). The king of Aram is frustrated that the king of Israel anticipates his every move in war (v. 8-11), and when the king of Aram is told that the prophet Elisha is the one revealing his troop movements, he sends out “horses and chariots” (סוסים וכרבים) to Dothan to capture him (v. 12-14). Elisha’s servant brings word to Elisha that they are surrounded by the “horses and chariots” (סוסים וכרבים) of the king of Aram (v. 15). The servant is afraid, but Elisha tells him that “there are more with us than with them” (v. 16), and then he prays that the eyes of the servant might be opened. The servant is then able to see what had

73 Gray, I and II Kings, 476.

74 On the element of the spirit (روح), see Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament,” 44.
been hidden from him earlier: “horses and chariots of fire” (סוסים והרכב אש) surrounding Elisha to protect him (v. 17).

Analysis

These supernatural chariots and horses perform a number of different functions. In chapter 6, these chariots are defensive forces, sent by God to protect Elisha and his servant from harm by meeting the king of Aram’s military force with a more powerful, heavenly force. Chapter 6 uses vocabulary that hearkens back to the chapter 2 account. It repeatedly uses many of the same words (chariots, horses), using them to describe both the Aramean force and the LORD’s forces, thus drawing a distinction between the two. Gray suggests that the passage here refers not to actual horses and chariots of fire, but rather to Israelite forces and/or the military genius of Elisha, thereby denying the supernatural intervention of God explicitly stated by the text (2 Kgs 6:17-18). However, Cogan and Tadmor disagree with this analysis, saying that it strips Elisha of his prophetic power. Additionally, such an interpretation is not consistent with the text or its message. They are not saved from the king of Aram because Elisha is smarter; they are delivered by God himself.

This kind of celestial intervention in military contexts has already been seen in the present study. In Josh 5:13-15 and in Judg 5:20, celestial agents battle on behalf of the

75 As noted by van der Merwe et al., הרכב is often used as a collective noun in BHRG §24.3.2.a, p. 183.

76 Gray, I and II Kings, 512-513, 516. Alter suggests that it is a metaphor for the importance of Elijah (not Elisha). In Ancient Israel, 737.

77 Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 75, n. 1. They further say that “this kind of historicizing is wide of the mark.”
people of Israel. Here the intervention is more personal—the horses and chariots of fire are there on behalf of two individuals.

2 Kings 18: The Bronze Serpent

Context

This text precedes the account of the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib. It details the reform of Hezekiah, who smashed the “stone pillars” (מַחְצוֹת) and other illicit cult objects (v. 4). Additionally, the text says that he destroyed the “bronze serpent” (נְחַשְׁנִית) that Moses had made (Num 21) because it had become an object of worship called Nehushtan (נְחַשְׁנִית) (v. 4).  

78 On the etymology of the word נְחַשְׁנִית, see R. S. Hendel, “Nehushtan,” DDD, 615.
Analysis

Serpents (שחנ) could be associated with luck, divination and magic, and protection, and were worshipped by many cultures in the ancient Near East. The bronze serpent made by Moses is associated with healing in Num 21, and perhaps the object retained some of that association into the time of the kings. Some have suggested that the Nehushtan was actually a Canaanite cult object that pre-dated the Jerusalem cult of YHWH and that an association with Moses was retroactively used to legitimize it. However, this view lacks support.

---


84 Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 217.
It is important, however, to make the distinction that the text is not decrying the existence of the object, but rather the worship of it. Many consider it to be related to the seraphim, and although this is not universally agreed upon, the point is still worth consideration because it has implications for the interpretation of the vision of Isa 6. If, in fact, the object is related to the seraphim of Isa 6, its presence in the temple is not unjustified (cf. the images of cherubim in the temple), but because it became an illegitimate object of worship it had to be destroyed.

2 Kings 19: A Spirit, Cherubim, and An Angel

Context

This chapter is a continuation of the narrative that began in chapter 18. After the disastrous deportation of the Israelites to Assyria (18:9-12), Judah finds itself under threat from the armies of Sennacherib (18:13-37), and Jerusalem is under siege. Hezekiah puts on sackcloth and inquires of Isaiah for a word from the LORD (v. 1-4). The LORD responds through Isaiah, and He promises to put a “spirit” (חֵרוּ) (v. 7) upon Sennacherib that will cause him to return to his own land and die by the sword. After the Rabshakeh writes Hezekiah a threatening letter (v. 8-13), Hezekiah takes the letter to the temple of

---


87 Joseph Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB 19 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 225. He even suggests that the coals in the Isa 6 vision may be related to the practice of burning incense to the Nehushtan. Ibid.
the LORD and prays for deliverance from the king of Assyria. In his petition he calls on the LORD, “the One Who Sits on the Cherubim” (שבי הרברים (v. 15). Isaiah brings words of comfort from the LORD (v. 20-34). The LORD answers Hezekiah’s prayer and delivers Jerusalem from the king of Assyria. By night he sends an “angel of YHWH” (מלאך יהוה) to strike down 185,000 of Sennacherib’s men (v. 35). Afterward, the promise made in verse 7 is fulfilled when Sennacherib retreats to Nineveh, only to be struck down in a temple of Nisroch, his god (v. 36-37).

Analysis

The reference in 2 Kgs 19:15 to cherubim uses terminology to indicate that the God who sits upon the cherubim is the creator and ruler of heaven and earth. This usage is similar to that found in 1 Sam 4 and 2 Sam 6, in which we find that YHWH is called “the LORD of Hosts Who Sits on the Cherubim,” in reference to the ark. However, the reference to the “hosts” is omitted in 2 Kgs 19.

In the 2 Kgs 19 account, there is no description of the spirit (v. 7, 36-37), and some interpreters do not view this spirit as a personal being. In the text, the spirit is called neither an evil spirit, nor a lying spirit. Nevertheless, some scholars have related this spirit to the one in 1 Kgs 22, which would make it more likely that it is to be interpreted as a personal being. The text is not clear if the report Sennacherib hears is true


89 Gray, I and II Kings, 685.

or not, although the implication is that it is misleading. Hamori points out that several texts in the Hebrew Bible, including this one, depict a רוח, “spirit,” who is functioning in a punishing function and who uses falsehood to achieve the result.

Much like 1 Kgs 22, it seems that the spirit in 2 Kgs 19 is used to punish the wicked. Both of these spirits act under the authority of God, but the spirit in 1 Kgs 22 shows evidence of individuality and initiative. In 2 Kgs 19, the most we know is that the LORD is using the spirit to intervene in this situation.

Many messages are passed in 2 Kgs 19, much like the account in 2 Kgs 1. In this case, it all begins with Hezekiah’s message to the Assyrians (18:13) and their subsequent messages back. Ultimately, God sends messages through the prophet Isaiah and then deliverance through the “angel of YHWH” (מלאך יהוה). In 2 Kgs 19, the word of the Lord through His prophet is more trustworthy than the messages of men.

As noted in the last chapter, angels sometimes function as executioners or instruments of punishment. This passage has been compared with other destroying angel accounts, including 2 Sam 24 and Exod 12. Although the angel in 2 Kgs 19 is not

91 Hamori has no doubt that the report is false. In Hamori, “The Spirit of Falsehood,” 22. She notes the irony of the Assyrians telling the Judahites not to be deceived, meanwhile God is instead deceiving the Assyrians. Ibid.


described (the account takes only one verse: v. 35), it is called the “angel of YHWH” ( slu).

The text describes his action with the verb הכנ in *hiphil*, meaning “to strike.”

The angel in 2 Sam 24 is similarly described as both “the smiting angel” ( slu) and the “angel of YHWH” ( slu). In 2 Kgs 19 the punishment occurs in one night (similar to Exod 12), killing 185,000; in 2 Sam 24 it begins in the morning, going for a certain length of time, and kills 70,000. In 2 Sam 24 God stops the angel partway through, but in 2 Kgs 19, the angel completes his task. However, the biggest difference between the two accounts is that in 2 Sam 24 the punishment is directed at the Israelites and in 2 Kgs 19 the punishment is directed at a foreign nation.95

The 2 Kgs 19 narrative can also be compared to the parallel accounts in Isa 37 and 2 Chr 32.96 In 2 Chronicles, the angel is described as one whom YHWH sent to annihilate ( slu, *hiphil*) the Assyrian army. No time element or number of the dead are given. Isaiah 37:36 is nearly identical to 2 Kgs 19:35, except that Isa 37:36 is missing the phrase יהיו ההלילה והנהו.

---

95 Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 127. Schöpflin notes that 2 Sam 24 is different from 2 Kgs 19, Gen 19, and Exod 12 in that the activity of the angel is directed at the Israelites instead of foreigners. Ibid.

96 Michalak notes that the event described in 2 Kgs 19, Isa 37, and 2 Chr 32 is “the most significant manifestation of the ‘military’ power of the Angel of Yahweh.” Michalak, *Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Jewish Literature*, 38.
2 Kings 21: Ghosts and Spirits of the Dead

Context

This passage details the sins of Manasseh, king of Judah. He reinstituted illicit religious practices and rebuilt many of the places that Hezekiah destroyed, including the shrines of Baal and Asherah (v. 2). Additionally, he sinned by bowing down to “all the host of heaven” (업체לשמם) (v. 3) and setting up altars to them in the house of the LORD (v. 4-5). Furthermore, he sacrificed his son by fire and practiced divination, consulting “ghosts and spirits” (הרוחים והשדים) (v. 6).

Analysis

In Deuteronomy, the injunction against worshipping celestial entities is given to Israel, but it is not extended to the “nations.” To these groups, the heavenly bodies are “allotted” (חלת) as objects of worship (Deut 4:19). It is well known that several ancient Near Eastern cultures worshipped celestial bodies, personified as deities or as agents of the deities. Mark Smith notes that scholarship typically downplays the importance of astral religion in West Semitic contexts, but that it is of vital importance to understanding

97 Schmidt suggest that these include the Astral bodies. See Schmidt, “Moon,” DDD, 592; Lelli, “Stars,” DDD, 811.


West Semitic religion.101 While the Bible prohibits worshipping celestial bodies, it does not refrain from personification (e.g. Deut 32:1, Judg 5:20, Ps 19:2-8, Job 38:7).102 It is of interest that in Deut 17 the celestial bodies and the host of heaven are mentioned in connection with the worship of other gods,103 although this is not surprising because certain celestial objects were identified with specific deities.104 The Israelites were told to refrain from worshipping what the LORD has created, and this was intended to prohibit idolatry among the Israelites.105

Within local cultic practices, the stars may have been linked with the so-called Queen of Heaven cult, as well as magic and divination.106 Archaeological evidence indicates that stars (and other heavenly bodies, as noted above) were worshipped in the Levant during in the Late Bronze Age and beyond.107


103 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 162. Rofé, Deuteronomy, 10.
105 Niehr, “Host of Heaven,” DDD, 429. Cooley suggests that this association has led the HB to refrain from giving details about names of stars and constellations. Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 227, 237.


The host of heaven is mentioned in 2 Kgs 21:3, 5. Celestial bodies remained objects of worship throughout the reigns of the pre-exilic kings.\textsuperscript{108} Cooley notes that the instance in 2 Kgs 17:16 of astral worship in northern Israel is unusual, since worship of the celestial bodies is more typical of Judah, as evidenced in 2 Kgs 21 and 23.\textsuperscript{109} Gray has suggested that this practice was introduced to Israel under the Assyrian vassalage,\textsuperscript{110} and he also attributes the Judean astral cult in 2 Kgs 21 and 23 to Assyrian influence as well.\textsuperscript{111} Alter likewise suggests that worship of the heavenly host was important during the late monarchy,\textsuperscript{112} probably due to the influence of Assyria.\textsuperscript{113} Cogan and Tadmor disagree, aptly saying, “There is nothing particularly Mesopotamian about the astral cults.”\textsuperscript{114} McKay likewise finds that local astral cults, rather than Assyrian ideology, were likely the source of this practice.\textsuperscript{115} From the account of 1 Kgs 22 we find that Israel had divinely-revealed knowledge of the existence of the host of heaven as beings in the

\textsuperscript{108} Schmidt suggests that even the reform of Hezekiah overlooked the astral cults, based on the silence of the text. Schmidt, “Moon,” \textit{DDD}, 592.


\textsuperscript{110} Gray, \textit{I and II Kings}, 648.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 706.

\textsuperscript{112} Alter, \textit{Ancient Israel}, 808.


\textsuperscript{114} Cogan and Tadmor, \textit{2 Kings}, 266, 272, 285-286.

council of Yahweh. Perhaps some used this account to legitimize their practice of worshipping the heavenly bodies.

King Manasseh “appointed ghost(s) and spirits” (תעשה אשודיעים). The “ghost(s)” (אש) are typically associated with the worship of illegitimate deities (2 Kgs 21 and 23), and consulting the dead (1 Sam 28 and Deut 18:11). The term, “spirit,” is used in a similar way, and is thought to be derived from the Hebrew verb ידע, “to know,” apparently meaning “all-knowing,” indicating the great knowledge that the spirits of the dead supposedly possessed.

It is significant that under Saul such spirits were (purportedly) “removed/cut off” (1 Sam 28:3, 9), but under Manasseh they are “appointed” (תשע) (2 Kgs 21:6). Under Josiah they will be “purged” (רעב) (2 Kgs 23:24). Thus, the king’s role in local cultic practices was highly important.

### 2 Kings 23: Chariots of the Sun and Ghosts

#### Context

This passage deals with the reform of Josiah. He removes all of the offending idolatrous paraphernalia from the temple in Jerusalem, including the items for “the sun,

---

116 On the definitions of אש and ידע see chapter 4 above.


119 On this translation see Schmidt, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*, 152-153; *BDB*, 794.
moon, and constellations”120 (לשמש ולירח ולchers), and of “the entire host of heaven” (bombat hashemesh) (v. 4-5). He removes “the high places of the gates” (תומבי לאין) (v. 8). 121 He also removes “the horses” (תומבי לאין) dedicated “to the sun” (שמשל) and destroys “the chariots of the sun” (תובכרמ שמשל) (v. 11). He destroys the altars on the roof of the “chamber of Ahaz” (עלית אחז) (v. 12). 122 Additionally, he bans “the ghosts” (תובאה) and “spirits” (יינעיה) (v. 24).

Analysis

It is natural to compare the horses and chariots of fire in 2 Kgs 2:11-12 and 6:17 with 2 Kgs 23:11 and the mention of the horses and chariot of the sun. 123 Perhaps because of the Elijah/Elisha texts and the knowledge that the LORD possessed (and apparently

120 This is one of possibly two occurrences of this term in the OT. The other is in Job 38:32. See I. Zatelli, “Constellations,” DDD, 202-203. Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 232-237. This term can also mean zodiac signs. (Zatelli, “Constellations,” DDD, 202.) For a discussion of how to translate the term see Cooley, 232-234, 274-275. Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 286; Marvin H. Pope, Job, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), 254-255.


122 Cooley notes that this narrative is connected to the miracle of the shadow moving backward on the steps of Ahaz in 2 Kgs 20 and Isa 38 (יירח), especially in 1QIsa. In Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 309-311. See also Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 256, 289. Hurowitz, “YHWH’s Exalted House,” 95.

rode in) fiery, horse-drawn chariots, it is no surprise that these chariots could have
become conflated with the idea of the sun as a chariot and thus objects of idolatry (2 Kgs
23:11). McKay notes that models of horse-drawn chariots with solar emblems on them
have been discovered at archaeological sites in Judah.124

Second Kings 23 shows that these heavenly chariots apparently became
associated with illicit celestial cults. While the text denies that the heavenly chariots are
legitimate objects of worship, it does not deny their existence. This passage, 2 Kgs 23, is
the only place in the OT that associates horses with the sun.125 This has led many scholars
to the conclusion that this anomalous reference is connected with Assyrian practices,126
while O’Daniel Cantrell also notes that horses were important to the Babylonians as well,
especially within the cults of Shamash, Marduk, Ashur and Adad.127 Alter even suggests
that the horses were sacrificed to the sun.128 This is unlikely, however, because to my

124 John W. McKay, “Further Light on the Horses and Chariot of the Sun in the Jerusalem Temple
Under the Assyrians, 33-34. Although, not all agree with his interpretation. See Keel and Uehlinger, Gods,
Goddesses, and Images of God, 343-344. McKay also tells of text which describes a Syrian ritual related to
the sun-god, which includes the use of horses and a chariot. The text in question, however, is from the third
century AD, which he admits is eight or nine centuries after the events of 2 Kgs 23 in McKay, “Further


126 Cogan and Tadmor, 2 Kings, 288; Morton Cogan, Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah
and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E., Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 19
(Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974), 86-88; Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 158-
160, 342-344.

127 O’Daniel Cantrell, The Horsemen of Israel, 58. Scurlock, “Animals in Ancient Mesopotamian
Religion,” 370. It is thought that the horse was primarily associated with the sun deity Shamash. Black and
Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols, 103-104. Scurlock, “Animals in Ancient Mesopotamian Religion,”
368.

128 Alter, Ancient Israel, 839.
knowledge, there is no evidence of equid sacrifice in monarchic Israel.\textsuperscript{129} It seems that the Mesopotamians simply used the horses to pull the chariot containing the images of the gods,\textsuperscript{130} but McKay finds that the Judahite chariot held more significance than that.\textsuperscript{131} The assumption that these practices came from Assyria is, therefore, unfounded. McKay prefers to draw comparisons with local cultic practices.\textsuperscript{132}

The sun (שמש) is not mentioned as a deity in the Hebrew Bible, but there seems to be evidence of a local solar cult in some toponyms of the land (e.g., Josh 15:7, 10: “En Shemesh/Spring of the Sun” (עין שמש), “Beth-Shemesh/House of the Sun” (בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ), etc.)\textsuperscript{133} as well as in the material remains.\textsuperscript{134} However, reference to an illicit solar cult is

---


\textsuperscript{130} O’Daniel Cantrell, \textit{The Horsemen of Israel}, 58.

\textsuperscript{131} McKay, \textit{Religion in Judah Under the Assyrians}, 32.


found later in Ezek 8. Additionally, YHWH himself is often compared with the sun (Ps 84:12 [Eng 84:11], Isa 60:19-20, Mal 3:20 [Eng 4:2], Hab 3:4). In several places within the Hebrew Bible, the LORD is portrayed as riding in a chariot, drawn by horses (Ps 68:18; Isa 66:15; Hab 3:8, 15; Jer 4:14). Thus, these native ideas may have been linked to solar worship in the local sun cult.

The Egyptians also viewed the sun as a god, and their iconography was used and reused in Israel and Judah. However, horses were not associated with this (or any) deity in the Egyptian religious system. An early parallel might be found at Ugarit, which also regarded the sun as a deity. It is notable that Ugaritic literature tells the story about a mare who is the daughter of the sun (Špš). In the text, she asks for help with a spell to cure snakebites. The mare is only known from this text, so it is uncertain

---


140 Smith, “Astral Religion and the Representation of Divinity,” 192-195. Pardee, Ritual and Cult at Ugarit, 283-284. The Ugaritic sun deity was regarded as female, in contrast to the more prevalent male solar deities.

141 However, her parentage is complicated, as the text indicates she has several parents. (RS 24.244 I:1; cf. COS 1.94: 295)

142 RS 24.244; COS 1.94; Cf. Pardee, Ritual and Cult at Ugarit, 172-179.
as to how she fits into the Ugaritic supernatural world, though horses are also connected to various Ugaritic deities. In any case, it appears possible that the idolatry in question in 2 Kgs 23 centered around a native Canaanite tradition, rather than an Assyrian or Egyptian one.

**Summary and Synthesis**

Within Deuteronomy-Kings, it seems that Kings has perhaps the fullest picture of the supernatural world and humanity’s awareness of it. In fact, it seems that almost all of the major concepts are found in 1-2 Kings. The “divine council” motif is found in 1 Kgs 22, as well as a view of the host of heaven surrounding YHWH, serving Him, and also interacting with each other. The ministering angel appears in 1 Kgs 19 to care for Elijah, and the fiery horses and chariot later comes to whisk him away. Again, we encounter trouble-making spirits, messenger-angels, and cherubim. Additionally, the text deals with the troubling aspect of Israel’s and Judah’s perception of these sub-divine beings, in that they become illegitimate objects of worship for the people.

---

143 Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 172.

CHAPTER 6

SYNTHESIS OF ANGELS AND OTHER SUB-DIVINE BEINGS IN
DEUTERONOMY-KINGS

Introduction

The preceding chapters have looked at the occurrences of angels and sub-divine beings in the books of Deuteronomy-Kings in order to gain a better understanding of their functions, characteristics, and relationships in pre-exilic biblical literature. This chapter will synthesize the material.

Synthesis

Deuteronomy contains references to sub-divine supernatural beings, such as “demons” (םידש) and “holy one(s)” (שדק). The book of Deuteronomy affirms existence of sub-divine beings but prohibits Israel from worshipping them. There are also numerous references to other “gods,” whom the LORD denounces. Israel must accept that YHWH is the only true God, and their savior. This makes sense within the polemic of the book against idolatry. This also lays the groundwork for subsequent writings and their treatment of the subject of sub-divine beings in relationship to both God and human beings.

Within the framework of Joshua-Judges, there is awareness of sub-divine beings and their roles as warriors, messengers, and tormentors. What is consistent is that they all
operate under the direction of YHWH and do his bidding. They are not granted license to act and do as they please. It appears that angelic stories come into play when the “customary” avenues for choosing a leader no longer work and there is an “absence or malfunction of the tribal assembly[.]”¹

The books of Samuel contain many references to sub-divine beings, including angels, cherubim, and spirits. A fuller picture of the supernatural world becomes clear, and the attitudes that the people have to these beings also become evident. Additionally, questions arise regarding YHWH’s use of evil/harmful spirits and destructive angels.

Kings provides more complete information regarding the supernatural world and humanity’s awareness of it. Many key concepts are found in this section: the “divine council” motif, the ministering angel, the fiery horses and chariots, trouble-making spirits, messenger-angels, and cherubim. The text also deals with the troubling aspect of Israel’s and Judah’s awareness of these sub-divine beings, in that they become illegitimate objects of worship for the people.

Host of Heaven and Its Prince

The host of heaven and its Prince are found in Joshua-Kings. The phrase “the host of heaven” (נצח השמים) refers to beings who demonstrate “agency,”² and the term

¹ Boling, Judges, 136-137.
² Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 289-292, 317-320, 329. His definition of agency is “the ability of something both to have intention and to act on this intention.” Ibid., 289. Cf. Pongratz-Leisten, “Divine Agency and Astralization of the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia,” 144-147; Simkins, Yahweh’s Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel, 57-75.
includes the sun, moon, stars, and planetary bodies. The stars are mentioned in Judg 5 as part of YHWH’s fighting force. The phrases “stars” ( doença) and “host of heaven” (ברא שמים) are often used together in in Deuteronomy-Kings (Deut 4:19, 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:16, 21:3, 23:4; cf. 1 Kgs 22:19). God is known as YHWH of Hosts (1 Sam 4:4, 2 Sam 6:2), and the host of heaven refers to YHWH’s attendants (1 Kgs 22:19). The passage in 1 Kings 22 portrays YHWH seated on His throne, among the heavenly host who are the celestial agents serving as his advisors. The title “Prince of the Host of YHWH” (שר השמים שליה) is used in Josh 5 by a mysterious “man” who is a military commander, filling the same position as the divine Prince of the Host of Heaven in Dan 8:10-11.

Spirits and Ghosts

Spirits are associated with the heavenly host in 1 Kgs 22. The evil spirits in Judg 9, 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19 lay the groundwork for more complex depictions of antagonistic spirits, such as those in 1 Sam 28 and 1 Kgs 22. The spirit of 1 Kgs 22 demonstrates that

---


5 Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 290-291. Cogan, 1 Kings, 492.


7 Doukhan, Daniel, forthcoming, on Daniel 8:11 and 10:5.
he is a distinct person,\(^8\) who distinguishes himself by creating a plan and volunteering to deceive Ahab in order to lead him to his death.\(^9\)

In Judges-Kings, the spirits generally act upon YHWH’s command. Nothing beyond that is allowed (1 Sam 18, 19). The exception is 1 Sam 28. This passage has no indication that YHWH is involved in the interaction. Rather Saul summoned the spirit through illicit means. At least one spirit is clearly depicted as having agency: the lying spirit in 1 Kgs 22. He comes up with a plan, receives YHWH’s approval, and then executes the plan.

### Cherubim and Heavenly Animals

Cherubim are representative of the presence of God,\(^10\) and his title as “the LORD who sits/dwells [above] the cherubim” invokes the idea of the Holy of Holies both on earth and in heaven. Cherubim were likely understood to be different from angels.\(^11\) Cherubim do not deliver messages and their primary function seems to be keeping humans away from sacred things and places.\(^12\)

---

\(^8\) McCarter, “Evil Spirit of God,” *DDD*, 320. Cogan, *1 Kings*, 492 says that this spirit was one from a crowd. Jackson says that this is “The only occasion where a spirit (as distinct from an angel) is identified as a person” in the Hebrew Bible. In Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*, 33. White, *Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership*, 120.


\(^10\) Cunchillos, *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses*, 159-160.


The cherub in 2 Sam 22 is a living being, a flying mount for the living, acting YHWH. This account has led to the idea that cherubim are like celestial animals,\textsuperscript{13} probably quadrupeds.\textsuperscript{14} The cherubim are associated with the Garden of Eden,\textsuperscript{15} and there is iconographic evidence that there was a wider connection between cherubim, trees, and animals.\textsuperscript{16} Second Kings 2 and 6 both mention the existence of heavenly animals (horses), and it seems that heavenly charioteers are driving the chariots of fire (2:12).\textsuperscript{17}

Angels and Demons

As the name “messenger” implies, angels often serve as mouthpieces of God, bringing messages from Him to humans (Judg 2:1-4, Judg 6:11-24, 2 Kgs 1:3-15). But angels serve in other capacities as well: angels punish the wicked (2 Sam 24:16-17, 2 Kgs 19:35), make birth announcements (Judg 13:3-21), minister to the needy (1 Kgs 19:4-8), and protect and save people from calamity (2 Kgs 6:15-17). Angels are part of YHWH’s


\textsuperscript{17} Interestingly, the Rephaim Texts mention the rephaim riding horse-drawn chariots, but L’Heureux suggests that these are merely humans, based on their mode of transportation. L’Heureux, “The Ugaritic and Biblical Rephaim,” 271-272, 273.
heavenly entourage, and as a group they are called “holy ones” (Deut 33:2), “host of heaven” (1 Kgs 22:19), or “sons of God” (Deut 32:8). This may be the reason that humans invoke angels as symbols of righteousness (1 Sam 29:9) and wisdom (2 Sam 14:17-20, 2 Sam 19:27).

The angel of God is held up as an exemplar of wisdom and loyalty. However, we also encounter the destroying angel (2 Sam 24, 2 Kgs 19:35) who brings disaster upon humans, apparently at the bidding of God himself. Thus, the picture of angels is complex and multi-faceted. It shows the God of Israel working, not only directly and through human agencies, but through supernatural ones as well. This includes the function of some of them as punishers of the wicked.

Demons are only mentioned once in Deuteronomy-Kings, but it is a highly significant text. The beings called “demons” (שדם) (Deut 32:17) are unworthy of worship. The text does not deny that they are real supernatural beings, and it mentions that they accept the offerings of the people (v. 37-38), but worshipping/sacrificing to them is prohibited. Within Deuteronomy, these practices are linked with the occult: divination and consulting the dead. These are all unacceptable practices, and thus the religions of the other nations are dangerous (Deut 18:9-12). The Israelites are warned to avoid these other supernatural beings, or they will be led away from YHWH.

18 Following the DSS evidence.

19 Cf. Lev 17:7 in which the Israelites are to cease from sacrificing to שדים, “goat-demons.”

It is likely that this concern kept the text relatively quiet regarding a celestial conflict. We will see that in later literature the focus on the conflict between good and evil becomes more pronounced as concerns about the worship of sub-divine beings is diminished.21 Nevertheless, all of the building blocks for this understanding have been assembled and have their basis in early biblical literature.

**Conclusion**

This chapter synthesized the occurrences of sub-divine beings in the books of Deuteronomy-Kings in order to gain a better understanding of their functions, characteristics, and relationships. In the next chapter I will examine how the concepts in Deuteronomy-Kings compare with ideas about angels and sub-divine beings during and after the exile to determine if the shift in perceptions of these beings was really as great as has been suggested.

---

CHAPTER 7

INTERTEXTUAL COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ANGELS
AND OTHER SUB-DIVINE BEINGS OF DEUT-KINGS
AND THOSE OF EXILIC/POST-EXILIC TEXTS

Introduction

As we have seen in the preceding chapters, the “angelology,” that is, the concept of angels and sub-divine beings, of Deuteronomy-Kings is multi-faceted and vibrant. The question remains: how do these ideas compare with the “fuller” angelology of the exilic/post-exilic time period when an increase in the amount written on the subject of sub-divine beings occurs?

Carol Newsom says, “It is probably not accidental that the 6th century saw a considerable increase in speculation about the heavenly world and its angelic inhabitants, especially in the prophetic literature.”¹ Boling notes: “References to angels multiply rapidly in the works of the apocalyptic seers such as the author of Daniel, at the close of the OT period, and in early Judaism and early Christianity.”² Eynikel states that by this period, “The distance between God and human beings had become so extensive that God needed a whole legion of servants to fill the gap.”³

¹ Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:250.
² Boling, Judges, 137.
Scholars have thus suggested that some of the biggest developments in angelology come from this time period, especially the concept of the fall of the angels and the development of Satan as a force hostile to God. It is certainly true that far more was written about angels and demons after the exile than before, but our objective is to determine if the substance of the characterization of these sub-divine beings changes drastically. This chapter will give an overview of some of the developments in angelology within some exilic/post-exilic biblical and extra-biblical literature. Then I will compare them with our findings regarding the sub-divine beings in Deuteronomy-Kings.

**Analysis of Later Angels and Sub-Divine Beings**

**Old Testament**

**Ezekiel**

The book of Ezekiel has numerous passages that relate to sub-divine and other supernatural beings. The book contains the most detailed description of cherubim anywhere in the Hebrew Bible. In chapter 1, there is a detailed account of the chariot-

---


5 Several sections in this chapter are adapted from a draft I wrote for the “Angel, Critical Issues” and “Demon, Critical Issues” articles of the *Lexham Bible Dictionary*, although the material used here was not included in the final publication.

throne of God that is moved about by four unusual beings. The chapter calls the beings תור, “living ones,” and they are described as having the body of a man, four faces, four wings, and hands (Ezek 1:4-28). This is the first time in Hebrew Bible where we find a description of a creature that resembles a man and has wings. These same beings appear in chapters 10 and 11, and in this section they are called “cherubim” twenty-one times, and “living one(s)” once (Ezek 10:1-20, 11:22). Wood postulates that the “living ones” in Ezekiel might actually be closer to the seraphim of Isa 6 than to cherubim, and that these “living ones” should properly be understood as “beasts,” similar to those in Dan 7. She attributes the text in Ezek 10, which links the “living ones” to cherubim, to later editorial activity, an explanation which is problematic. However, her connection of the account of Ezek 1 with Isa 6 has merit, in that both passages describe a throne scene, and both accounts mention the creatures flying with one pair of wings, while using another pair to cover their bodies.

7 However, winged human figures are present in the Levantine iconography as early as the MBII period. See Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 29-30, 55-56, 138-140; Collon “A North Syrian Cylinder Seal Style: Evidence of North-South Links with ‘Ajul,” 57-68. For Mesopotamian iconography see Gane, “Composite Beings in Neo-Babylonian Art,” 48-66. The Bible mentions winged women in Zech 5:9-11.


9 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 93-94, 133-135, 137, 140, 152 n. 207, 205. It is interesting that she spends so much time trying to differentiate these “beasts” from cherubim. She repeatedly refers to the idea that, on the basis of 2 Sam 22/Ps 18, cherubim were understood to be quadruped (ibid., 2 n. 4, 56-57, 87-88, 114-115, 123 n. 181, 140, 161-162), while also saying, “The cherubim in Ezekiel’s visions are probably not quadrupeds (Ezek 1:5-7).” (Ibid., 136).

10 Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 121-135. She identifies three problems in the Ezekiel 8-11 pericope: internal inconsistencies, apparently useless repetition, and thematic and structural inconsistency. Ibid., 120-124.

11 See Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, 18-21.

Wood is not the only scholar to connect Ezekiel with Isa 6. For example, Schöpflin notes the similarities of the cherub giving coal to the man in linen and the seraph putting the coal of fire on Isaiah’s lips to purge sin. Hartenstein observes that Isa 6 and Ezek 1 are closely linked together in the theme of judgment and the departure of God’s glory. Furthermore, he states that these texts were influential in the formation of post-exilic angelology, specifically merkabah mysticism.

In addition to these cherubim/living ones, there is mention of another being called a cherub (Ezek 28:14, 16). The passage likens the King of Tyre to a covering cherub in the garden of Eden (v. 13, 14). The rest of the occurrences of cherubim in Ezekiel are found in chapter 41, which describes cherubim carved into the features of the temple (Ezek 41:18, 20, 25). These cherubim differ from the “living ones” in that they only have two faces. It has been suggested that this difference derives from the creatures being in profile.

Beyond the prominent cherubim/“living ones” we also find subtler appearances of supernatural beings in the book. The “spirit” (חנן) is mentioned six times in Ezek 1. In

13 Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 131-132.
15 Ibid., 155-156, 177-178. Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 160. According to Hartenstein, 4Q405 f20ii 22:3-8; 1 En. 61:10, 71:7; Sir 49:8; Apoc Moses 33:2-3; Apoc Abr 18:12 are all part of the merkabah mysticism matrix. In “Cherubim and Seraphim,” 155.
the first instance (1:4), it is clearly meant to indicate wind, as it is described with the adjective “stormy” (םַלְעָה). However, the other five instances are more complex. Block classifies these as instances of animation, indicative of the creature’s life force. However, Moskala equates the חֹרַשׁ, “spirit,” in 1:12 and 1:20 with the Holy Spirit and connects it with the חֹרַשׁ, “spirit,” of Gen 1:2. If that is the case, then the spirit here should be identified as God. Whether it is God or the creature’s life force, this usage of חֹרַשׁ, “spirit,” does not denote an independent angelic sub-divine being.

Similarly, although there is a being mentioned in Ezek 8:2, this is likely to be the same figure as in Ezek 1:26-28, i.e., God, not an angel. However, in chapter 9, the text mentions “men” who act in the capacity of angels and executioners of judgment killing the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Ezek 9:1-7, 11). An interesting parallel is found in Rev 15:5, where the angels of the seven plagues, acting in a judgment capacity, are dressed in linen with golden sashes. In Ezekiel, a man in linen, who is distinguished from the other men, appears in chapters 9 and 10 (Ezek 9:2-3, 11; 10:2-3, 6-7), and he marks those who are to be left untouched by the punishers (Ezek 9:4). The cherubim and the man in linen

---


19 Ibid., 34-37.


22 Cf. Rev 19:11-16 describes a glorious Christ leading the linen-clad cavalry of heaven (v. 14).
interact briefly in Ezek 10:6-8, when the cherub gives the man coals of fire from within the chariot-throne. Later, Ezek 40-48 describes a man as looking like bronze, with a linen cord and a measuring reed in his hand (40:3). These accounts have similarities with Daniel; the man clothed in (Ezek 9:2-3, 11; 10:2-3, 6-7; 40:3) is similar to the figure in Dan 10:5 and 12:6-7. These and other individuals in Daniel resemble the description of God in Ezek 1. For example, in Ezek 1:26-28, God is described as having “an appearance like a man” (דמות כהאריך אדום), and the descriptions of both the “son of man” (הבר אنشأ) and the “Ancient of Days” (שופך ימי) in Dan 7 bear a striking resemblance to the language of Ezek 1.

Melvin has identified the man in Ezek 40-48 as the first occurrence of an interpreting “angel” in prophetic and apocalyptic literature, and he notes the similarities with the figures in Daniel and Zechariah. In contrast, Schöpflin sees Ezek 40-48 as a “guidance report,” and not as an occurrence of the interpreting angel, though this distinction is not particularly strong. Melvin differentiates the figure of Ezek 40-48 from the other men in Ezekiel’s visions because this figure acts primarily as a guide, not an

actor, within the vision.\textsuperscript{28} Additionally, the man of 40-48 seems to have some autonomy from YHWH, while Melvin argues that the earlier men do not.\textsuperscript{29}

**Daniel**

Like Ezekiel, the book of Daniel significantly contributes to the exilic/post-exilic theology of angels and sub-divine beings. As an apocalyptic book, it distinguishes itself from our other OT passages in that it gives lengthy descriptions of the activities in the heavenly realm. It has been argued that apocalyptic literature gave rise to a more developed angelology,\textsuperscript{30} although Melvin remarks that, “It is truly surprising that the development of Jewish angelology has not figured more prominently in the discussion of apocalyptic origins.”\textsuperscript{31} What is certain is that the apocalyptic genre and angels are closely linked in the biblical text.

The term מַלֵּאךְ appears in the book of Daniel only two times. Both occurrences are found within the Aramaic section, and both are in the context of deliverance from


\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 48-52.


John J. Collins, has penned an influential definition of the genre “apocalypse”: “A genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.” *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5. Emphasis mine.

\textsuperscript{31} Melvin, *The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, 17.
execution, from fire and then from lions (Dan 3:28, 6:23 [MT]). However, there are numerous references to other supernatural beings in Daniel. For the first time in the biblical text, we encounter beings called קדושים (Dan 4:10, 14, 20 [MT]).

The watchers in the book of Daniel are of particular significance, because they are also called “holy ones” (קדושים). This is in contrast to the predominantly negative portrayal of the watchers in extra-biblical literature who, in the majority of cases, are characterized as evil or rebellious. Due to this extra-biblical literature, the term “watchers” has become almost synonymous with “fallen angels.” Scholars understand the concepts to be linked, while recognizing that the terms are not exactly identical. However, the concept in Daniel is the opposite: The watchers are identified as “holy ones,” and thus are part of the celestial realm.

In chapter 7 of Daniel, within the context of the judgement scene, the text mentions “a thousand thousands,” and “ten thousand ten thousands” serving the Ancient of Days at his throne (Dan 7:10; cf. Deut 33:2). White correctly interprets this passage as a “Council of Yahweh text,” despite the fact that the name YHWH is not used in the


34 Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 160; Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him, 15. White calls them the “citizens of Heaven” in Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership, 55. See also ibid., 128.
passage. “Holy ones” are mentioned in both chapters 7 and 8 (7:18, 21, 22, 25, 27; 8:13, 24). In chapter 7 they have been traditionally interpreted as “saints” or “holy people,” because the passage talks about giving the kingdom over to them. In 8:13, however, the “holy ones” seem to be angels/watchers, and within the vision they participate in a call and response. Stars and the host of heaven are also mentioned within 8:10-11, 13, and 12:3, although these might be interpreted as “saints” (cf. Dan 8:24). Additionally, we find the terminology כרבשׁנא, “like a son of man” (Dan 7:13) to describe a heavenly figure, interpreted by Christian commentators as Jesus Christ, and המה שלבראלים, “like


38 Mowinckel says, “‘Holy ones’ in the O.T. always means divine beings.” In Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel’s Worship, 1:150 n.132. Cf. Mowinckel, Religion and Cult, 44.

39 Hasel argues against Mowinckel, on the basis of his analysis of the word שדיאם, that “It is thus patently established that q’dōšîm does not always mean celestial beings in the OT…” In Hasel, “The Identity of ‘The Saints of the Most High’ in Daniel 7,” 178-179.

a son of the gods” (Dan 3:25) to describe a supernatural being, again generally seen as the pre-incarnate Messiah.

One of the most obvious developments in angelology within Daniel is that two of the angelic beings have names. This is the only book in the Hebrew Bible in which this is so. Gabriel (גָּבִ֥רְוָה) and Michael (מִיכָ֣אָל) are both named in the book of Daniel (Dan 8:16, 9:21, 10:13, 10:21, 12:1), and their names appear again later in the NT as well as in extra-biblical literature (Luke 1:19, 26; Jude 9; Rev 12:7). Michael is said to be opposing the Prince of Persia (מֶלֶךְ פָּרָשָׁה) in Dan 10:13, which is similar to his role of opposing the devil in the NT (Jude 9, Rev 12:7). Within Daniel there is also indication

41 On these figures within the structure of the divine council see White *Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership*, 46-47, 130-134, 143. White says that is a generic divine being not part of the council, (pp.46-47), and is a specific figure in the divine council (White, *Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership*, 143).


43 Eynikel attributes this appearance of named “angels” as evidence of their increasing importance and expanded duties, though this is uncertain. Eynikel, “The Angel in Samson’s Birth Narrative-Judg 13,” 116.

44 Unless one interprets “מרפָּא – He is Wonderful.” Kübel, “Epiphanie und Alturbau,” 230 n. 16.


of a type of hierarchy within the celestial sphere. There is a mention of "Prince of the Host" (Dan 8:11), and Michael is described variously as "one of the chief princes" (or "the first of the chief princes," Dan 8:25) and "your prince" (Dan 10:21), and "the great prince" (Dan 12:1).

While these descriptions of Michael are new to the Hebrew Bible, the terminology "Prince of the Host" is not. This title is used in Josh 5 by a mysterious being who is called "Prince of the Host of YHWH" (Josh 5:14), thus implying that these beings in Joshua and Daniel are one and the same.

In chapter 9, Gabriel says that he "flew," and Schöpflin interprets Gabriel’s ability to mean that he has wings. White goes further by suggesting that Gabriel should be understood as a seraph or cherub on the basis of 9:21-23. While I agree that it is impossible for ordinary creatures, such as birds, bats, and insects, to fly without wings, the biblical text is generally specific about the presence of wings when they are present.

---

48 Cf. the mention of the "prince of princes" in Dan 8:25.

49 Doukhan, *Secrets of Daniel*, 163. He notes that the book of Daniel consistently uses דמות for the ordinal number "first." This reading is consistent with Daniel 8:25 (see n. above).


51 Doukhan, *Daniel*, forthcoming, on Daniel 8:11 and 10:5.

52 Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 200.


54 For example, Isa 6; Ezek 1; Zech 5:9-11. Cf. Judges 13:20 when the angel ascends in the fire, though no wings are mentioned, and up until that moment Manoah thought the angel was nothing more than a man. On the other hand, Constance Gane notes that Mesopotamian genii sometimes have wings, although sometimes they do not. In “Composite Beings in Neo-Babylonian Art,” 48.
Also significant within Daniel is the function of the interpreting beings\textsuperscript{55} found in chapters 7-12. Of Dan 7, Melvin says, “the apocalyptic motif of angelic interpretations of symbolic visions reaches its mature, classical form.”\textsuperscript{56} Melvin notes that God speaks to Gabriel in chapter 8, not to Daniel, and he finds this to be highly significant because he is explicitly provided as an interpreter to Daniel.\textsuperscript{57} This is in contrast to chapter 7, in which Daniel inquires of a seemingly random person within the vision,\textsuperscript{58} probably a member of the divine council.\textsuperscript{59} Eynikel states that God is viewed as transcendent and thus the role of the interpreting angel is needed.\textsuperscript{60} While this opinion is held among many scholars,\textsuperscript{61} it is by no means a proven fact.\textsuperscript{62} It is equally likely that YHWH simply wants to remind Daniel that he is the God of the whole earth, not just a local deity—a perspective that is encouraging when one is captive in a foreign land. When the innumerable angelic hosts are presented, this drives the point home (Dan 7:10).


\textsuperscript{58} Melvin, *The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, 157, 161-163.

\textsuperscript{59} Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 199.


\textsuperscript{62} Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 8-9, n. 23.
Schöpflin has identified several similarities between Ezekiel and Daniel. A man clothed in linen, similar to the one previously seen in Ezek 9:2-3, 11:10:2-3, 6-7; 40:3, also appears in Dan 10:5 and 12:6-7. The figure in Daniel is described in fantastic detail that resembles the description of both the living creatures and God in Ezek 1. Shea and Black identify this figure as YHWH, and Rev 1:12-20 later describes Christ in similar language. However, Rev 15:5 describes the angels of the seven plagues as dressed in linen with golden sashes, and Rev 19:11-16 describes a glorious Christ leading the linen-clad cavalry of heaven (v. 14). Thus, linen is not an absolute indicator that the figure is Christ.

Zechariah

Zechariah shares many features with Daniel (and Revelation). In particular, the visions of the heavenly realm found throughout the book of Zechariah are rich in angels (Zech 1:9, 11-14; 2:2, 7 [MT]; 3:1, 3-6; 4:1, 4-5; 5:5, 10; 6:4-5; 12:8.), other-worldly

63 Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 198-201.


horses, winged women, Satan,\textsuperscript{69} and a spirit of uncleanness. Scholars are particularly interested in the angels within the first half of the book.\textsuperscript{70} Additionally, the concept of an interpreting angel becomes important in the exilic and post-exilic period, and it is considered a major step in the development of angelology.\textsuperscript{71}

In the first vision, in chapter 1, the book describes a man mounted on a horse, another man among the myrtle trees, later described as the angel of YHWH, and horses of various colors. The horses here are associated with angelic messengers,\textsuperscript{72} though it is unclear whether they are the angels or whether riders accompany all of the horses, as is the case with the first red horse.\textsuperscript{73} The presence of riders is not necessary, as it is not explicitly stated in the text.\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Or the satan (שָׁטָן).
\item Melvin, \textit{The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature}, 89. Hallaschka refers to the various angels in the book in attempting to reconstruct the redaction history of the book. Specifically, so-called First Zechariah. He identifies the layers as the man on horseback (earliest), the angel who speaks with Zechariah, and the angel of YHWH (latest). Hallaschka, “Zechariah’s Angels: Their Role in the Night Visions and in the Redaction History of Zech 1, 7-6, 8,” 13-27.
\item Niditch, \textit{The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition}, 144; O’Daniel Cantrell, \textit{The Horsemen of Israel}, 58-59. In later literature, visionary horses could be equated with angels as they are in 3 Bar. 6, a second or third century AD text. (On the date see H. E. Gaylord, Jr., “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in \textit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha}, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:655-656.)
\item Butterworth suggests that the horses speak, whereas Petersen infers that (unmentioned) riders on the horses speak. Mike Butterworth, \textit{Structure and the Book of Zechariah}, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 64; Petersen, \textit{Haggai and Zechariah 1-8}, 145. This is similar to Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 192. Melvin favors the idea of riders in \textit{The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature}, 4 n. 9, 100. Hallaschka implies that the horses do not have riders in Hallaschka, “Zechariah’s Angels: Their Role in the Night Visions and in the Redaction History of Zech 1, 7-6, 8,” 17. O’Daniel Cantrell calls the horses “messengers” in \textit{The Horsemen of Israel}, 58.
\item Ruffin, \textit{Symbolism in Zechariah}, 135-136. Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 192 n.16. Conversely, by assuming that there are riders on all of the horses, the horses themselves become nothing but “props,” as Niditch sees them in \textit{The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition}, 144.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The text says that the horses have been roaming the earth, and they report to the angel of YHWH that the earth is peaceful. The angel responds by advocating for Jerusalem with the LORD, and the LORD responds. Eynikel notes that the role of the angel has changed in Zech 1:12, in that “where angels used to announce God’s message to humans, now angels bring human words to God.” Melvin notes that it is significant that the LORD Himself does not communicate directly with Zechariah, but He speaks to the angel (v. 13), who then speaks with Zechariah (v. 14-17). This vision emphasizes that YHWH is the God of the earth and has sovereignty over all world events, just as in Daniel. Therefore, angels are featured more prominently.

In chapter 2, the interpreting angel is again present to help Zechariah understand the vision of the four horns and the four smiths (v. 1-4 [English: 1:18-21]). Zechariah then sees a man with a measuring line and speaks with him (v. 5-6). The angel comes forward and another angel comes to speak with him, apparently with a message for the man with the measuring line (v. 7-8).

Chapter 3 is very interesting for this study. In this chapter, Zechariah is shown the priest Joshua standing before the angel of YHWH and Satan in a judgement scene. The Angel of YHWH is also viewed by scholars as a special figure within the book of


76 Melvin, The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, 105-106.

77 Although it has been noted that the text says that the LORD showed Zechariah the smiths, and He may be the one who answers the question in verse 2:4. Melvin, The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, 107-108. Meyers and Meyers, Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, 139-140.

78 On the difficulty of interpreting who “he” is, see White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership, 96-97. It is most likely the same angel (ךאלמה רבדה יב) from 1:9, 13-14; 2:2, 7 [MT].
Zechariah. For example, Hallaschka observes that this individual emphasizes the transcendence of YHWH. However, within Christian theology, the Angel of the LORD in Zechariah 3 is generally regarded as the pre-incarnate Christ because of his role in the forgiveness and cleansing of Joshua (Zech 3:3-5; cf. Heb 7:22-28; 9:11-14), thus also emphasizing YHWH’s eminence. White refers to the angel of YHWH as both a “judicial official” and a “court officer” within the scene and compares his role to that of a defense attorney. This assessment fits well with the view of the Angel of the LORD as the pre-incarnate Christ, who advocates on behalf of the sinner (1 John 2:1-2).

Scholars understand the satan (טָנָן) in this chapter to be acting as a prosecutor in a legal proceeding, though some admit that his actions are portrayed in a negative light. Many have noted the similarities between this passage and that of Job 1-2, and White states that “These three uncontested [Council of Yahweh] passages (Job 1, 2, and


80 Hallaschka, “Zechariah’s Angels: Their Role in the Night Visions and in the Redaction History of Zech 1, 7-6, 8,” 26.


82 White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership, 140-141.

83 Ibid., 125.


86 Schöpflin, “YHWH’s Agents of Doom,” 133-135; Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, 189-190; Day, An Adversary in Heaven, 147-149.
Zech 3) referring to a celestial being called שֶׁרֶשׁ present an almost identical portrayal.”

She further states that the satan serves as a symbol of any objections that the community might have had to reinstating the priesthood and/or the restoration of Israel. These objections are thus overridden by God. She states that the satan does not have any independence beyond what YHWH allows, and he is acting under the authority of YHWH. This is consistent with the limited role of the evil spirit in 1 Sam 16, 18, 19 and the lying spirit of 1 Kgs 22.

Zechariah 4 records another vision in which the angel interpreter is present. The text states: רְשֵׁב הַמַּלְאָךְ חָדָר יִ ד, “and the angel who spoke with me returned” (4:1). This angel is the same as the angel from 1:9, 13-14; 2:2, 7 [MT], who is consistently called “the angel who spoke with me” (הַמַּלְאָךְ חָדָר יִ ד). This being is not likely to be the “angel of YHWH” (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה) in chapter 3, who does not interact with Zechariah. Rather, the angel interpreter is the one who showed Zechariah the vision of Joshua (3:1). The angel interpreter speaks with Zechariah about the lampstand (4:1-10) and the two olive trees (v. 11-13). In chapter 5, the conversation continues between Zechariah and the angel about a vision of a flying scroll (v. 1-4), the woman who is Wickedness (v. 5-8), and two women

87 White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 113. She goes on to say “This could be due to the similar date of composition.” Ibid. Herein lies the problem of using Job 1-2 as evidence of a pre-exilic notion of Satan: many scholars assume Job 1-2 to be late. Cf. Ibid., 55, 156-162.


89 White, Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership, 117-118. She says, “In Zechariah, God immediately curtails the only action that שֶׁרֶשׁ takes that could be conceived of as independent, even before the words can leave its lips. This is not a figure who can operate outside the deity’s will.” Ibid., 118. I would argue that because it is evident that שֶׁרֶשׁ wants to say something that is not allowed is, in fact, evidence of independence.
with wings like storks (v. 9-11). These women are in fact the only definite occurrence of winged “humans” in the biblical text.  

In chapter 6 four horse-drawn chariots, not an uncommon motif in the Hebrew Bible, emerge from between two bronze mountains and are sent out to the four winds. Petersen suggests that the imagery of the horses and chariots emerging from between two bronze mountains is reminiscent of the Mesopotamian sun-god Shamash, who appears between two mountains.  

More likely, however, the imagery of the two bronze mountains alludes to the bronze pillars in Solomon’s temple, as described in 1 Kgs 7:15-16. Thus, the four chariots are entering and exiting YHWH’s presence in his heavenly temple.

The four groups of horses patrol the earth. Instead of patrolling the earth in order to gather information, we learn that they are sent to provide rest to YHWH’s “spirit” (חזר) in the north. Thus, the mission of the chariots is related to judgment against Babylon and restoration for God’s people.  

Upon seeing this vision, Zechariah speaks

---


with the angel yet again. Within this passage it is difficult to distinguish the angel from YHWH.\footnote{Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter,” 195; Melvin, \textit{The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature}, 118.}

In Zech 13:2, there is mention of an unclean spirit associated with false prophecy. This phenomenon may be compared with the “lying spirit” found in 1 Kgs 22. Wahlen identifies it as a demonic being.\footnote{Wahlen, \textit{Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels}, 28-29.} This text can further be compared to texts from the NT, which frequently references unclean spirits (Mark 5:13-18; Luke 4:33, 9:42).\footnote{Cf. ibid., 26-30.}

New Testament

Both angels and demons appear frequently in the NT. The word ἄγγελος occurs often, and its usages are similar to the OT נָאָם. As in the Old Testament, ἄγγελος is sometimes used to indicate human messengers (Luke 7:24, 9:52; Jas 2:25). The belief in angels in the NT period was complex, and it seems that not every branch of Judaism believed in angels (Acts 23:8).\footnote{Bamberger argues that the meaning of this statement is uncertain and that it is highly unlikely that the Sadducees did not believe in angels of any kind. He suggests that they did not believe in angels/spirits who indwell men and grant insight. Bernard J. Bamberger “The Sadducees and the Belief in Angels,” \textit{JBL} 82.4 (1963): 433-435.} Watson points out that the concept of angels in the NT is “derived from that of the OT and Judaism,” and that NT angelology “does not make any important modifications or innovations of its own.”\footnote{Duane F. Watson, “Angels (New Testament),” \textit{ABD} 1:253.}
Angels (ἄγγελος) have active roles in the NT. They have similar functions as the מלאך in the Hebrew Bible; angels are sent to deliver messages from God (Matt 2:13, 19-20, 28:2-7; Mark 16:5-7; Luke 2:9-15, 24:4-7; John 20:12-13; Acts 1:10-11, 8:26, 10:22, 11:13-14, 27:23-24; Heb 2:2; Rev 1:1, 22:16), including birth announcements (Matt 1:20-24; Luke 1:11-20, 26-38; Cf. Luke 2:9-15, 21). Additionally, angels minister to the weak and needy (Matt 4:11; Mark 1:13; Luke 22:43) and protect the righteous (Matt 4:6, Luke 4:10). An angel is sent to rescue the apostles on more than one occasion (Acts 5:19-20, 12:7-11, 27:23-24). God uses His angels as instruments of judgment and eschatological deliverance (Matt 13:39, 41, 49, 16:27, 24:31, 25:31, 26:53; Mark 13:27; Acts 12:23). The Lord’s entourage is made up of angels (Matt 16:27, 24:31, 25:31; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26, 12:8-9; John 1:51; 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Pet 3:22), and they celebrate with Him (Heb 12:22), rejoicing over the repentant (Luke 15:10). They serve as witnesses (1 Cor 4:9, 11:10; 1 Tim 3:16, 5:21; Heb 13:2; Rev 3:5), and as interpreters of visions (Rev 17:1-18, 21:9-10, 22:6, 8-11). People are compared favorably with angels (Acts 6:15; 1 Cor 13:1; Gal 4:14)\textsuperscript{100} and angels appear as men (Mark 16:5-7; Luke 24:4-7, Acts 1:10-11).\textsuperscript{101} However, angels are also called “spirits/winds,” “servants/ministers” and “a flame of fire” (Heb 1:7) as well as “ministering spirits” (Heb 1:14) suggesting that they are more than simply man-like. Similar to our earlier “angel of the LORD” texts, we find several ἄγγελος κυρίου texts (Matt 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19; 28:2; Luke 1:11; 2:9; Acts 5:19; 8:26; 12:7;

\textsuperscript{100} Sullivan, \textit{Wrestling with Angels}, 118-125.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. ibid., 37-83.
in the NT. One of these angels is named Gabriel (Luke 1:19), indicating that this ἄγγελος κυρίου is neither a Christophany nor a theophany.

In addition to these characteristics, which are similar to those found in the OT, more information is revealed about angels in the NT. God’s angels fought against the devil and his angels in heaven, led by Michael the archangel (Rev 12:7-9). They do not marry (Matt 22:30; Mark 12:25), and the NT indicates that at least some people have personal angels (Matt 18:10; Acts 12:15). The giving of the Law is associated with angels (Acts 7:38, 53; Gal 3:19), although angels apparently refrain from pronouncing judgment (2 Pet 2:11). In one instance an angel is described as flying (Rev 14:6).

Angels are portrayed as limited creatures. They are not omniscient (Matt 24:36; Mark 13:32; 1 Pet 1:12), nor omnipotent (Rom 8:38-39). They may fall into sin (2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6), but Christ does not help the angels as He does human beings (Heb 2:16). Some angels serve Satan (Matt 25:41; Rev 12:7), and he himself masquerades as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14). It is folly to worship angels (Col 2:18); because Christ is superior to angels (Heb 1:4-14, 2:5-9; 1 Pet 3:22), and the saints will judge them (1 Cor 6:3).


---


103 Although there is undoubtedly a symbolic aspect to this figure, it may still be significant that the angel is pictured as flying.

(Μιχαήλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος) is portrayed as opposing the devil (Jude 9; Rev 12:7-9), similar to his role in opposing the “Prince of Persia” (שֶׁר מִלְכוֹת פְּרֵס) in Daniel 10:13. The term ὁ ἀρχάγγελος “the archangel,” (Jude 9) is a reference to Michael’s title αὐτὸς ὁ θερεμος ἡραστήσιμος, “the first of the chief princes,” (Dan 10:13),105 and recalls the terminology וַשָּׁר יְהוָה, “Prince of the Host of YHWH” (Josh 5:14),106 thus implying that these beings are one and the same.107


In Rev 6:1-8, four horses and riders are sent out to the earth. As with Zech 6, this text has four different colored horses, this time with riders, going out to the earth to execute judgment. Again, in Rev 19:11-16, we see Christ riding on a white horse, followed by the armies of heaven, each angel linen-clad and seated on a white horse. The conquering army of heaven arrives as a cavalry, ready to reclaim the earth for God.


107 Doukhan, *Daniel*, forthcoming, on Daniel 8:11 and 10:5.
The NT contains only one use of the word χερουβίν, “cherubim” (Heb 9:5), and this is in the context of the ark of the covenant. However, within Revelation (Rev 4:6ff., 5:6ff., 6:1, 14:3, 15:7), we also find four “living ones” (ζώα) who are similar but not identical to those in Ezekiel (Ezek 1:5ff.; 3:13; 10:15ff.).

In the New Testament, unclean spirits are associated with demons, disease, and insanity (Matt 10:1, 8; Mark 5:1-18, 7:25-30, 9:17-29; Luke 4:33-36, 8:27-38, 9:38-42; Rev 16:13-14, 18:2). Demons are plentiful in the NT. At times they are interchangeable with “unclean spirits” (Mark 5:1-18; 7:25-30; Luke 4:33-36, 8:27-29, 9:42; Rev 16:13-14, 18:2) and are said to have a prince named Beelzeboul (Matt 9:34, Matt 12:24-27, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:14-20). They are connected with idolatry (1 Cor 10:20), they cause diseases and are frequently linked with possession in the NT. The role of tempter and accuser is again taken up by Σατάν, “Satan,” which becomes a proper name of an individual also called διάβολος, “(the) devil” (Matt 4:10-11; Rev 12:9, 20:2).

---


111 Riley, “Demon,” DDD, 236-239; Sorensen, Possession and Exorcism, 124-125; Contra Wahlen, Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 161-162.

112 See McGuire-Moushon, “Divine Beings” LTW. Possession is a concept that becomes prevalent in the NT. See Sorensen, Possession and Exorcism, 118-127. However, it is probably influenced by the accounts of Saul in Samuel. Cf. Sorensen, Possession and Exorcism, 50-53. Wahlen, Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 87.

113 See McGuire-Moushon, “Divine Beings,” LTW.
Martin suggests that the connection between fallen angels and demons was not made until the second or third century AD. However, it is possible to see the connection in the NT: the prince of demons is named Beelzeboul (Matt 9:34, Matt 12:24-27, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:14-20), the fallen angels are led by Satan (Rev 12:7-9; see also Matt 25:41, 2 Cor 12:7, Gal 1:8), and Jesus links Satan and Beelzeboul together (Matt 12:26-27, Mark 3:22-23, Luke 11:18-19). Thus, although there is no explicit statement that demons are fallen angels, the pieces of evidence are there to make the connection.

Additional Second Temple Period Literature

**Septuagint**

The Septuagint contains several references to angels that are not found in the Hebrew Bible. Some texts in the LXX have “angels” where the MT reads “sons of God” (Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7) or where the MT reads “sons of Israel” (Deut 32:8). Generally, however the LXX translates כַּלַּמָּה as ἄγγελος. Martin convincingly suggests that the translators of the LXX deliberately resisted translating כַּלַּמָּה, “angel,” into Greek as δαιμον/ δαιμόνιον, to avoid the cultural baggage of the term δαιμον, “demon,” which meant a god/divinity (either a lesser god or a higher one), and thus avoiding the idea that the כַּלַּמָּה, “angel,” was a god/divinity. The translators instead preferred to equate δαιμόνια, “demons,” with “false gods.”

---


115 Martin acknowledges this, though he does not think that this link was made until later in the second or third century AD. Martin, “When Did Angels Become Demons?” 673-675.

116 Ibid., 664-666.
The LXX uses the term δαιμόνιον, “demon,” quite often, using it to translate several different Hebrew words. Besides שדים (see above in chapter 2), we find that the LXX uses δαιμόνιον, “demon” to translate שָׁעֲרִים, “goat-demon,” in Isa 13:21. A second occurrence may be found in Isa 34:14, although it is uncertain because the translation is not one-to-one; in other words, the LXX may be translating either שָׁעֲרִים, “desert dwellers,” or both collectively as δαιμόνια. The term שָׁעֲרִים, “goat-demon,” is sometimes connected by scholars to Azazel, the enigmatic name found in the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev 16:8, 10, 20, which is associated with the second goat of the ritual that is sent alive into the wilderness (v. 10; cf. the plural of שָׁעֲרִים, apparently “goat-demons,” in 17:7).

---


118 The other two occurrences of the term שָׁעֲרִים are translated as ματάλοις, “vanities, idols” (Lev 17:7, 2 Chr 11:15). On the connection between idolatry and demons, see Beale, We Become What We Worship, 108.


Many references to angels in the LXX are found in the Deuterocanonical books. Angels are also mentioned in the additions to Daniel and Esther, as well as in several other places, such as the books of Maccabees.\footnote{Add Esth 15:13; Add Dan 3:49, 3:58; Sus 44, 55, 59-60; Bel 34-39; Odes 2:8, 2:43, 8:58; Sir 48:21; LetJer 1:6; Wis 16:20; 1 Macc 7:41; 2 Macc 11:6, 15:22-23; 3 Macc 6:18; and 4 Macc 4:10, 7:11. North, “Separated Spiritual Substances in the Old Testament,” 138-143. 2 Macc 2:21, 3:24. Henten says that these are influenced by Hellenistic ideas. In Henten, “Angel (II),” DDD, 51.} The most detailed account of an angelic being appears in the book of Tobit. In this story, an angel named Raphael disguises himself as a human named Azarias and becomes the companion to the hero of the story, Tobias, helping him along the way (Tob 5:4-6, 12:15). In the same book, the evil demon Asmodaus plagues the woman, Sarah, preventing each of her marriages from being consummated. Raphael, the angel, is sent to intervene and deliver her from the schemes of Asmodaus (Tob 3:7-17).\footnote{In accordance with his thesis, that angels and demons were not equated until the third century AD, Martin states that the angel, demon, and evil spirits in Tobit “are not presented as the same species.” Martin, “When Did Angels Become Demons?” 670.} Frey-Anthes correctly notes that the book of Tobit is an important work for understanding Second Temple period demonology.\footnote{Frey-Anthes, “Concepts of `Demons’ in Ancient Israel,” 49. Cf. Wahlen who says “The book of Tobit stands out as an early representative of popular demonology.” In Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 30.}

**Pseudepigrapha**

mentions several classes of beings, including seraphim, cherubim, and a new group called ophanim (ophanim), literally “wheels,” all of whom guard the throne of God (1 En. 14:11, 18; 61:10; 71:7), in addition to the various classes of angels (1 En. 20:7, 61:10). First Enoch also mentions “good” angels, who have names such as Uriel, Raphael, Zotiel, Gabriel, and Michael (1 En. 9:1; 22:6; 32:2, 6; 33:3; 60:4; 69:14; 71:3; 72:1; 74:2; 75:3; 80:1). Uriel is the head of the heavenly lights, and may also be the embodiment of light. Fallen angels have names such as Semiaza, Ramiel, Tamiel, Azazel, and Touriel (1 En. 6:3, 7-8; 8:1).

Associating angels with astrological phenomena, such as the angel Uriel (named “light of God”), Kokabel (“star of God”), Shamashiel (“sun of God”), Sahriel (“moon of God”) (1 En. 8:3), is a tradition that is not much different than the identification of the

some have suggested a few changes to this scheme, categorizing chapters 1-5 as a prologue and 105-108 as an appendix: Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 5; Cf. Jones, Enoch and the Fall of the Watchers: 1 Enoch 1-36, 17.

126 Cf. 2 En. 1:0, 19:6, 20:1, 21:1, 22:2; Apoc Moses 19:3; 22:3; 28:3; 32:2; 33:2-3, 38:3. According to Hartenstein, 4Q405 f20ii 22:3-8; 1 En. 61:10; 71:7; Sir 49:8; Apoc Moses 33:2-3; Apoc Abr 18:12 are all part of the merkabah mysticism matrix. In “Cherubim and Seraphim,” 155.

127 Melvin states of 1 En. 72:1, “The importance of the … passage for the development of the interpreting angel motif—and indeed, Jewish angelology in general—cannot be overstated. Here, for the first time, an angel is clearly given a personal name (Uriel).” In The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, 142. He dates The Book of Luminaries to before the book of Daniel.


129 Helge S. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Alten und Neuen Testament Monographs 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 300-304, 312, who notes that this account bears some
heavenly host with the heavenly bodies, which we have seen in Deuteronomy-Kings.

Jackson aptly says: “According to BW [Book of Watchers] there is a connection between the Watchers who fell, stars which behave in an irregular manner, pagan gods/idols and pagan worship of astral phenomena.”[130]

In 1 Enoch the fallen angels go to earth and take wives (1 En. 6:1-7:3), produce monstrous offspring (1 En. 7:2-6) and teach the people all kinds of trades, astrology, and magic (1 En. 8:3). As a result, Azazel is blamed for all sin (1 En. 10:4-8), despite the fact that Semiaza is the one who comes up with the idea to take human wives (1 En. 6:3-5, 10:11-14).[131] Enoch attempts to intercede on behalf of the fallen watchers but is told that they ought to have interceded on behalf of humanity. However, because of their sin they cannot intercede, and they will have no peace (1 En. 13:1-6, 15:1-16:4).[132]

Several scholars have suggested that the “watchers” are influenced by the somewhat similar Mesopotamian apkallū (pre-Flood sages) traditions.[133] If the


131 On the various views of the origin of sin, see Reed, Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity, 84-121.


connection between the *apkallū* and watchers/angels is valid, that opens up a range of possibilities regarding the development of the iconography of angels.\textsuperscript{134}

The book of Jubilees also has a well-developed angelology. Newsom notes the tendency of Jubilees to insert angels into its version of the events of the OT.\textsuperscript{135} The book is a narrative retelling of the events of Gen 1-Exod 19, in which God himself tells the story to Moses on Mt Sinai. Within the tale are *halakhic* interpretations that emphasize specific laws found in the Torah.\textsuperscript{136} The book’s angelology (as well as its theology of the election of Israel) is bound up in its theology of creation and the Sabbath. On the first day, God creates the angels and assigns them to stations in a kind of hierarchy (Jub. 2:1-2, 18). He gives the Sabbath to two types of angels (the angels of the Presence and the

---


\textsuperscript{136} Of this feature Endres says, “This device provides an imaginative insight into the nature of God’s revelation to Moses at Sinai: Moses perceived the priestly Torah as part of the articulated and interpreted history of Israel’s earliest ages and not legal stipulations first revealed at Sinai.” John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 4.
angels of holiness), thus differentiating between them and the others. The fall of the angels in Jubilees is similar to that of 1 Enoch, but Stuckenbruck has noted that the Jubilees account “is more nuanced” and focuses on the angels, giants, and humans deviating from the laws of God.

1 Enoch and Jubilees both equate the antediluvian giants, who are offspring of the watcher/human union, with spirits (1 En. 15:8-9; Jub. 5:1, 10:5). Within 1 Enoch, they become evil spirits. Stuckenbruck suggests that the giants of 1 Enoch, who survive the flood only as disembodied spirits, are jealous of humanity’s corporeal existence and thus they enter human bodies to possess them. They are portrayed as inherently evil in 1 Enoch, whereas in Jubilees, the spirits are not specified as such. First Enoch equates spirits and demons (1 En. 69:12), and Jubilees states that demons led people astray to

---

137 In Jubilees, the Sabbath is a sign, not for all mankind (or angels), but for a certain group of angels (those of the presence and sanctification) and a certain group of humans (Israelites). Jub. 2:17-21, 31. Cf. Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 161-162.


139 Stuckenbruck notes that this is consistent in the Book of Watchers (1 En. 1-36) and the related Book of Giants. He states, however, that the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85-90) indicates that the giants were wholly destroyed. In The Myth of Rebellious Angels, 15-23. Wahlen says (based on Syncellus) that in the passages in the Book of Watchers these spirits are evil because they reside on earth and, “The burden of the passage has less to do with why the spirits are called evil than why they are called spirits.” Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 32-33. Fröhlich finds that there are similarities between the Enochic giants and the Mesopotamian utukku (ghosts). Fröhlich, “Mesopotamian Elements and the Watchers Traditions,” 17, 21.

140 Stuckenbruck, The Myth of Rebellious Angels, 15-16.

141 Stuckenbruck, The Myth of Rebellious Angels, 29-30, 55-57. The giants are also intrinsically evil in the Book of Giants (ibid., 55-57). Wahlen agrees that the spirits are evil in 1 En., but also sees the spirits in Jubilees as evil. In Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels, 32, 35.

destruction (Jub. 7:27, 10:1-2). Both books also make the connection between worshipping idols and sacrificing to demons (1 En. 19:1, 99:7; Jub. 1:11). This is fairly similar to the biblical statements about demons (Deut 32:17; Lev 17:7; cf. 1 Cor 10:20).

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Judah equates following demons to idolatry (T. Jud. 23:1). An extensive demonology is found in the pseudepigraphal Testament of Solomon. Using a magic ring and aided by the power of God, Solomon interrogates various demons and commands them to stop their mischief (T. Sol. 1:1-25:9), until the demons entrap him because of his love for the Shummanite woman (T. Sol. 26:1-8). This text, however, is dated to between the first and third centuries AD, so it is rather late. Another text, 3 Baruch 16, connects demons to afflictions and calamities, which is consistent with ancient Near Eastern conceptions of demons. Again, this is late, dated to the second or third century AD, but Shneider shows that ideas found in 3 Baruch are connected to earlier ideas found in 2Q23.

---

143 Martin acknowledges that Jubilees equates demons with evil spirits in Jub. 10:1-2, 3, 11, but he finds this reading to be late. In Martin, “When Did Angels Become Demons?” 667-669.

144 Beale, We Become What We Worship, 154-155, 225-226.


147 The verse numbers are different depending on the MSS consulted. Slavonic: 16:2, Greek 16:3; See Gaylord, “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 1:676-677.


Dead Sea Scrolls

In the extrabiblical Dead Sea Scrolls, many of the references to angels refer to their roles, whether good or bad. For example the “angels of destruction” (马来ך חבל) will destroy sinners (CD 2:6), but “the angel of hatred” (马来ך המשתח) will leave those who follow the Law (CD 16:5, 4Q270 f6ii:18, 4Q271 f4ii:6.).\(^{150}\) The “angel of darkness” (马来ך חרש) works against the community (1QS 3:18-24.),\(^{151}\) but the “angel of his truth” (马来ך אמונת) works for the holy community (1QS 3:24).\(^{152}\) Also mentioned are “the angel(s) of the Presence” (马来ך הפנים) (1QsB 4:25, 3Q7 f5:3, 1QHa 14:16),\(^{153}\) “the angel of the authority of Michael” (马来ך אורי מלשרת מיכאל) (1QM 17:6), the “angel of peace” (马来ך שלום) (3Q8 f1:2, 4Q228 f1i:8, 4Q369 f1i:2, 4Q369 f1i:2), the “angel of the LORD” (马来ך יהוה) (4Q226 f6a:3, 4Q388a fD:2), “the angel of the pit” (马来ך נשחת) (4Q286 f7ii:7), the “angel of intercession” (马来ך אزالת) (4Q369 f2:1), and the angels Gabriel, Michael, Sariel, Uriel, and Raphael (1QM 9:15-16; 1Q19bis f2:4; 4Q529 f1:4; 4Q557 f1:2, etc.).\(^{154}\) The DSS manuscripts seem to contain traditions that man was

---

\(^{150}\) This angel is also mentioned in the War Scroll (1QM 13:11) and 4Q495 f2:3.

\(^{151}\) 1QS=The Community Rule. Martin suggests that here the angel and the evil spirit might be equated. In Martin, “When Did Angels Become Demons?” 669.

\(^{152}\) This angel is also mentioned in 4Q177 f12 13i:7.

\(^{153}\) 1QsB = Benedictions.

\(^{154}\) 1Q19bis = Book of Noah.
created in the image of angels, not God (4Q417 f1i:17; 4Q418 f43-45i:2), presumably to protect the transcendence of God and to keep from anthropomorphizing him.

The DSS also have an interest in the Cherubim-Chariot of God. In the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, the cherubim and the chariot are described in some detail using language similar to that of Ezekiel: “wheels” (륜, “firmament” (犴), “fire” ( אש), “wings” (כנמים), “going about” (מההלכים), etc. (4Q403 f1ii:15, 4Q405 f20ii 22:3, 7-8). The entire section is about the heavenly beings, including the cherubim, *ophanim* (практи), and the angels, and the text describes them as having the form of “living gods” (อลוחים תים) (4Q405 f3ii:4-f23ii:12).

The literature of Qumran mentions demons in several manuscripts and fragments, including texts from the books of Jubilees, Pseudo-Daniel, Apocryphal Jeremiah, Pseudo-Ezekiel, Canticle of the Sage, and the Apocryphal Psalms. It also contains some texts that mention evil spirits and exorcism of them (1Q20 20:16-17, 28-29; 4Q538 f1 2:2-4; 4Q560 f1ii:6; 11Q5 19:15), and Satan (4Q213a f1:17, 11Q5 19:15).

---


158 2Q23 f1:7, 4Q216 2:11, 4Q243 f13:2, 4Q244 f1:2:2, 4Q385a f3a c:7, 4Q386 f1iii:4, 4Q387 f1:4, 4Q388a f3:6, 4Q510 f:5, 4Q564 f1ii:2, 11Q11 2:3-4.
The Angels and Sub-Divine Beings of Deut-Kings
Versus Those of Later Texts

Host of Heaven and Its Prince

“The host of heaven” (אבצם השמים) and its Prince are found in both Deuteronomy-Kings and exilic/post-exilic literature. The passage in 1 Kgs 22 portrays YHWH seated on His throne, among the host of heaven who are the celestial agents serving as his advisors (1 Kgs 22:19). Similarly, the later text of Daniel 7:10 mentions “a thousand thousands,” and “ten thousand ten thousands” serving the Ancient of Days at his throne, who can be interpreted as the “host.”

In Deuteronomy-Kings, the phrase “the host of heaven” (אבצם השמים) includes the sun, moon, stars, and planetary bodies (Deut 4:19, 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:16, 21:3, 23:4), and the stars are personified in Judges 5:20. In later literature, we find that stars and the host of heaven are also connected, such as in the vision of Dan 8:10-11, 13 (Cf. 12:3). The NT identifies stars and angels in several places (Jude 13, Rev 1:20, 8:10-11, 9:1, 12:4). In 1 Enoch, the angel Uriel is the head of the heavenly lights and may plausibly be interpreted as the embodiment of light. Identifying angels with natural phenomena is consistent

---

159 Cooley, Poetic Astronomy in the Ancient Near East, 290-291. Cogan, 1 Kings, 492.
162 Dörfel, Engel in der apokalyptischen Literatur und ihre theologische Relevanz, 172-173. She suggests that Uriel is the light that was created on the first day, and that all of the heavenly bodies created later are under his jurisdiction. Cf. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 411-413; Melvin, The Interpreting Angel Motif in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, 142-144; Mach, “Uriel,” DDD, 885.
with the personification of the heavenly host in Deuteronomy-Kings. However, the later literature goes further by assigning names to these beings and describing their duties in detail. Thus, it would seem that these later authors are no longer fearful that the readers will be in danger of worshipping these beings, unlike Deuteronomy-Kings which condemns the practice many times (Deut 4:19, 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:16, 21:3, 23:4).

The title “Prince of the Host of YHWH” (שזרה ידוהי) is used in Joshua 5:14 by a mysterious man who is a celestial military commander. Within the book of Daniel there are also indications of a hierarchy within the celestial sphere. “The Prince of the Host” (שזרה) is mentioned in Daniel 8:11, and the implication later on in the book is that he is the same person as Michael, “the first of the chief princes” (אדד השלים הראשות) (Dan 10:13; Cf. 10:21, 12:1). The NT goes further by calling Michael ὁ ἀρχαγγελός, “the archangel” (Jude 9, Cf. Rev 12:7, Dan 12:1), a new title to be sure, but perfectly compatible with “Prince of the Host of YHWH” (שזרה ידוהי) and “the first of the chief princes” (אדד השלים הראשות). Thus, we again have a continuation of a tradition that begins in Joshua, but along the way we find more information about this prince: his name, details about his function in the hierarchy, etc. If indeed the figure in Josh 5:13-15 is to be identified as Christ (see chapter 3 above), then Michael is also a reference to Christ.

---


165 For other factors indicating that Michael is Christ, see Moskala, “Toward Trinitarian Thinking in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 267-268.
Spirits and Ghosts

The evil spirits in Judg 9, 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19, the ghost of 1 Sam 28, and the lying spirit of 1 Kgs 22 lay the groundwork for depictions of antagonistic spirits in later literature. The spirit of 1 Kgs 22 demonstrates agency, distinguishing himself by creating a harmful plan and submitting it for YHWH’s approval. Zechariah 13:2 mentions an unclean spirit associated with false prophecy. This phenomenon may be compared with the “lying spirit” found in 1 Kgs 22. The fits of madness that came upon Saul when the “evil spirit” fell upon him in 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19 can be understood as a type of spirit possession.

These passages provide background to the type of possession and the need for exorcism seen so often in the NT. In the New Testament, unclean spirits are associated with demons, disease, and insanity (Matt 10:1, 8; Mark 5:1-18, 7:25-30, 9:17-29; Luke 4:33-36, 8:27-38, 9:38-42; Rev 16:13-14, 18:2). Within 1 Samuel, the method of exorcism is playing music (though it is often ineffective), while in the NT, the exorcism is performed by adjuring the spirit to leave the person in the name of God and/or Jesus.


Christ. Within 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19 it is unclear if it was the same spirit each time, as the text is ambiguous. However, it may be analogous to the parable in Matt 12:43-45 about an unclean spirit returning, sometimes with additional spirits, to the same person after exorcism.

First Enoch and Jubilees both equate spirits with the (dead/disembodied) antediluvian giants (1 En. 15:8-9; Jub. 5:1, 10:5). In 1 Enoch they are inherently evil, whereas in Jubilees, the spirits are not specified as such.

What these spirits have in common, from Judges to the Pseudepigrapha, is that they are often harmful to humans. From the evil spirit of 1 Samuel, to the NT, to 1 Enoch, the spirits can fall upon a human to cause erratic behavior and destruction. Even when the spirits interact with humans outside of possession, as in 1 Sam 28, their destructive purpose is evident.

Clearly, there is a development in the portrayal of the spirits. Deuteronomy-Kings does not discuss the origins of the spirits, and frequently uses both the idea of the (good) spirit of YHWH and the “evil spirit” of (sent from) God. In Deuteronomy-Kings, the spirits are generally only allowed to act upon YHWH’s command. However, at least one spirit has agency—the lying spirit in 1 Kgs 22. Other indicators of the independence of the spirits include the case of an evil spirit who impels Saul to try to murder David. David escapes because it was not the will of YHWH for him to die. Additionally, 1 Sam 28 has no indication that YHWH is involved in the interaction.


In the New Testament, the unclean spirits are openly antagonistic to humans and to God, and the NT also distinguishes between the good spirits (i.e., angels, cf. Heb 1:7, 14) and the unclean spirits. Nevertheless, when the unclean spirits are commanded by Christ (generally in exorcism), they must obey. Thus, the sovereignty of God over the spirit world is preserved from Deuteronomy-Kings through the NT.

Cherubim and Heavenly Animals

Cherubim are supernatural sub-divine beings linked with the physical presence of YHWH, and they were likely understood to be different from angels. The text of 2 Sam 22 presents a cherub as a living, flying mount for YHWH. Cherubim do not deliver messages, rather, their primary function seems to be keeping humans away from sacred things and places. Connected with this function, cherubim are also associated with the Tree of Life and the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:24, Ezek 28:13-14, Ezek 41:18-172

---

172 Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 159-160.


174 This passage has led some commentators to the conclusion that cherubim are celestial animals. Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” ABD 1:251. Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 156, n. 22. Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 172. However, at some point they must have been viewed as capable of handling items (fire (Ezek 10:6-8), a fiery sword (Gen 3:24); though the fiery sword in Genesis has been viewed by some as a separate creature (Hendel, “The Flame of the Whirling Sword,” 672-674; Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 56-57). On quadruped cherubim see Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 2 n. 4, 56-57, 87-88, 114-115, 123 n. 181, 140, 161-162. Cf. Hurowitz, “YHWH’s Exalted House,” 86; Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 45-46, 139-140, 205. Contra Haran, “The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual,” IEJ 9.1 (1959): 36-37.

and there is iconographic evidence that there was a wider connection between cherubim, trees, and animals.

The exilic book of Ezekiel contains the most detailed description of cherubim anywhere in the Hebrew Bible. The chariot-throne of God is conveyed by four unusual beings, called תָּשִׁית, “living ones,” and they are described as having the body of a man, four faces, four wings, and hands (Ezek 1:4-28). These same beings appear in chapters 10-11, in which they are called “cherubim” twenty-one times, and “living ones” once (Ezek 10:1-20, 11:22).

Within Revelation, we also find “living ones” (ζῷα) who are similar but not identical to those in Ezekiel (Rev 4:6-9, 5:6-6:1, 14:3, 15:7). The word “cherubim” (χερουβῖν) is only mentioned in the NT once (Heb 9:5).


180 Hartenstein, “Cherubim and Seraphim,” 155-156, 177-178. Cunchillos, Cuando los ángeles eran dioses, 160. 4Q405 f20ii 22:3-8; 1 En. 61:10, 71:7; Sir 49:8; Apoc Moses 33:2-3; Apoc Abr 18:12 are all part of the merkabah mysticism matrix. Hartenstein, “Cherubim and Seraphim,” 155.
14:18, 61:10, 71:7.).\textsuperscript{181} The DSS also have an interest in the cherubim-chariot of God. In *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, the cherubim are described in some detail, in the tradition of Ezekiel (4Q403 f1ii:15, 4Q405 f20ii 22:3, 7-8).\textsuperscript{182} It also calls the heavenly beings, including the cherubim, in the form of “living gods” (אלהים חיים) (4Q405 f3ii:4-f23ii:12).

Thus, we see a continuation of the cherubim tradition of Deuteronomy-Kings all the way through to the Second Temple period, along with development. Cherubim consistently attend YHWH and are associated with His throne/ark, as well as providing a means of transport in 2 Sam 22, but they are not described with any detail except in regards to the presence of wings. Without contradicting the previous accounts, Ezekiel expands their description to make them part of the chariot of God and describes them as composite beings, calling them both “living ones” and “cherubim.” Revelation seems to indicate that the “living ones” are not all exactly alike (Rev 4:7-8).

Chapters 2 and 6 of 2 Kgs mention the existence of heavenly horses, which also appear in the books of Zechariah (chs. 1 and 6) and Revelation (chs. 6 and 19). In 2 Kgs, it seems that in addition to the horses, there are also heavenly charioteers driving the chariots of fire (2:12). In Rev 6:1-8, four different-colored horses with riders are sent out to the earth, similar to the horses of Zech 1. In Rev 19:11-16, we see Christ riding on a white horse, followed by the armies of heaven, with each warrior seated on a white horse.

\textsuperscript{181} Cf. 2 En. 1:0, 19:6, 20:1, 21:1, 22:2; Apoc Moses 19:3; 22:3; 28:3; 32:2; 33:2-3, 38:3. Boustan suggests that the basis for the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* angelic beings called *ophanìm* are derived from either 1 Kgs 7 or Ezek 1. In “Angels in the Architecture,” 204.

The image of a heavenly cavalry is similar to the heavenly chariots described in 2 Kgs 6. The difference is that the riders are apparently on horseback rather than in chariots, however supernatural chariots are mentioned even in late Pseudepigraphal literature.\(^\text{183}\)

Thus, supernatural horses also populate the supernatural world as part of the heavenly army in 2 Kings, Zechariah, and Revelation. In 2 Kgs they are described as fiery, but this description is not present in Zechariah or Revelation. Rather, there are other indicators that they are supernatural, such as the presence of interpreting angels and riders.

**Angels and Demons**

As the name “messenger” implies, angels often serve as mouthpieces of God, bringing messages from Him to humans (Gen 22:11-18, 31:11, 32:2; Judg 2:1-4, 6:11-22; 2 Kgs 1:3-15), including birth announcements (Gen 16:7-12; Judg 13:3-21; Cf. Gen 18). But angels do more than deliver celestial mail; they punish the wicked (Gen 19:1-22, 2 Sam 24:16-17, 2 Kgs 19:35, Isa 37:36, Ps 35:5-6, Ps 78:49, 1 Chr 21:11-30, 2 Chr 32:21), minister to the needy (Gen 21:15-19, 1 Kgs 19:4-8) and protect and save people from calamity (Gen 19:1-22, Gen 48:16, 2 Kgs 6:15-17, Isa 63:9, Ps 34:8, Ps 91:11, Dan 3:28, Dan 6:23). Angels are part of YHWH’s heavenly entourage, and as a group they are called “holy ones” (Deut 33:2-3, Job 15:15, Ps 89:6-8, Dan 4:14),\(^\text{184}\) “host of heaven” (1

\(^{183}\) Cf. 3 Bar. 6:2, in which Baruch discovers that the sun is drawn by a chariot with fiery, winged horses/angels, and accompanied by the phoenix-bird; in Gaylord, “3 (Greek Apocalypse) of Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:668-669.

\(^{184}\) The watchers in the book of Daniel are called “holy ones” (ניישדיק) (Dan 4:10, 14, 20 [MT]). In Dan 8:13, the “holy ones” give a call and response, speaking to each other, a feature which also shows up in Zechariah.
Humans invoke angels as symbols of righteousness (1 Sam 29:9) and wisdom (2 Sam 14:17-20, 19:28).

Angels (ἄγγελος) are very active in the NT, having functions that are similar to those of the כּחֲלֵם in the Hebrew Bible (see above). Angels are also called “spirits/winds,” “a flame of fire” (Heb 1:7), as well as “ministering spirits” (Heb 1:14), suggesting that they are more than simply man-like. The NT is also explicit about the angels’ ability to sin and even rebel against God (2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6). The tempter and accuser receives the name Σατανᾶς, “Satan,” also called διάβολος, “(the) devil” (Matt 4:10-11; Rev 12:9, 20:2). Some angels serve Satan/the devil (Matt 25:41; Rev 12:7, 9). In Daniel, we learn the names of two angels: Michael and Gabriel (Dan 8:16; 9:21; 10:13, 21; 12:1). These same angels appear again in the NT (Luke 1:19, 26; Jude 9, Rev 12:7-9).

The functions of the angels in Deuteronomy-Kings is quite similar to that of the angels in later OT literature and in the NT. However, the later literature adds new details about the angels. Some are named, and angels frequently appear as guides for the visions the prophets receive. We also learn that they have the ability to serve God willingly or to rebel. The watchers in the book of Daniel are called “holy ones” (נשדיק), which contrasts the predominantly negative portrayal of the watchers in extra-biblical literature who, in the majority of cases, are characterized as evil or rebellious (i.e. Jub. 7:21, 1 En. 10:7). In 1 Enoch the fallen angels/watchers go to earth and take wives (1 En. 6:1-7:3), produce

---

185 Based on the DSS reading. See chapter 2 above.

monstrous offspring (1 En. 7:2-6) and teach the people all kinds of trades, astrology, and magic (1 En. 8:3, 1 En. 10:7).

Demons are only mentioned once in Deuteronomy-Kings, but it is a highly significant text. The beings called שדים (Deut 32:17) are unworthy of worship. The text does not deny that they are real supernatural beings, but worshipping/sacrificing to them is prohibited and linked with idolatry.¹⁸⁷ Within Deuteronomy, these practices are also linked with the occult: divination and consulting the dead. These are all unacceptable practices, and thus the religions of the other nations are dangerous (Deut 18:9-12).¹⁸⁸ The Israelites are warned to avoid שדים, or they will be lured away from YHWH.

It is likely that this concern kept the text relatively quiet regarding a celestial conflict between good and evil.¹⁸⁹ And yet, the acknowledgement of the danger of idolatry can also be taken as a confirmation of this conflict.¹⁹⁰ All of the building blocks for this understanding have been assembled and have their basis in early biblical literature.

Demons are plentiful in the NT. At times they are interchangeable with “unclean spirits” and are frequently linked with possession in the NT (Mark 5:1-18; 7:25-30; Luke 4:33-36, 8:27-29, 9:42; Rev 16:13-14, 18:2), which is very similar to the accounts of the

---

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Lev 17:7 in which the Israelites are to cease from sacrificing to שדים “goat-demons.”


¹⁹⁰ Beale, We Become What We Worship, 172, 308.
“evil spirit” which plagues Saul in 1 Sam 16, 18 and 19. They are also connected with idolatry in 1 Cor 10:20, which seems to be a direct reference to Deut 32:17.\(^{191}\)

First Enoch equates spirits and demons (1 En. 69:12), and Jubilees states that demons led people astray to destruction (Jub. 7:27, Jub. 10:1-2). Both books associate demons with idolatry (1 En. 19:1, 1 En. 99:7, Jub. 1:11), as does the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, in which Judah compares following demons to idolatry (Testament of Judah 23:1). These ideas are quite similar to OT statements about demons, especially in Deut 32:17-21 (Cf. Lev 17:7).

**Summary**

As we have seen above, there are many interesting and pronounced features of exilic and post-exilic angelology. However, the differences between pre-exilic and exilic/post-exilic concepts of angels and sub-divine beings have been overstated, since most features of exilic/post-exilic angelology have clear antecedents in Deuteronomy-Kings.

---

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

This study has investigated occurrences of angels and sub-divine supernatural beings in the books of Deuteronomy-Kings in order to gain a better understanding of their functions, characteristics, and relationships in pre-exilic biblical literature. The research has also compared the features of pre-exilic concepts with those found in exilic/post-exilic literature.

Deuteronomy contains references to sub-divine supernatural beings, such as “demons” (-finals), “holy one(s)” (קָדוֹשׁ), and the “heavenly host” (עֲנָן הַשְּׁמֵשׁ). While Deuteronomy affirms the existence of sub-divine beings, it forbids the Israelites to worship them. There are also numerous references to other “gods,” whom the LORD denounces. Israel must accept that YHWH is the only true God, and their savior. This makes sense within the polemic of the book against idolatry. This theology lays the groundwork for subsequent writings and their treatment of the subject of sub-divine beings in relationship to both God and man.

Within the framework of Joshua-Judges, there is an awareness of sub-divine beings and their roles as warriors, messengers, and tormentors. All of these consistently operate under the direction of YHWH and do his bidding. These passages also lay the foundation for themes that appear in later biblical material. The host of heaven with a
commander (Josh 5:13-15) correlates with Dan 8:11.\(^1\) When one identifies the figure in Joshua as the pre-incarnate Christ (see chapter 3), then subsequent references to this prince (and Michael) also concern Christ. Furthermore, some “angel of the LORD” passages, such as Judg 6, Exod 3, and Zech 3, can also be classified as Christoanies or theophanies. However, such a decision should be context-based, as the phrase does not in and of itself indicate that the figure in question is YHWH (Hag 1:13ff.).

The books of Samuel contain many references to sub-divine beings, including angels, cherubim, and spirits. A fuller picture of the supernatural world becomes clear, and the attitudes that the people have towards these beings also become evident. Angelic messengers are found throughout the Bible from the early literature through the NT, and evil spirits are seen in 1 Samuel and post-exilic literature, including the NT. These beings all become important to the later understanding of sub-divine beings in both Jewish and Christian theology.

Cherubim are representative of the presence of God,\(^2\) and his title as “the LORD who sits/dwells above the cherubim” invokes the idea of the holy of holies both on earth and in heaven. The angel of God is held up as an exemplar of wisdom and loyalty. However, Samuel also contains evil spirits and the destroying angel, all of whom bring disaster upon human beings, apparently as instruments of God’s judgment. Thus, the

---

\(^1\) Cf. Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1; 1 Thess 4:16; Jude 9; Rev 12:7.

\(^2\) Cunchillos, *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses*, 159-160.
picture in Samuel is complex and multi-faceted. It also shows that God works not only directly and through human agencies, but through supernatural ones as well.

Within our study, it seems that Kings has the fullest pre-exilic picture of the supernatural world and humanity’s awareness of it. In this section of Scripture, we encounter many concepts. The “divine council” motif is found in 1 Kgs 22, as well as a view of the “host of heaven” (עֵבֶד יְהוָה) surrounding YHWH and serving Him. The ministering angel appears in 1 Kgs 19 to care for Elijah, and later Elijah and Elisha experienced chariots and horses of fire (2 Kgs 2, 6). The text also contains a lying spirit, other angels, and cherubim. Additionally, the text deals with the troubling aspect of Israel’s and Judah’s awareness of these sub-divine beings, in that they become illegitimate objects of worship for the people.

The idea that God uses evil/lying spirits to accomplish his mission seems to raise a problem of theodicy: How could a sinless God commission an evil agent?³

First, it is important to make the distinction between these beings and YHWH himself. Although YHWH commissions the “lying spirit” (רוח שקר) to execute its plan (1 Kgs 22:22-23), the quality of שקר is an attribute of that spirit, not of YHWH.⁴ In 1 Sam 16, 18, and 19 we find an “evil spirit” (רוח יוהו רעה/רוחו יוהו רעה), and each

³ For a summary of the major views, see Block, “What Has Delphi to Do with Samaria? Ambiguity and Delusion in Israelite Prophecy,” 189-191.

⁴ Block argues that it is not an attribute of the spirit, but rather the effect that the spirit will have on Ahab. Block, “What Has Delphi to Do with Samaria? Ambiguity and Delusion in Israelite Prophecy,” 206. However, the spirit says he will be a חָורָק in the mouths of the prophets, not a חָורָק in the ears of Ahab (1 Kgs 22:22-23). Therefore, I believe that the emphasis is on the words spoken, not the interpretation of the prophecy by Ahab.
time it is referring to a destructive spirit sent by God (1 Sam 16:14; cf. Job 1:12, 2:6-7), not describing God himself.  

Second, as Block has pointed out, the reader is not required to interpret רעה as moral evil, but rather as a morally neutral negative effect for punishment, such as calamity in Isa 45:7, where God says that he makes “well-being” (שלם) and creates “calamity” (רע, ESV), i.e., the opposite of well-being.  

Third, in Job 1-2, YHWH allows harmful and destructive actions by Satan, who is an evil being. These chapters are highly instructive for understanding the dynamics of the conflict between God and evil. Here Satan makes the case that Job should be tested to see if he is truly loyal to YHWH (1:9-11). YHWH replies that all that is Job’s is in his (Satan’s) hand (1:12; cf. 2:3-6). Like the spirit in 1 Kgs 22, Satan responds to a question posed by YHWH (1:8, 2:3) with his own idea about how to treat the human in question. Both the spirit and Satan act under the authority of God. The spirit in 1 Kgs 22 is used by God to punish the wicked, but in Job 1-2 Satan is used to test the righteous Job.

---

5 When the text calls the spirit an “evil/harmful spirit of God” or (in 1 Sam 19:9) an “evil/harmful spirit of YHWH” (רחותא/רחותא ייהו רעה), it seems that these are abbreviations for the phrase (רחותא ייהו רעה). On the translation “harmful/destructive spirit” see Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament,” 47; Block, Judges, Ruth, 323-324.


Nevertheless, all of these calamities come upon the humans because Satan is eager to wreak havoc in their lives (1 Pet 5:8).

God allows a certain measure of Satan’s attacks as part of his plan of salvation (1 Pet 4:12-17), and just as humans have freedom of choice, so do the celestial beings. There is never any doubt that YHWH has the ultimate control over these situations (1 Kgs 22:23, Job 2:3) and he imposes limitations on how far spirits/Satan can go. Just as YHWH used the sinful nations of Babylon, Assyria, and Persia (Jer 25:9, 27:6, 43:10; Isa 10:5, 44:28, 45:1; 1 Chr 5:6) as instruments to punish his people and yet he also punished these nations for their own wickedness (Isa 10:5; Jer 50:18), so will the spirits/angels be punished for their wickedness (Ps 82:6-7, Matt 25:41, Rev 20:10). YHWH takes responsibility for the actions that these beings commit (1 Kgs 22:23, Job 2:3).

Theologically, this is important for the OT, emphasizing that there is only one true God, and he is the sovereign over all (including positive and negative events) and the only one worthy of worship (Deut 32:39; Isa 45:7).

Humans are given a choice of whom to side with in the conflict with evil. Within the life of Saul, once he rejects the commandments of God, the (good) spirit of God leaves him and an evil spirit torments him (1 Sam 16:14-16, 18:10-11, 19:9-10; cf. Judg

---


9 Job 1-2 states that the satan (伝え) was the one that came up with the idea to test Job and he is the one who carried it out. Nevertheless, YHWH states that he (YHWH) was incited against Job in 2:3. Later in the text, YHWH affirms his right to test Job as he has (Job 28-41). 1 Kgs 22:23 says that YHWH put the lying spirit in the mouths of the prophets.

10 Daniel I. Block pointed out Isa 45:7, and Jacques B. Doukhan noted the relevance of Deut 32:39 to this discussion (personal communication on March 8, 2019).
9:23). He takes his rebellion further, and in 1 Sam 28 he chooses his own tragic fate.\textsuperscript{11} The spirit he encounters was not sent by YHWH, but conjured at Saul’s own request. Therefore, YHWH does not intervene, leaving Saul to the consequences of his own actions: despair and death. This is a sobering reminder of the dangers of these occult practices, dangers that Deuteronomy mentions. Divination, consulting the dead, and the idolatrous religions of pagan nations are dangerous (Deut 18:9-12).\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, Israelites are warned to avoid the supernatural beings involved with them, or they will be lured away from YHWH.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, there are many interesting and pronounced features of exilic and post-exilic angelology. Some beings are named, further roles (i.e. vision-interpreter) are assigned, and the accuser/Satan’s role in the cosmos becomes clearer. However, the differences between exilic/post-exilic angelology and pre-exilic concepts of angels and sub-divine beings have been overstated. We find similarities such as the association of angels with the celestial bodies and heavenly animals (such as horses), cherubim in the presence of YHWH, a prince of the heavenly beings, the angel of YHWH, and evil spirits. Many of the post-exilic conceptions about the supernatural world, particularly their ideas about Satan and the fallen angels, have roots in the pre-exilic period.


\textsuperscript{12} Jonathan Seidel, “Necromantic Praxis in the Midrash on the Seance at En Dor,” 98.
It is likely that the concern regarding idolatry kept the earlier texts relatively quiet regarding a celestial conflict between good and evil.\textsuperscript{13} And yet, the acknowledgement of the danger of idolatry can also be taken as a confirmation of this conflict.\textsuperscript{14} All of the building blocks for this understanding have been assembled and have their basis in early biblical literature, so one does not need to search for foreign origins of these ideas.


\textsuperscript{14} Beale, \textit{We Become What We Worship}, 172, 308.
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