Rainer Kessler

The Unity of Malachi and Its Relation to the Book of the Twelve

1. An Outline of the History of Research

1.1 From Hitzig to the Zurich School

For a long time, biblical scholars read the book of Malachi as an entity unto itself. Ferdinand Hitzig published the 1st edition of his commentary on the Book of the Twelve in 1838. According to him, Malachi did not act publicly. He was the head of a school. His writing was no longer inspired by the powerful spirit of the older prophecy, but consisted of a monotonous and doctrinal teaching.[1] For Julius Wellhausen in the 1890s, the form of the discussion in Malachi "is of course only a literary device"[2]. The anti-Jewish paradigm of powerful vivid prophecy vs. doctrinal dry teaching was upheld up to the 20th century, but now Malachi is defended. For Karl Marti (1904), the book of Malachi does not give the impression of "a dry school teaching or merely rabbinical school discussion," but of vivid contact with friends and adversaries.[3] At the end of this line of interpretation, in 1976, we find Wilhelm Rudolph who contends that "without doubt" the oracles of Malachi are the record of real discussions.[4]

In 1993, the next German commentator, Henning Graf Reventlow, already argued against a newly emerging current in the interpretation of Malachi. According to him, the interpretation of the book as a mere product of a writer is not possible ("Die Deutung des Buches als rein schriftstellerisches Erzeugnis … ist nicht möglich"). In brackets he adds three names: Utzschneider and Bosshard/Kratz.[5] Two things had happened in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

First, Helmut Utzschneider had argued strongly for the written character of the prophecy of Malachi, claiming that this was a form of true prophecy and not just the degeneration of the older, vivid oral prophecy.[6] This new interest in the written character of Malachi's prophecy, however, went further than the early critics of the 19th century. The new phenomenon that came into the focus of the exegetes was intertextuality. Utzschneider, who restricted his study to Mal 1:6 – 2:9, discovered what he called "äußere Kontextualität (Intertextualität)"[7] with all parts of the canon, from Genesis to the Psalms and Nehemiah. In 1996, Donald Berry presented a table that runs over two pages in an article that bears the title "Allusions to

[1] Hitzig, *Propheten*, 414.
[2] Wellhausen, *Propheten*, 203-204 ("natürlich nur schriftstellerische Form").
[3] Marti, *Dodekapropheton*, 459 ("… macht doch keineswegs den Eindruck eines trockenen Schulvortrags oder blossen rabbinischen Schulstreits").
[4] Rudolph, *Maleachi*, 250 ("… es kann keinem Zweifel unterliegen, daß hier die Niederschrift von tatsächlichen Gesprächen vorliegt").
[5] Reventlow, *Propheten*, 131.
[6] Utzschneider, *Künder*.
[7] Utzschneider, *Künder*, 42.

Canonical Traditions in Malachi."[8] Finally, in 2000 Karl William Weyde dedicated a book of about 450 pages to "the Use of Traditions in the Book of Malachi."[9]

The second new trend that arose in the late 1980s was an interest in the formation of the Book of the Twelve as a unity.[10] Erich Bosshard and Reinhard Gregor Kratz – both rejected by Graf Reventlow together with Utzschneider – combine the new trends.[11] Their model was fully accepted later by their teacher Odil Hannes Steck.[12] For these exegetes, Malachi was written prophecy from the beginning. At the same time, it was written exclusively as a continuation of the prophecies of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah. It was mere *Fortschreibung*. Even the original layer, according to them, was never independent from Haggai and Proto-Zechariah. Its horizon, however, was wider; it included the emerging book of the Twelve and Deuteronomy. The second layer is a *Fortschreibung* of the original layer. It now refers to Zech 9-14 too. The third layer, finally, makes Malachi an independent book by inserting the superscription in Mal 1:1. At the same time, it connects Malachi with the canon of Torah and Prophets by adding the appendix in 3:22-24.

The Bosshard-Kratz-Steck model has often been criticised. Arndt Meinhold calls it "hypothesenfreudig"[13]. Indeed, many of the intertextual relations with Haggai and Zechariah the authors rely on are neither significant nor exclusive.[14] Besides this, Malachi has a very special form, the form of "disputation speech"[15]. This form is unique in the whole Hebrew Bible. It is difficult to believe that such a book should be nothing else than a literary continuation of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah, which are so different in literary character.

James Nogalski, in his 1991 Zurich dissertation written under the supervision of Odil Hannes Steck and published in two volumes in 1993, goes a step further. First, he formulates a consensus among these scholars: "… the similarities shared by the respective studies [i.e. Bosshard, Kratz, and Steck], together with Utzschneider, independently conclude that Malachi is a literary construction which manifests canonical awareness in its compositional process". He then notes similarities and differences between his own conclusions and those of Bosshard, Kratz, and Steck: "All of these studies, mine included, see Malachi as the redactional continuation of Zech 8:9ff. I differ with their conclusions in that I sense this redactional work already takes place in the Book of the Twelve, and not with the Haggai-Zechariah corpus alone"[16].

In contrast to the somehow apodictic declaration of Bosshard and Kratz that Malachi is a mere *Fortschreibung* of the Haggai-Zechariah-corpus, Nogalski discusses "three possible explanations" for the problem of "the incorporation of Malachi into the Book of the Twelve".

---

[8] Berry, "Dual Design," 270-272.
[9] Weyde, *Prophecy*.
[10] For the discussion until the end of the century see the review by Schart, "Redaktionsgeschichte".
[11] Bosshard and Kratz, "Maleachi".
[12] Steck, *Abschluß*.
[13] Meinhold, „Maleachi/Maleachibuch," 7.
[14] See the discussion in Lauber, "Maleachi".
[15] Hill, *Malachi*, 34.
[16] Nogalski, *Processes*, 211 n. 96.

"*First*, … [is] the placing of two completed works next to one another …". "A *second* possibility argues … that Malachi was composed for its position as the conclusion to the Book of the Twelve". This option "appears to be" "the most likely solution" for Nogalski. "The *third* option argues that the redactional shaping has been accomplished by adaptation of pre-existing material which skillfully integrated the perspective of a larger corpus with the book of which it was a part."[17] If I understand this last option right, it means that there existed already something like a book of Malachi that was integrated by redactional work into the larger corpus. The task then would be to identify this redactional work.

1.2 Jakob Wöhrle's Model

In the rest of my paper, I will argue for Nogalski's first explanation, namely that Malachi existed as "a completed work" and was added as such at the end of the Book of the Twelve. Before I do this, however, I will turn to the elaboration of Nogalski's third explanation given by Jakob Wöhrle. Wöhrle rightly states that one has to start with the analysis of the individual books of the collection of the Twelve. He then gives a long analysis of the book of Malachi, where he discovers an original layer ("*Grundschicht*") which was enlarged by a cult-critical redaction and a redaction which inserts the motif of the righteous and the wicked. These redactions nearly cover the whole text of the book of Malachi. The only exceptions are the superscription 1:1, two verses on Edom in 1:4-5, the so-called "grace layer" (*Gnadenschicht*) in 1:9a, and the appendix in 3:22-24. The most important of these few verses are the superscription and 1:4-5. According to Wöhrle, they are part of a redactional layer that covers and unites the whole Book of the Twelve, the "layer of the foreign nations II" (*Fremdvölkerschicht II*).[18]

Wöhrle contends that the book of Malachi was available to the redactors of the layer of the foreign nations II ("lag das Maleachibuch den Redaktoren der Fremdvölkerschicht II bereits vor"[19]). Compared with the works of the Zurich school, this is a very strong reduction. For Wöhrle, Malachi is not a *Fortschreibung*, be it of the Haggai-Zechariah-corpus (Bosshard, Kratz, and Steck) or of the emerging Book of the Twelve (Nogalski). Malachi is an independent book inserted by just three and a half verses of redactional origin.

2. The Unity and Intertextuality of Malachi

In my view, no redactional work was necessary to incorporate Malachi into the (emerging) Book of the Twelve. To demonstrate my position I will, in a first step, discuss whether the verses claimed by Wöhrle to be redactional can bear the weight that he lays on them. After denying that they can, I then will develop my own view, namely that Malachi indeed was an

[17] Nogalski, *Processes*, 210f.
[18] Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 255-263.
[19] Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 275.

independent book and that it was not necessary to do redactional work within the book to add it to the Twelve.

2.1 Mal 1:2-5 – Unity and Intertextual Relations

Wöhrle gives several arguments for his opinion that Mal 1:4-5 are a secondary addition to 1:2-3. First, he argues that v. 4-5 leave the "basic theme" which, as another commentator has it, "is not the judgement of Edom but God's covenant love for Israel"[20]. Besides, the verses do not speak of Edom's present fate, but of its future. Second, Mal 1:4-5 are the only verses in the Book of Malachi that show hostility against foreign nations. Third, v. 4-5 no longer speak of Esau and Jacob but of Edom and Israel. In v. 4a, they even shift from the third person masculine to the third person feminine. Fourth, Wöhrle mentions that 1:4 is the only verse in the book that has the so called messenger formula (*koh 'amar yhwh*).[21]

Concerning the last argument, Wöhrle himself admits that also the formula "says the Lord" (*n^{e}'um yhwh*) in v. 2 is unique in the whole book.[22] So why should the singular messenger formula *koh 'amar yhwh* be secondary while the likewise singular *n^{e}'um yhwh* is original? Besides, the *koh 'amar yhwh s□^{e}ba'ôt* in v. 4 is easy to explain. It is part of a longer sentence which begins in v. 4aα with "if Edom says" and continues in v. 4aβ with "then says Yhwh of hosts". The normal introduction formula for divine speech in Malachi is a form of "says Yhwh". Twenty times Malachi uses "says Yhwh of hosts" (*'amar yhwh s□^{e}ba'ôt*) (1:6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14; 2:1, 4, 8, 16; 3:1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 21), three times he uses "says Yhwh"(*'amar yhwh*) (1:2, 13; 3:13), and once we find "says Yhwh, the God of Israel" (2:16). As the first part of the sentence in 1:4 is a conditional clause ("if …") its most natural continuation is introduced by "then …", followed by Malachi's usual "says Yhwh of hosts" (*'amar yhwh s□^{e}ba'ôt*).

Wöhrle's other observations are correct and helpful for understanding the text, but they cannot prove that v. 4-5 are a secondary addition to v. 2-3. There is a shift from the present to the future from v. 2-3 to v. 4-5. There also is a shift from the words "Esau" and "Jacob" in v. 2-3 to "Edom" and "Israel" in v. 4-5. The basic theme of YHWH's love to Jacob is contrasted with a threat against Edom, indeed. But does all this prove that v. 4-5 are secondary? They form a new element after the prophet's refutation in v. 2b.3. I think Arndt Meinhold is right when he finds four elements in the disputation speeches of the Book of Malachi: the prophetic declaration or opening statement (1:2aα) – the hypothetical audience rebuttal or objection (1:2aβ) – the prophet's refutation or explanation (1:2b.3).[23] As a fourth part of the disputation speech Meinhold identifies what he calls "consequences"[24]. This fourth part can be found in

---

[20] Verhoef, *Books*, 195.
[21] Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 219-222.
[22] Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 221 n. 11.
[23] Terminology according to Hill, *Malachi*, 26.
[24] Meinhold, *Maleachi*, XII ("Folgerungen").

all of the six disputation speeches. Why should it be missing in the first one? It is not missing, indeed, but is to be found in v. 4-5 as an integral part of the speech.

However, it is not enough to reject Wöhrle's interpretation. One should be able to give an alternative explanation. Let me start with the general consensus of most of the authors in the last twenty years that Malachi is aware of numerous traditions and even written texts. I am convinced that he knows most parts of the Torah and a great number of prophetic texts in written form. I would like to demonstrate this on our text, Mal 1:2-5.

The author of the Book of Malachi – I just call him Malachi – knows the tradition of the brothers Esau and Jacob. From the short text of Mal 1:2-5 we cannot say that he must know the text of Gen 25-36 because the story of the two brothers certainly was well known in post-exilic Israel so that Malachi could just know it from oral tradition. However, other parts of Malachi demonstrate that the prophet knows pentateuchal texts (see below). So it is probable that he also knew the text of Gen 25-36. Be it from the oral tradition, be it from the text of Genesis, Malachi knew that the two brothers were the ancestors of Israel and Edom. He knew that Jacob was preferred to Esau. But he also must have known that the story ends in the reconciliation of the brothers. When their father died the brothers came to bury him, and Esau the first-born is even mentioned first: "and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him" (Gen 35:29). For Malachi, however, God loves Jacob and hates Esau, as if he knew nothing of their reconciliation. What happened?

Besides the fundamental story of Genesis, Malachi also knew prophetic announcements of the future destruction of Edom, as I will demonstrate below. How did Malachi proceed from the story of Genesis to these texts of hatred? I think he just continued to read the Pentateuch. The next occasion when Israel meets Edom is during the wandering in the wilderness. The story is told in Num 20:14-21. It begins with these words: "Moses sent messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom, 'Thus says your brother Israel …'" (v. 14). Though the story only uses the names of the peoples of Edom and Israel, by characterising Israel as "your brother" the story gives a hint at the Jacob-Esau-tradition. As we know, Edom refused Israel to give passage through their territory. Three times the text of Num 20:14-21 uses the word *g^{e}bûl* for "territory". It is the same word that Malachi uses for the territories of Edom and Israel in 1:4-5.[25]

For the reader of the Pentateuch the reconciliation between the brothers Esau and Jacob is not the end of the story. Edom's hostile attitude towards Israel during the wandering in the wilderness is the bridge to the great number of texts of hatred against Edom to be found in the prophetic literature. Of course these texts are not just the result of a reading of the Pentateuch, but have their roots in the attitude of Edomites after the destruction of Jerusalem in the Neo-Babylonian epoch. Because of these bad experiences, Judahite prophets threatened Edom with destruction. But once you read these texts in the context of the emerging canon, you must find a bridge between the story of the brothers and the actual political tensions.

[25] Cp. Kessler, "Jakob und Esau."

Malachi seems to know most or all of these prophetical texts. There is a long list of semantic allusions. They include the motif of the brothers (Am 1:11; Ob 10, 12), the verbal form *'aśîm* "I have made" together with the words "ruins" and "desolation" in the context of Edom (Ez 35:4), the root *šmm* for "desolation" (Jer 49:13, 17; Ez 32:29; 35,3-4, 7, 9, 14-15), the mention of jackals in the devastated territory of Edom (Is 34:14), the use of a feminine verbal form with the noun Edom (Jer 49:17; Ez 32:29), the root *h□rb* for "ruins" (Jer 49:13; Ez 25:13; 35:4), and the word *g^{e}bûl* for "territory" (Ob 7). Of course, not all of these allusions are exclusive nor are they significant when seen in isolation. The cluster they form, however, shows that Malachi must have known at least some of these texts.[26] The closest and densest allusions are with texts from Jeremiah and Ezekiel – and not with any prophet from the Book of the Twelve.

Further, I consider it highly probable that Malachi knew the text of Ez 36:33-36. In this text Yahweh announces that in the future the ruins of Judah shall be rebuilt. The land that was desolate shall be tilled, and the waste and ruined and desolate towns shall be inhabited. We have the same semantic field as in Mal 1:4-5 with the roots *šmm* for "desolation", *h□rb* for "ruins", and *hrs* for "to tear down". Both texts begin with *koh 'amar jhwh*, both have a reaction of Israel ("you will say", Mal 1:5, resp. "they will say", Ez 36:35). Malachi's text is a counter-text to Ez 36. What Yahweh promises to Israel ("the ruins shall be rebuilt") is denied to Edom ("if Edom says … we will rebuild the ruins etc.").

For the discussion of both positions, those of Nogalski and of Wöhrle, it is crucial to recognize that Malachi's allusions are not exclusive to texts of prophets from the Book of the Twelve. To the contrary, the allusions to other prophetical texts from Jeremiah and Ezekiel are much closer. So I think there is no reason to believe that Malachi was formulated with (only) the other books of the Twelve in mind. Nor is there any proof that Mal 1:4-5 which Wöhrle holds to be secondary in Mal 1 form a redactional layer that runs through the Book of the Twelve. The only semantic parallel that Wöhrle mentions is the word *g^{e}bûl* for "territory" in Ob 7. One could add the motif of Esau as "brother". In a summary, Wöhrle gives four characteristics of his layer of the foreign nations II.[27] Three of them are not present in Mal 1:4-5: the enslavement of Jews by foreign nations, the expectation of an invasion of the neighbouring territories, and the promise of a transformation of nature in favour of better agricultural conditions. Only one of the characteristics in my eyes is discussible: the announcement of judgement against the nations. But even this characteristic is not quite clear because in Mal 1:2-5 judgement is not announced to but has already come over Edom. Yahweh says: "I have made his hill country a desolation and his heritage a desert for jackals" (v. 3). This is not an announcement but an appraisal. The only threat is directed against plans for future reconstruction.

---

[26] According to Meinhold, *Maleachi*, 49 the author of the Book of Malachi knows Jer 49:7-22; Ez 35; and Obadiah.

[27] Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 273.

In my eyes, the example of Malachi's first disputation speech (1:2-5) demonstrates that the author of the book knows and uses traditions and even texts from the Torah and from prophetic books. At the same time, he presupposes that his readers know these traditions and texts. In the next two sections I am going to show how the prophet also in his other speeches makes use of traditions and texts from all parts of the Torah and the Prophets.

2.2 Mal 1:6 – 2:9 and the Torah

We have already found the Esau-Edom-tradition of Genesis and Numbers in Malachi's first speech. We will find the idea of a messenger sent by Yahweh which comes from the book of Exodus in the next section of this paper. I now turn to the observation that the discussion about offerings in Mal 1:6-14 has close and sometimes literal parallels with Lev 21-22. So both texts end with a paragraph about lay people after having dealt with the priests' duties (Mal 1:14 and Lev 22:17-25). Both texts speak of a "vow" (Mal 1:14 and Lev 22:18, 21, 23), both expressly mention the „male" offering (Mal 1:14 and Lev 22:19), both use the rare form *måšh□at* ("blemished") that only appears in Lev 22:25, Mal 1:14, and Prov 25:26.

However, Malachi also must know the text of Deuteronomy. For Deut 15:21 forbids the offering of lame and blind animals what according to Mal 1:8 the priests are doing. Deut 15:21 calls these defects *ra'*, something "evil", whilst the priests of Mal 1:8 who offer these animals just say "no evil" (*'ên ra'*).

From Deuteronomy I turn to Numbers. It is very likely that the text of Mal 1:6 – 2:9 is written with the Priestly Blessing of Num 6:23-27 in mind. The key word "to bless" appears in both texts (Num 6:23, 24, 27 and Mal 2:2). The role of YHWH's name is central in both (Num 6:27 and Mal 1:6, 11, 14; 2:2). The Priestly Blessing says: "YHWH make his face to shine upon you, and be gracious to you", Mal 1:9 echoes this text: "And now appease God's face that he may be gracious to us." Finally, the wish for *shalôm* should be noted as important for both texts.[28]

The final section of Malachi's first disputation speech confronts the behaviour of the actual priests with that of their ancestor Levi. YHWH reminds them of "my covenant with Levi" (2:4). The words about this "covenant" have their closest parallels in Num 25:10-13 and in Dt 33:8-11. Num 25:10-13 mentions a "covenant of perpetual priesthood" with "Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest" (v. 10 and 13). The texts of Malachi and Numbers have some ideas and semantic expressions in common. Phinehas "turned back [YHWH's] wrath" (Num 25:11), Levi "turned many from iniquity" (Mal 2:6). According to Num 25:12, YHWH "grants" Phinehas "my covenant of peace", according to Mal 2:5 YHWH "granted" Levi a "covenant of life and peace". In both texts, the covenant "exists" expressed by the Hebrew verb *hjh* ("to be") (Num 25:13 and Mal 2:5). All theses traits point into the direction of an intertextual relation between the two texts.[29]

---

[28] Cp. Fishbane, „Form," 118-120; idem, *Interpretation*, 332-334.
[29] Cp. Utzschneider, Künder, 64-70.

One central difference remains: Num 25 does not mention Levi but goes back only to Aaron. It is Malachi's special interest to stress that the actual priests of his time, the Zadokites, were not only descendants of Aaron, but of Levi too. In 3:3 he expressly calls them "descendants of Levi". To demonstrate that also the Zadokite priests are "sons of Levi", Malachi combines in 2:4-8 the idea of YHWH's "covenant of perpetual priesthood" with "Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest" with the Blessing of Levi in Dt 33:8-11. In Dt 33:10 as well as in Mal 2:7, Levi's central task is to teach Israel the torah. Both texts mention YHWH's "covenant" (Dt 33:9). It is true that in Dt 33:9 it is YHWH's covenant with Israel, whereas in Mal 2:4-8 it is God's covenant with Levi. However, "one would underestimate the midrashic way in which the Book of Malachi deals with the pentateuchal traditions if one would expect only verbal quotations".[30] When YHWH has a covenant with the priests, and when the priests are teachers of the torah as Levi was, it is only consequent that YHWH should have a covenant with Levi. So we can conclude that Mal 2:4-9 indeed "utilizes two pentateuchal passages in developing the idea of a covenant with Levi"[31], namely Num 25:10-13 and Dtn 33:8-11.

I do not have the space to go through the whole Book of Malachi. The result would be the same: Malachi is aware not only of a great number of traditions from the Pentateuch, he also knows texts from all layers of the pentateuchal traditions.

The same is true for prophetic texts.

2.3 Mal 2:17 – 3:5 and the Prophets

Malachi knew other writings from the emerging Book of the Twelve. A look at the fourth discussion in Mal 2:17 – 3:5 will demonstrate this. The opposition of "evil" and "good" and the quest for "justice" in 2:17 have their closest parallel in Am 5:14-15 and Mic 3:1-2. The question concerning the day of the messenger's coming: "and who can stand when he appears?" (3:2) echoes Joel 2:11 ("the day of Yahweh is great – who can stand it?") and Nah 1:6 ("Who can stand before his indignation?"). The combination of the coming of the Lord (*ha'adôn*) with his "temple" (*hêkal*) and the idea of Yahweh being a witness (*'ed*) (Mal 3:1, 5) is also found in Mic 1:2. All this demonstrates that Malachi indeed knew a collection of prophetic books that later became the Book of the Twelve.

However, the allusions to Joel and Amos, Micah and Nahum are not exclusive. The root *jg'* (hif) "to weary Yahweh" in the Hebrew Bible only appears in Mal 2:17 and Is 43:24. The same is true for the idea of clearing the way before Yahweh which is found in Mal 3:1 and Is 40:3. So we can be sure that Malachi knew Deutero-Isaiah. The phrase "See, I am sending my messenger" (Mal 3:1) seems to be inspired by Exod 23:20 and 33:2 ("I will send a messenger before you"). In 3:2-3, Malachi uses the image of a refiner's fire and a fuller's soap; the refiner will purify the sons of Levi and refine them like gold and silver. The closest parallels

[30] Frevel, "Bund", 90 („Man unterschätzt den midraschartigen Umgang des Maleachibuches mit den Pentateuchtraditionen, wenn man sich auf wörtliche Zitate versteift").
[31] Fuller, "Blessing," 37-40.

in concept and vocabulary are found in Is 1:22, 25, Jer 6:27-30, and Zech 13:9: the "fire" (Jer 6:29; Zech 13:9), to refine (*s□rf*) (Is 1:25; Jer 6:29; Zech 13:9), the "soap" or "lye" (Is 1:25), and the "silver" (Is 1:22; Jer 6:30; Zech 13:9). There is a vivid discussion of the question whether Malachi knew Zech 13:9 – as Bosshard and Kratz claim [32] – or whether Zech 13:9 is dependent on Mal 2:17 – 3:5 – which is Judith Gärtner's option.[33] Whom ever we follow, the connection between Mal 2:17 – 3:5 and Zech 13:9 is not exclusive.

In sum, Malachi must know a form of the Pentateuch that is very close to the one we have in the final form. Besides, Malachi knew texts from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, as we have seen in the first (1:2-5) and fourth discussion (2:17 – 3:5). He also knew texts from the emerging Book of the Twelve. To all the examples I have already given and that one will find in the works of Bosshard and Kratz, of Nogalski, Wöhrle and others, I would like to add Mal 3:7 which is nearly identical with Zech 1:3 ("Return to me, and I will return to you, says YHWH of hosts"). But the allusions to writings from the Book of the Twelve are not exclusive.

3. Consequences

The first conclusion I draw from the observation of this rich intertextuality of the Book of Malachi concerns the date of the book. I think we should go to the late Persian period, and not to its beginning. The later we go, the more probable it is that an author may know so many texts. Already more than a hundred years ago, C.C. Torrey made observations „that … point distinctly to a late rather than an early date"[34].

Second, Malachi's intertextuality is not restricted to the Haggai-Zechariah-corpus or the Book of the Twelve. It covers the Torah and the prophetic corpus nearly in their final form. Consequently, I cannot see that Malachi was written as a continuation of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah or as a continuation of the emerging Book of the Twelve. Neither can I see that any redactional work was necessary to include Malachi into the Book of the Twelve. The few verses Wöhrle mentions cannot bear the weight they are asked to bear.

In my eyes, Malachi was written as an independent book. Malachi has a message for his time, the message of God's everlasting love towards Israel, of serious problems with priests and lay-people, the necessity of purification, judgement, and conversion, and of the final elimination of the wicked. He brings his message inventively into the form of a continuing discussion. He formulates his message in the light of the pentateuchal and prophetic texts he has at hand. At the same time, he reckons with the knowledge of these texts by his readers. In a review article on the literature of the Persian period, Thomas Willi notes that Chronicles may be seen as a form of re-shaping and re-interpretation of the older traditions. Chronicles

[32] Bosshard and Kratz, "Maleachi," 41.
[33] Gärtner, *Jesaja 66*, 280-283.
[34] Torrey, "Prophecy," 13.

has its own message, but formulates it in the light of tradition.[35] The same is true with Malachi.

As in my view Malachi was written as an independent book and then added to the Twelve, an analysis of Malachi can give no answer to the question whether Malachi was added to Proto-Zechariah[36] or the whole Book of Zechariah including ch. 9-14.[37] This question can only be answered by a thorough analysis of the Book of Zechariah itself which I cannot deliver here.

A third consequence of my position concerns the superscription of Mal 1:1. Superscriptions are always secondary because they are not part of the corpus of the writing itself. In the words of James Nogalski: "Mal 1:1 presents a simple title affixed to the head of the writing"[38]. However, this does not necessarily mean that the superscription is redactional. The author himself could have affixed it to his writing. I think we are not able to decide the question. As with all superscriptions to prophetic books, the name therein is meant to be a proper personal name. As in other prophetic writings, we have allusions to the prophet's name within the text of the book. One should compare the use of the root *jš'* in the Book of Isaiah (it appears 52 times in the book against 23 appearances in the rest of the later prophets), the use of the root *h□zq* in the Book of Ezekiel (22 times in the book), or the *mi-'el kamôka* as an allusion to the prophet's name in Mic 7:18. So Malachi uses *mal'ak* three times for figures who function as mediators between God and Israel: the prophet himself in 1:1, the priest in 2:7, and God's "messenger of the covenant" in 3:1. The superscription of Mal 1:1 fits perfectly with the text. Malachi speaks only to Israel, never to foreign peoples. It is a text where the word of Yahweh is indeed "in the hand of Malachi," who throughout the whole book continuously gives Yahweh the floor ("says YHWH of hosts" and some other formulae). So it is possible that already the author of the book added the superscription. It also may have been affixed by someone else before Malachi was added to the Twelve. We even cannot exclude that it was affixed only when the book was added to the Twelve. This however is the least probable interpretation.

Fourth, Malachi was added to the Twelve and to the whole prophetic corpus by adding 3:23-24 to the book (verses according to the Hebrew text). These verses are an interpretation of open questions in Malachi. Who is the messenger? What is meant by the day that comes? They necessarily are an addition to Malachi and could not have been added to any other writing of the Twelve. At the same time, they connect Malachi with the prophetic tradition from the earlier times by introducing Elijah. From this line of reasoning, it is clear that Malachi was added at the end of the emerging Book of the Twelve. This does not exclude the

[35] Willi, "Weltkönigtum."
[36] Nogalski, *Processes*, 277; Redditt, "Zechariah 9-14."
[37] Schart, *Entstehung*, 297-299; Wöhrle, *Abschluss*, 275.
[38] Nogalski, *Processes*, 188.

possibility that other texts were inserted later into the Book of the Twelve, e.g., Zech 9-14. But whatever was inserted later could not have been inserted after Mal 3:24.[39]

In a second step, Mal 3:22 was added before 3:23-24. As has often been seen, this verse, which mentions the Torah of Moses, connects Malachi with the beginning of the Book of Joshua and the end of the Pentateuch. It is the final step of the incorporation of the originally independent Book of Malachi into the emerging canon of Torah and Prophets.

List of references

Berry, D.K. "Malachi's Dual Design: The Close of the Canon and What Comes Afterward" Pp. 269-302 in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by J.W. Watts and P.R. House. JSOTSup 235. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Bosshard, E. and Kratz, R.G. "Maleachi im Zwölfprophetenbuch." *BN* 52 (1990) 27-46.

Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1985.

– "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing." *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115-121.

Frevel, Ch. "'Mein Bund mit ihm war das Leben und der Friede'. Priesterbund und Mischehenfrage," Pp. 85-93 in *Für immer verbündet. Studien zur Bundestheologie der Bibel*. Edited by Ch. Dohmen and Ch. Frevel. SBS 211, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2007.

Fuller, R. "The Blessing of Levi in Dtn 33, Mal 2, and Qumran," Pp. 31-44 in: *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte*. Edited by R. Bartelmus et al. FS K. Baltzer. OBO 126. Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Gärtner, J. *Jesaja 66 und Sacharja 14 als Summe der Prophetie. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Abschluss des Jesaja- und des Zwölfprophetenbuches*. WMANT 114. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006.

Hill, A.E. *Malachi. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25D, New York et al.: Doubleday, 1998.

Hitzig, F. *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*. KEH. Leipzig: F. Hirzel, ^{4}1881.

Kessler, R. "Jakob und Esau als Brüderpaar in Mal 1,2-5." Pp. 209-229 in: *Diasynchron. Beiträge zur Exegese, Theologie und Rezeption der Hebräischen Bibel*. Edited by Th.

[39] One exception is the Qumran manuscript 4QXIIa (DJD XV, 221-232), where Malachi is followed by Jonah. The exceptional order in this manuscript – one of the two oldest manuscripts we have – warns against too far-reaching speculations about the meaning of the order of the writings within the Book of the Twelve.

Naumann and R. Hunziker-Rodewald. FS W. Dietrich. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2009.

Lauber, St. „Das Buch Maleachi als literarische Fortschreibung von Sacharja?“ *Bib.* 88 (2007) 214-221.

Marti, K. *Das Dodekapropheton*. KHC XIII. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904.

Meinhold, A. *Maleachi*. BK XIV/8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006.

– “Maleachi/Maleachibuch.” *TRE* 22 (1992) 6-11.

Nogalski, J. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. BZAW 218. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.

Redditt, P.L. “Zechariah 9-14, Malachi, and the Redaction of the Book of the Twelve,” Pp. 245-268 in: *Forming Prophetic Literature. Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by J.W. Watts and P.R. House. JSOTSup 235. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Reventlow, H. Graf. *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*. ATD 25,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Rudolph, W. *Haggai – Sacharja 1-8 – Sacharja 9-14 – Maleachi*. KAT XIII/4. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976.

Schart, A. Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs. BZAW 260. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.

– „Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Zwölfprophetenbuches.“ *VF* 43 (1998) 13-33.

Steck, O.H. *Der Abschluß der Prophetie im Alten Testament. Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons*. BThSt 17. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.

Torrey, C.C. “The Prophecy of ‘Malachi’.” *JBL* 17 (1898) 1-15.

Utzschneider, H. *Künder oder Schreiber? Eine These zum Problem der “Schriftprophetie” auf Grund von Maleachi 1,6-2,9*. BEATAJ 19. Frankfurt am Main et al.: Verlag Peter Lang, 1989.

Verhoef, P.A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.

Wellhausen, J. *Die kleinen Propheten*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., ^{4}1963.

Weyde, K.W. *Prophecy and Teaching: Prophetic Authority, Form Problems, and the Use of Traditions in the Book of Malachi*. BZAW 288. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.

Willi, Th. “Das Weltkönigtum – seine Residenz und seine Regeln. Ein kritischer Blick auf die Diskussion zur biblischen Literatur der persischen Epoche.“ *ThLZ* 135 (2010) 1055-1070.

Wöhrle, J. *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuches. Buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen*. BZAW 389. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter 2008.