in the temple,[29] even where it was not used in previous iterations of the same narratives (cf. Hundley 2009, 537–40). As with the ark and the *kābôd*, the renegotiation between the community's past and the needs of its present was not a matter of a sharp and sudden severance, but of a gentle nuancing or reorienting.

The framework of divine agency formulated in this book is employed in one form or another from the beginning to end of the Hebrew Bible and beyond, undermining the primary contention of "Name Theology," namely that D and Dtr employed the concept of the name's installation in the temple precisely to deny the deity's presence therein. Rather, these authors maintained the presencing function of the temple while insulating the deity's "self" from the risks associated with traditional hosts for the vehicles of divine identity. The identification of the *šēm* as the salient locus of divine agency also likely served these authors' structuring of power and of authoritative knowledge, isolating the temple as the only appropriate host for this primarily textual vehicle of divine agency over which they had unique purview. That is, until the interpolation of the messenger.

Names were conceptualized as powerful agents in ancient Southwest Asia, and Iron Age Israel and Judah were active participants in the sociomaterial conventions associated with that conceptualization. Scholars sometimes appeal to the notion that inscriptions on stelai or other monuments served solely memorializing, commemoratory, or authoritative functions, but in a sociomaterial ecology where memory could perpetuate the afterlife of the deceased (for example, through invocation), and reify the presence of human or divine agency (for example, through ventriloquization), we cannot draw such firmly prescriptive lines. The sociomaterial functions of names in glyptic and literary texts were much more complex than is generally allowed by the traditional retrojection of twenty-first century CE reflective rationalizations. The significance of those functions to the changing means of presencing deity as well as to the development and authority of the biblical corpora will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

CONCLUSION

The messenger of YHWH began with the appropriation of a figure from a lower tier of the conventional divine hierarchy for purposes of rhetorical prophylaxis. This was likely initiated by redactors who sought to obscure the deity's direct physical interactions with humanity, but it ultimately overlapped conceptually with expectations regarding divine agency and its communicability, giving rise to a new and dynamic literary framework for divine presencing. This was a textual solution to a textual problem that laid the conceptual groundwork for the elaboration of a new rhetorically flexible divine agent: the messenger of YHWH. I have

---

[29] See Deut 12:7, 12, 18; 14:23, 26; 15:20; 16:11, 16; 18:7; 26:5, 10, 13.