Reinhard Achenbach

Theocratic Reworking in the Pentateuch

Proto-Chronistic Features in the Late Priestly Layers of Numbers and Their Reception in Chronicles

יהוה ימלך לעולם ועד Exodus 15:18

1 Introduction

The idea of Yhwh's kingship roots in preexilic mythical concepts of the weather-god, Yhwh, as a divine warrior (Ps 24:7–10) who is proclaimed as king (Ps 93:1–5; 97:1–7), paid homage by the gods (Ps 29:1–10; 97:7), and acclaimed by the whole cosmos (Ps 98:4–9). He erected his throne above the flood (Ps 29:10). He receives the king and the congregation in an audience at his temple. He protects and nourishes gods, humankind, and the creation (Ps 36:7–10; 104:1–4, 10–11, 27–28, 30–33).¹ In the royal cult, the king's position and role were legitimated and confirmed by Yhwh, the divine king. The royal accession to the throne mirrors a divine accession, probably in a regular festival at new year (cf. Ps 97:1–7; 98:4–9).² In the postexilic period, when the Judean monarchy was not reinstated, the congregation of Zion worshipped Yhwh in the Second Temple as the divine and universal king, the only God and ruler of the nations (Ps 47:9–11; 48:10–12; 98:1–3). Regarding these verses, therefore, Reinhard Müller has applied the term “theocratic reworkings.”³

Flavius Josephus, in his writing *Contra Apionem* II, 164–165, introduced the term *theocracy*:

---

1 Reinhard Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott. Studien zur althebräischen Kultlyrik anhand ausgewählter Psalmen*, BZAW 387 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 244.

2 Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott*, 178–180, continuing from Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship I–II* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), I, 122; John Day, *Psalms*, OTG (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 67–85. See also Corinna Körting, *Der Schall des Schofar. Israels Feste im Herbst*, BZAW 285 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999).

3 Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott*, 169–172, 191–192. The weather-god has become the ruler of the whole world, the “Weltenherrscher” (227–234).

Reinhard Achenbach, Münster

Some peoples have entrusted the supreme political power (*exousia*) to monarchies (*monarchia*), others to oligarchies (*oligôn dynasteia*), yet others to the masses. Our lawgiver (*nomothetes*), however, was attracted by none of these forms of polity, but gave to his constitution (*politeuma*) the form of what – if a forced expression be permitted – may be termed a “theocracy” (*theokratia*), placing all sovereignty (*arche*) and authority (*kratos*) in the hands of God.⁴

Josephus stressed the advantage of a hierocratic system that was independent of any other political superiority; cf. *Contra Apionem II*, 184–187:

For us, with our conviction that the original institution of the Law was in accordance with the will of God, it would be rank impiety not to observe it. What could one alter in it? [...] Could there be a finer or more equitable polity than one which sets God at the head of the universe (*hegemôn tôn holôn*), which assigns the administration of its highest affairs to the whole body of priests, and entrusts to the supreme high-priest (*archhieros*) the direction of the other priests? These men, moreover, woeed their original promotion by the legislator to their high office, not to any superiority in wealth or other accidental advantages. No; of all his companions, the men to whom he entrusted the ordering of divine worship as their first charge were those who were pre-eminently gifted with persuasive eloquence and discretion. But this charge further embraced a strict superintendence of the Law and oft he pursuits of everyday life; for the appointed duties of the priests included general supervision, the trial of cases of litigation, and the punishment of condemned persons.⁵

Josephus suggests that the order described in the *torah* of the Pentateuch had been established in Jewish institutions as part of a social and political constitutional reality. However, these primary texts to which Josephus refers present the results of an iterative conceptual development, symbolically represented by

⁴ Henry S. J. Thackeray, trans., *Josephus. I The Life – Against Apion*, LCL (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press – London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1926 [repr. 1961]), 359.

⁵ Cf. Thackeray, trans., *Josephus*, 369. The hierocratic features are also described by Hecataeus (Diod. Sic. XL). For problems related to the term *theocracy* cf. Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*, BZAR 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 130–140, “Überlegungen zu den Ursprüngen der jüdischen Theokratie”; Hubert Cancik, “Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft. Die mosaische Verfassung bei Flavius Josephus, contra Apionem 2,157–198,” in Hubert Cancik and Hildegard Cancik-Lindemeyer, *Religionsgeschichten. Römer, Juden und Christen im römischen Reich. Gesammelte Aufsätze II*, 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 72; Bernhard Lang, “Theokratie: Geschichte und Bedeutung eines Begriffs in Soziologie und Ethnologie,” *Taubes* (1987), 12; Jan Assmann, *Herrschaft und Heil: Politische Theorie in Altägypten, Israel und Europa* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000), 28; Jan Assmann, *Ägypten. Eine Sinngeschichte*, München: Carl Hanser, 1996, 332–334; Reinhard Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld*, WMANT 63 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987), 284; Markus Saur, *Die Königspsalmen. Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie*, BZAW 340 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), 275–77.

Israel in the desert. Thus, they arose more in a virtual than in a political reality. Such development can be traced in a diachronic analysis of the Pentateuch when comparison with other biblical texts.

2 Divine Kingship in the Postexilic Composition of the Hexateuch

In the postexilic period after the transfer of the Babylonian Province of Yehud to Persian jurisdiction, the Achaemenids did not allow the restoration of the kingdoms of Israel or Judah. Under the first administrator (*pəḥah* פַּחָה), named Sheshbazzar, some of the exiled Judeans probably returned from Babylon (Ezra 1:5–8; 5:14). Another group seems to have returned together with a Jewish *pəḥah* Zerubbabel at the time of Darius I (Ezra 2:2; Neh 7:7). According to Haggai 1:1 Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel, as governor of Yehud, and Joshua ben Jehozadak, as high priest, initiated the building of the Second Temple (Hag 1:7–15; 2:4). In later rewritings, Zerubbabel was described as Yhwh's *signet* (חֹתֶם), as *chosen*, and as *servant* of God (Hag 2:23), and thus connoted with royal Davidic symbols, in a messianic perspective (Hag 2:20–23; Zech 4:6–14; 6:9–14).⁶

Samaria and Yehud each remained governmental districts (*medinah*) under Persian jurisdiction. The rebuilding of the Yhwh temple in Jerusalem was permitted only at the end of the 6th century BCE. Recent archaeological work has documented the later edification of a sanctuary for Yhwh on Mount Garizim in the middle of the 5th century BCE. As everywhere else, the Persians did not interfere in local religious issues or even local jurisprudence. Leading families cooperating with the authorities made sure that taxes were collected, a modest, rather poor local economy could develop, and young men were regularly mustered to serve in the Persian army.⁷

⁶ Ralf Rothenbusch, "Serubbabel im Haggai- und im Protosacharja-Buch. Konzepte der Gemein-deleitung im frühnachexilischen Juda," in *Literatur- und sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zu alttestamentlichen Texten. Symposium in Hólar i Hjaltadal, 16.–19. Mai 2005*, FS W. Richter, ed. Sigurður Ö. Steingrímsson et al., ATSAT 83 (St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 2007), 219–64; Reinhard G. Kratz, "Serubbabel und Joschua," in Reinhard G. Kratz, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels. Kleine Schriften 1*, FAT 42 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 79–92.

⁷ Material culture and archaeological evidence show that the positive picture of the economic and social situation of Jerusalem and its temple as reported in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah is not very realistic; cf. Oded Lipschits, "Materialkultur, Verwaltung und Wirtschaft in Juda während der Perserzeit und die Rolle des Jerusalemer Tempels," in *Persische Reichspolitik und*

The community that generated collection oracles collected in Isaiah 40–55 (“Deutero-Isaiah”) believed that Yhwh had chosen the Achaemenid King in order to rebuild Jerusalem (Isa 44:24–45:8). Yet, the traditional function of the Davidic Kings as “servants of Yhwh” (*‘Ebed Yhwh*) was transferred to a representative of the people of Jacob-Israel. They believed that this representative could assume responsibility to claim the fundamental right for Jews to settle in their original realms and to establish a religiously independent ethnic unit (Isa 42:1–8). When this representative failed, the title of *‘Ebed Yhwh* (עֶבֶד יְהוָה) was transferred to the community itself (Isa 44:1–5; 52:13–53:12). Their members reestablished themselves as a community of Zion, considering themselves witnesses to the kingdom of Yhwh, the only God (Isa 44:6–8; 54).

If the Deuteronomists who wrote the history of Samuel and Kings had hoped, based on the oracle of Nathan (2 Sam 7:16), for the reinstitution of Davidic kings after Jehoiachin’s release (2 Kgs 25:27–30), their hope remained unfulfilled. In a further concept of the Deuteronomists the scribes propagated the legend that God had already revealed the Decalogue and the Deuteronomic Law on Mount Horeb, and thus described the condition of a broken and renewed Covenant (Horeb-Covenant Legend: Deut 5; 9–10) as a precursor to the settlement and life of all Israelites in the former promised land (Moab-Covenant Legend: Deut 1–3; 28:69*; 31*, 34). As a text written for the late exilic and postexilic generations, the Deuteronomistic Covenant Theology formed one of the persisting foundations for the restitution of Jewish religious life and society in the early postexilic period. According to Deuteronomy 12*, the rebuilt sanctuary in Jerusalem was believed to be the place that Yhwh had chosen to let his name dwell (Deut 12:10–11; cf. Josh 1; 13; 21:44; 1 Kgs 5:5; 8:20).⁸

---

lokale Heiligtümer. Beiträge einer Tagung des Exzellenzclusters “Religion und Politik in den Kulturen der Vormoderne und Moderne“ vom 24.–26. Februar 2016 in Münster, BZAR 25, ed. Reinhard Achenbach (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2019), 185–208.

8 A literary-critical differentiation must be observed between *Urdeuteronomium* (preexilic, not in the style of a sermon of Moses), late-exilic deuteronomistic frames that introduce the fiction of a Mosaic parenesis (Horeb-Covenant Deut 5:9–10, Moab-Covenant Deut 1–3*, 31*, 34*), late-dtr “historical commandments” (Deut 6–8; 11*) and a post-dtr introduction into the composition of Gen–Josh* (Hexateuch-Redaction: Deut 31:9–13), a late postexilic priestly Pentateuch-Redaction (Deut 31:14–15, 23; 32:48–52; 34:10–12) and later additions (Deut 32:33); cf. Eckard Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, FAT 20 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Eckard Otto, *Deuteronomium*, HThKAT, 4 vols. (Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2012–2017). One of the painstaking achievements of Otto’s commentaries is the insight that the (postexilic) deuteronomistically framed Deuteronomy can even be observed in post-deuteronomistic contexts and with post-deuteronomistic layers that are younger than the Priestly Code “*Grundschrift*” (P®).

The Priestly Code developed a foundation myth for the belief that Yhwh had chosen to dwell in the midst of Israel (Gen 1–Exod 29, 40* [Lev 9]),⁹ and introduced the legend that the ancient *Ark of God* (אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים) had its origin already in the time of Moses (Exod 25:10–16*). They held that the Ancient Israelite priesthood had its origin in the family of Aaron, whose members were anointed and ordained (Exod 29:29). Attempts to promote the position of the high priest in the sense of an early hierocratic system by a coronation were not completed (cf. Zech 6:9–15).¹⁰

From the reconstructed literary-historical development observed in the literary layers of the Pentateuch, it seems that scribes, having reestablished themselves at the Second Temple in the fifth century BCE, combined the Priestly and the Deuteronomistic foundation myths, together with pre-exilic narrative cycles, into a Hexateuchal composition. They modified the priestly claim to leadership in the Aaronite Legend of P when they combined it with the deuteronomistic narrative of violation and restoration of the covenant in Exodus 32–34* and Deuteronomy 9–10 (cf. Exod 32:21–25; Deut 9:20). Moses's relatives, the Levites, proved themselves to be the most dedicated to Yhwh and, therefore, were ordained and assigned the task of priesthood (Exod 32:26–29) – to carry the Ark that Moses had built (Deut 10:1–5, 9–10) – and to keep the tablets of the Decalogue and to preserve the scrolls of the Mosaic Torah (Deut 31:9).¹¹

⁹ For the debate about the reconstruction and the place of the Priestly Code in the context of Pentateuch redactions cf. Christian Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern. Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift*, HBS 23 (Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2000); Christoph Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT II/25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Thomas Römer, “Der Pentateuch,” in *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, ThW 1, ed. Walter Dietrich et al. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 53–93, especially 90–93; Reinhard Achenbach, “Priestly Law,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Law*, ed. Pamela Barmash (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 177–98.

¹⁰ Thomas Pola, *Das Priestertum bei Sacharja. Historische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur frühnachexilischen Herrschererwartung*, FAT 35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 224–64.

¹¹ Reinhard Achenbach, “Das Exodusbuch als Teil des Hexateuch und des Pentateuch,” in *Wege der Freiheit. Zur Entstehung und Theologie des Exodusbuches. Die Beiträge eines Symposiums zum 70. Geburtstag von Rainer Albertz (Münster, 10.–11. Mai 2013)*, ATHANT 104, ed. Reinhard Achenbach, Ruth Ebach and Jakob Wöhrle (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2014), 51–72; Reinhard Achenbach, “Grundlinien redaktioneller Arbeit in der Sinai-Perikope,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, FRLANT 206, ed. Eckard Otto and Reinhard Achenbach (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 56–80; Reinhard Achenbach, “The Story of the Revelation at the Mountain of God and the Redactional Editions of the Hexateuch and the Pentateuch,” in *A Critical Study of the Pentateuch. An Encounter Between Europe and Africa*, ATM 20, ed. Eckard Otto and Jurie le Roux (Münster: Litt-Verlag, 2005), 126–151.

According to the original form of Deuteronomy (the preexilic *Urdeuteronomium*) the priest at the central sanctuary – together with a judge – had the task of maintaining justice, even by divine ordeal in cases of unsolvable lawsuits and conflicts in the local courts (Deut 17:8, 9b, 10–13*). In the postexilic reworking of this text in the contexts of the Hexateuchal Redaction and Deuteronomistic history, these priests were called “*levitical* priests” (הלויים הכהנים, Deut 17:9a*). Within their domain, they claimed to have an exemplary text for the reproduction of further copies of the Torah (Deut 17:18), they kept the right of priesthood (Deut 18:1–8), and it was believed that they had taken care of the ark, the symbol of the central sanctuary (Num 10:35–36; 14:44; Josh 8:33). Aaron – as the brother of Moses (Exod 7:1–2 P*) – is believed thus to be of Levitical origin too. Moses took on the role of the *‘Ebed Yhwh* (Deut 34:5; Josh 1:1), who saved Israel from divine wrath by his intercessory prayers (Exod 32:7–14; Num 14:13–20). He became the first prophetic mediator of God’s will, to be followed by Yhwh’s chosen prophets (Deut 18:15–22). The concept of Second Isaiah, to accept the Achaemenid king as *Messiah* (Isa 45:1), was rejected: no foreigner could be king in Israel, only one of their *brothers* (Deut 17:14–15). Yet, the critical experiences with the historic kings deemed having a king unnecessary, unless he would strictly keep to the Torah of the Levitical priests (Deut 17:16–20).

The so-called “Law of the King” was formulated with respect to the late-dtr story of 1 Samuel 8, a text already critical towards kingship. The law was formulated as if it were destined to warn against the sins of Solomon (Deut 17:17//1 Kgs 11:1–13). It also reflects the warnings of Isaiah not to go down to Egypt for help and rely upon horses (Deut 16:16//Isa 31:1). According to the oracle in 1 Samuel 8:7, the wish to install a king responsible for the law according to the constitution of other nations (שִׁמְהָ לָנוּ מֶלֶךְ לְשִׁפְטָנוּ כְּכָל־הַגִּוִּים, 1 Sam 8:5) is itself even an iniquity, as the demand implies the rejection of Yhwh’s kingship: אֲתִי מֵאִסּוּ מִמֶּלֶךְ עָלֵיהֶם (“it is me they have despised as their king!”). Installing a king in the future could only mean that this king obeys the Torah administered by the levitical priests and, thereby, acknowledges the exclusive kingship of Yhwh.¹²

¹² Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft. Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik*, FAT II/3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 119–47 and 177–96; for the secondary, post-dtr character of the Law of the King in Deut 17:14–20, cf. Reinhard Achenbach, “Das sogenannte Königsgesetz in Deuteronomium 17,14–20,” ZAR 15 (2009): 216–33. The Law of the King reflects the collapse of the historical institution of kingship, accepts that it is not a necessary institution for Israel, and marks out conditions for a renewal in the context of the Hexateuch Composition.

3 Divine Kingship, a Holy Nation, and a Kingdom of Priests in Late-Postexilic Layers of the Pentateuch

As the process of *Fortschreibung* of the Hexateuch Composition continued, a new concept of divine presence was introduced, possibly around 400 BCE. This new concept was, namely, the idea of *kabôd yhwh* independent from any sanctuary – or even the ark. This *kabôd yhwh* appeared as a pillar of fire veiled by a pillar of cloud (Exod 13:21–22). The legend says that, after the covenant had been broken at Mount Sinai, Moses left the contaminated camp and pitched a tent outside the camp as a “Tent of Meeting” (אהל מועד, Exod 33:7–11). Yhwh descended in the pillar of cloud and spoke to Moses face to face (פנים אל-פנים, v. 11). In a later account, Yhwh confirms Moses’s exceptional position as a mediator of Yhwh’s word and will (Num 12:6–8). When leading authorities of the people (נשיאים) and a group of Levites around Korah question the priestly authority of the Aaronides, the *kabôd* appears before the Tent of Meeting, and the rebels are punished (Num 16:19–24). At the end of Moses’s life, Yhwh appears again in a pillar of cloud before the Tent of Meeting and installs Joshua as Moses’s successor (Deut 31:14–15, 23). The scribes who introduced these motifs into the Pentateuch concluded the composition of Genesis to Deuteronomy in Deuteronomy 34:10–12 and affirmed, that “never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses – whom Yhwh singled out face to face” (v. 10).

Whereas the earlier Hexateuch Composition had been open to the idea of a continuous prophetic Torah in addition to the canonised Mosaic Law of the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 18:15–22), the priestly scribes who filled up the Pentateuch with priestly Torah drew a line between prophetic scribal revelation and Moses’s Torah revelation. They stressed Aaron’s central position as the keeper of the *kehunnah* and relegated the other Levitical clans to the role of *clerus minor* (Num 16:8–10). The narrative of Num 16* seems to be part of the new structure focusing on the Holiness Code given to the narrative strand of Genesis to Deuteronomy, so it seems appropriate to identify this group of scribes with the Pentateuch Composition. These scribes sought to establish Israel not only as a holy people (עם קדוש, Deut 7:6), but as a holy nation (גוי קדוש). As such, priests would take the foremost responsibility for the administration of the covenantal law – including its sacral laws (ממלכת כהנים, Exod 19:6). This conception of a holy nation reconstructed the holy people into a congregational society of all Israelites (כל עדת בני ישראל, Lev 19:2a), with its whole oriented around the sacred. The formula “You shall be holy, for I, Yhwh, your God, am holy!” (קדשים תהיו כי קדוש אני יהוה, Lev 19:2) implies a process of the sacralisation of everyday life

in the midst of a community that gathers regularly around a permanent sanctuary. Whereas the administration of the Mosaic Torah was in the purview of these Levitical priests (Deut 17–18), the concept of Deuteronomy’s scribal reworkings and additions in the Holiness Code¹³ can be called hierocratic.

When the Holiness Code was introduced into the Pentateuch – probably in the late fifth century BCE – the whole composition was integrated into a new hermeneutic framework. The narrative connects to the older layers of the Priestly Code (= P^{8*}, Lev 9:22–24*) in Lev 10 and 16. The narrative in Lev 10 about the sin and death of Aaron’s firstborn sons – Nadab and Abihu – altered and expanded the foundation myth of P^{8*}¹⁴ and provided the reason for constituting a series of *sacral laws of atonement* (Lev 16), *sanctification and sacralisation* (Lev 17–26 + 27), supplemented by *ritual obligations on offerings* (Lev 1–7) and *rules of purity* (Lev 11–15). The book of Leviticus barely mentions Levites; the focus is rather on the central role of an Aaronide priesthood. According to this teaching, Aaron’s main responsibility is maintaining his purity (Lev 10:9; cf. Ezek 44:21) so that he will be able “to distinguish between the sacred and the profane, and between the unclean and the clean” (ולִהְבְּדִיל בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין הַחֵל וּבֵין הַטָּמֵא וּבֵין הַטָּהוֹר Lev 10:10). And so that he will be able “to teach the Israelites all the laws which Yhwh has imparted to them through Moses” (ולְהוֹרֹת אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת כָּל־הַחֻקִּים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה Lev 10:11).

The rule of Leviticus 10:8–11 has a parallel in the Zadokite tradition of Ezekiel 44, where it is preserved in an older and more extended version (Ezek 44:15–31). The scribes of the school of Ezekiel clearly rejected the idea that all Levitical priests should have priestly rights. For them only the descendants of Zadok are allowed to serve the sanctuary, “to teach the people of God to distinguish between holy and profane, and impart the knowledge about what is clean and what is unclean” (Ezek 44:23).¹⁵

¹³ Cf. Christophe Nihan, “The Holiness Code between D and P. Some Comments on the Function and Significance of Leviticus 17–26 in the Composition of the Torah,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, FRLANT 206, ed. Eckard Otto and Reinhard Achenbach (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 81–122.

¹⁴ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 576–607; Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 93–97; Reinhard Achenbach, “Ursprungsmythen des Priestertums in der Hebräischen Bibel als Camouflage klerikaler Machtkämpfe,” in *Sukzession in Religionen. Autorisierung, Legitimierung, Wissenstransfer*, ed. Almut-Barbara von Renger and Markus Witte, (Berlin: DeGruyter, 2017), 113–32; Lars Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik: Studien zur Rezeption des Pentateuchs in den Chronikbüchern*, FRLANT 274 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 296–299.

¹⁵ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 590–93 has shown that Lev 10:10 represents a younger version compared to Ezek 44:23; cf. also Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 169–70; see for further alternative positions with respect to the relation between Lev 10, Numb 18 and Ezek 44

The Zadokite rule in Ezekiel 44:24 demands the following in the form of a divine prescription:

“Presiding in lawsuits (על ריב) it is they who stand (המה יעמדו) to act as judges (לשפט) in accordance with my law (במשפטי), and they shall decide them (ושפטהו); they shall preserve all my *torot* and my rules and all my holy days (ואת תורותי ואת חקתי בכל מועדי ישמרו), and they shall maintain the sanctity of my Sabbaths (ואת־שבתותי יקדשו).”

The high priest should not only have the central position in the cult, but also at the central court. Ezekiel 44 thus tends to emend the rules of Deuteronomy 17:8–9: the judge of the central court, who had to obey the oracle of a priestly ordeal should be replaced by the high priest himself. And this person may only be of Zadokite origin. Not Levitical priests in general, but the leading high priest should maintain the text and the scroll of the Torah, and – beyond the conception of Deuteronomy – administrate the cultic calendar and the sanctity of the Sabbath.

It seems that the legitimization legend of Leviticus 10 met – at least in part – these claims and demands. It demanded that Aaron enter the sanctuary in a state of purity (Lev 10:9//Ezek 44:21). His task is to teach holiness and purity (Lev 10:10//Ezek 44:23), and he had to teach Israel all the orders and rules of Yhwh in general (Lev 10:11//Ezek 44:24). However, Lev 10:11 only implies any clear demand that the high priest should preside over the central court. Within this new hermeneutical frame, the Mosaic speeches of Deuteronomy are understood as an explication of the Torah (Deut 1:5). Therefore – within this context – the older tradition of Deuteronomy 17:8–9 is preserved and *not* changed according the more radical intentions of Ezekiel 44.

4 The Proto-Chronistic and Chronistic Genealogy of the Zadokites in the Theocratic Reworkings of the Pentateuch

Why, though, does Leviticus 10 report that these rules were proclaimed after the death of Aaron’s two older sons? The reason must be that the priestly scribes

---

Michael D. Konkel, *Architektonik des Heiligen: Studien zur Zweiten Tempelvision Ezechiels (Ez 40–48)* (BBB 129 – Berlin: Philo, 2001); Nathan MacDonald, *Priestly Rule: Polemic and Biblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44* (BZAW 476 – Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).

wanted to prepare a genealogical rationale for the demand that a Zadokite should occupy the position of high priest. Zadok's genealogical origin was unclear in 1 Kings 2:35, where it is reported that Solomon installed Zadok and rejected the ancient Israelite priest Abjatar (1 Kgs 2:26–27). It is only in 1 Chronicles 5:27–41 that the scribes maintain firmly that Zadok was a descendant of Aaron's third son Eleazar and grandson Pinehas – and an ancestor of Jehozadak, the father of the first high priest after the exile, Joshua.¹⁶

This genealogical line is introduced into the Pentateuch in Exodus 6:16, 20¹⁷ and explained in Leviticus 10:1–5 and Numbers 20:26–28, the narrative on Eleazar's succession.¹⁸

1 Chr 5:27–34	References
27 בני לוי גרשון קהת ומררי	Sons of Levi: Gen 46:11; Exod 6:16; Num 3:17; 10:17; 26:57–62; Josh 21:1–41
28 ובני קהת עמרם יצהר וחברון ועזיאל	Qohat: Gen 46:11; Exod 6:16, 18; Num 3:17, 19, 27, 29; 4:2, 4, 15; 7:9; 16:1; 27:57–58; Josh 21:5, 20, 26; 1 Chr 6:1, 3, 7, 23, 46, 51, 55; 23:6, 12
29 ובני עמרם אהרן ומשה ומרים	Amram: Exod 6:18, 20; Num 3:19, 27; 26:58–59; 1 Chr 5:28, 29; 6:3; 23:12–13; 24:20; 26:23
ובני אהרן נדב ואביהוא	Nadab and Abihu: Exod 24:1, 9; 28:1; Lev 10:1; Num 3:2, 4; 26:61; 1 Chr 5:29; 24:1

16 It is not possible to discuss every detail of the composite text of Chronicles. For an orientation to this, cf. Gary N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland: Doubleday, 2003), 400–15; Thomas Willi, *Chronik. 1 Chr 1–10*, BK XXIV/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 188–240, on 1 Chr 5:27–7:5. The impression that these texts contain a series of additions is due to the scribal technique of rewriting given texts (sources) and filling them up with explanations (lat. *adiectio*), but also leaving out things (lat. *detractio*), changing sequences (lat. *transmutatio*) or even replacing parts of them (lat. *immutatio*); cf. Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 43–50.

17 On the late dating and the assignment to Theocratic Reworking (ThR), cf. Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 110–24; the late dating was confirmed by Christoph Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung. Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels*, FAT 73 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 153–67, and Rainer Albertz, *Exodus, Band I: Exodus 1–18*, ZBK (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2012), 116–32; for the correlation with Chronicles cf. Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 289–96.

18 Num 20:22–29 traditionally is ascribed to P*, cf. Frevel, *Mit dem Blick auf das Land*, 237–48; for the late priestly and redactional origin, cf. Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist*, FRLANT 157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 379; Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 318–34.

אלעזר	Eleazar: Exod 6:23, 25; 28:1; Lev 10:6, 12, 16; Num 3:2, 4, 32; 4:16; 17:2, 4; 19:3–4; 20:25–26, 28; 25:7, 11; 26:1, 3, 60, 63; 27:2, 19, 21–22; 31:6–54; 32:2, 28; 34:17; Deut 10:6; Josh 14:1; 17:4; 19:51; 21:1; 22:13, 31–32; 24:33; Ezra 7:5; 1 Chr 5:29–30; 6:35; 9,20; 24:1–6
ואיתמר	Itamar: Exod 6:23; 28:1; 38:21; Lev 10:6, 12; Num 3:2, 4; 4:28, 33; 7:8; 26:60; Ezra 8:2; 1 Chr 5:29; 24:1–6
30 אלעזר הוליד את פינחס	Pinehas: Exod 6:25; Num 25:7, 11; 31:6; Josh 22:13, 30–32; 24:33; Judg 20:28; Ps 106:30; Ezra 7:5; 8:2; 1 Chr 5:30; 6:35; 9:20
פינחס הוליד את אבישוע	<i>Abishua: Ezra 7:5; 1 Chr 5:30–31; 6:35</i>
31 ואבישוע הוליד את בקי	<i>Bukki: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chr 5:31; 6:36</i>
ובקי הוליד את עזי	<i>Uzzi: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chr 5:31–32; 6:36</i>
32 ועזי הוליד את זרחיה	<i>Zeahiah: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chr 5:31–32; 6:36</i>
וזרחיה הוליד את מריות	<i>Meraioth: Ezra 7:3; 1 Chr 5:32–33; 6:37</i>
33 מריות הוליד את אמריה	<i>Amariah: Ezra 7:3; 1 Chr 5:33,37; 6:37</i>
ואמריה הוליד את אחיטוב	Ahitub: 2 Sam 8:17; Ezra 7:2; 1 Chr 5:33–34, 37–38; 6:37; 18:16
34 ואחיטוב הוליד את צדוק	Zadok: 2 Sam 8:17
וצדוק הוליד את אחימעץ	Ahimaaz: 2 Sam 15:27, 36; 17:20; 18:19–28; 1 Chr 5:34–35; 6:36.

The passage renders the genealogy of Aaron's successors. First Chronicles 6:35–38 repeats the special genealogy of Aaron's descendants because here the different roles of the high-priestly family and the other priestly Levitical families is reported according to the structure that is worked out in Numbers, cf. 1 Chronicles 6:33–38:

³³ And their brothers, the Levites (אחיהם הלוים), were assigned (נתונים) to all the service of the Tabernacle of the house of God (לכל עבדת משכן בית האלהים). ³⁴ As for Aaron and his sons, they were sacrificing upon the altar of burnt offering and upon the incense altar, for every work of the Holy of Holies, to atone for Israel according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded. ³⁵ And these are the sons of Aaron: Eleazar his son, Phineas his son, Abishua his son, ³⁶ Buqqi his son, Uzzi his son, Zerahiah his son, ³⁷ Meraioth his son, Amariah his son, Ahitub his son, ³⁸ Zadoq his son, Ahimaaz his son.

In Genesis–Numbers the genealogy serves to introduce the genealogies of Levites and of Aaronides. Its roots are traced back to Genesis 46:11. In the context of the Exodus account, it is introduced in Exodus 6:16 after the priestly account on Moses’s mission, the reception of the Holy Name (Exod 6:2–8), and the first appearance of Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh (6:13), when both represent political and religious leadership of the Israelites. The narrative of the priestly reworked Pentateuch continued, after the introduction of the Holiness Code, in Numbers 1–10. Only at this point were priestly and Levitical tasks delineated in a detailed structure. The priestly reworking here creates a new legend about the Tabernacle. It does not remain in the desert, but – in addition to the symbol of the Ark of the Covenant, the Tent of Meeting, and the Cloud of Divine Presence in the fiery *kabôd* – now the Tent of Meeting is identified with the *mishkan*, the sanctuary built at Mount Sinai. And this *mishkan* is transported together with the Ark and other sacred precincts by Priests and Levites during their wandering in the wilderness and brought into the promised land (Num 3–4; 9:15–23; Josh 18:1; 19:51; 1 Kgs 8:4).¹⁹ Numbers 10:17 mentions Levi’s genealogy again with respect to the tasks of the Levites as *clerus minor*. Numbers 26:57 mentions it with respect to the mustering before the conquest. Again, Joshua 21:6, 27 presents it with respect to the Levitical towns, though it never appears in any deuteronomistic or priestly layer of other biblical books. But then it appears again in 1 Chronicles 5:27 and in the Davidic census of the Levites in 1 Chronicles 23:6. Thus Exodus 6:16 stands in the line of late priestly reworkings of the Pentateuch, which included some necessary *Fortschreibung* in the scrolls of the Enneateuch and a systematic reception in Chronicles. In this way, the late priestly reworkings in Numbers 3–4, 9–10, and 26 can be described as *proto-Chronistic* reworkings.²⁰

The same literary level as the list of the three sons of Levi can be observed in continuity with the list on Kohath and his descendants. As Aaron is derived from this ancestor and his son Amram, the Kohathites are allowed to serve at the Most

---

¹⁹ The book of Joshua underwent a reworking from ThR, cf. Reinhard Achenbach, “Der Pentateuch, seine theokratischen Bearbeitungen und Josua – 2 Könige,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’ennéateuque*, BETHL CCIII, ed. Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid (Leuven – Paris: Peeters, 2007), 225–54; for the late priestly reworking see also Rainer Albertz, “Die kanonische Anpassung des Josuabuches: Eine Neubewertung seiner sogenannten ‘priesterschriftlichen Texte’”, in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’ennéateuque*, BETHL CCIII, ed. Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid (Leuven – Paris: Peeters, 2007), 199–216. References to these late priestly additions are found only a few times in Sam–Kgs, but their concepts are reflected in Chr.

²⁰ That the late layers in Numbers are proto-Chronistic also was seen by Hans-Peter Mathys, “Nueri und Chronik: Nahe Verwandte,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, BETHL 215, ed. Thomas Römer (Leuven – Paris – Deudley MA: Peeters, 2008), 555–78.

Holy (קדש הקדשים, Num 4:4),²¹ which is now identified with the Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד). It remains the privilege of Aaron to touch the holy devices and the Tabernacle itself (Num 4:5, 15).

Amram is listed as the husband of Jochebed, a daughter of Levi, and as the father of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam (Exod 6:20; Num 26:59; 1 Chr 5:29). Even when compared with his brother Moses, the high-priestly privilege is reserved for Aaron alone (1 Chr 23:13):

The sons of Amram: Aaron and Moses. Aaron was set apart (ויבדל), he and his sons, forever, to be consecrated as most holy (קדש קדשים), to burn incense (להקטיר)²² to Yhwh and serve Him and pronounce blessings in His name (לשרתו ולברך בשמו) forever (עד עולם).

The assignment of the priestly service to the tribe of Levi (Exod 32:29), as well as their performing cultic worship and blessings (Deut 10:8 – הבדיל יהוה – את־שבט הלוי ... לעמד לפני יהוה לשרתו לברך בשמו), is – according to this priestly reworking – exclusively assigned to Aaron and his progeny as a permanent privilege, not merely for a limited period (cf. Deut 10:8b – עד היום הזה). The daily burning of incense is a privilege reserved for the high priest that brings him closest to the holiest precinct in the sanctuary and, thus, to God's presence. This ancestral lineage serves to secure the exclusivity of the high-priestly family's position.

Interestingly enough, the construct of a pure Levitical genealogy for Aaron's sons is supplemented in Exodus 6:23. Here, Aaron's wife is identified as Elisheba the daughter of Aminadab and the sister of Nachshon, a Judean leader (Num 1:7; 2:3; 10:14). Thus, the concept of priestly leadership and political leadership is intertwined and harmonised by means of a construct of putative kinship.²³ Chronicles seems to correspond to this concept when it states that Zadok was anointed as high priest at the same time that Solomon was anointed as king (1 Chr 29:22).²⁴

²¹ The *godesh ha-godashim* is mentioned only in Exod 26:33–34; Num 4:4, 19; and 18:9 in connection with the desert shrine, and in 1 Chr 6:34 in connection with the Aaronide privilege of priestly accession to it. In 1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50; 8:6 (1 Chr 3:8, 10; 4:22; 5:7), in connection with the Solomonic temple; in Ezek 41:4 and Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65 with the Second Temple.

²² Exod 29:13, 15; 30:7–8, 20; Num 17:5; 18:17.

²³ Cf. Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 257–59 and 293–95.

²⁴ Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 545–46. The Judean concept of leadership as documented in Num 2, 7, and 10 is transferred to the priestly lineage. Maskow has clearly seen the connection between the two leadership concepts: “Es gibt im nachexilischen Juda zwei miteinander interagierende Herrschaftsdiskurse, den des aktuellen Hohenpriester und den des (reminiszenten) jüdischen Königtums. Der jüdische Herrschaftsdiskurs liefert dem hierokratischen Diskurs gewissermaßen die institutionelle Grundlage, wobei sich dieser nicht mehr personaliter realisiert, sondern durch die Übernahme in die priesterliche Konstruktion Geltung verschafft und die

The mother of Eleazar, Elisheba (Gr. Elisabeth), is not mentioned again anywhere in Chronicles, whether in the LXX or the MT.

Nadab and Abihu are regarded as the two elder sons of Aaron. According to Exodus 24:1, 9–11 – together with Moses, their father Aaron, and seventy elders of Israel – they have the privilege of partaking in the covenant ceremony at Mount Sinai. These verses are generally considered secondary priestly additions, although they have no further connection with P^s because – according to this layer – Moses was alone when he ascended the mountain to approach the divine (Exod 24:15–18). The narrative points out that when Moses approached the Most Holy during the first revelation, the designated high priest Aaron and his sons shared this privilege together with seventy representatives of the seventy descendants of Jacob (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5; Deut 10:22).²⁵ They even were honoured by sharing in the vision of God on his throne from beneath his footrest. This footrest consisted of a pavement of lapislazuli coloured sapphire, like the very sky in terms of purity (Exod 24:10), a metaphorical description of the heavenly dwelling that is attested only in the (Zadokite) Ezekiel tradition (Ezek 1:26–28; 10:1–2). They partook in the first cultic meal together with God (Exod 24:11).

Aaron's other sons Eleazar and Itamar did not take part in the ceremony, maybe because they were considered younger. However, when Aaron is assigned his office, the four sons are mentioned at his installation (Exod 28:1). The legend about Nadab and Abihu continues in Leviticus 10:1–3, which reports that they died after using foreign (impure) fire when offering incense to Yhwh. This legend has the function of justifying why Aaron's third son, Eleazar, becomes his successor. So all other references to the firstborn mention this event (Num 3:2, 4; 26:61). Neither Nadab nor Abihu is mentioned elsewhere in Chronicles (1 Chr 5:29; 24:1–2). Thus, it seems at least plausible to assume that Exodus 24:1, 9–11; Leviticus 10*; and Numbers 3; 26 are part of a reworking of the Pentateuch that is younger than P, D, HC, and is proto-Chronic. Because the function of this legitimating con-

---

Hohenpriester durch genealogische Ableitung zu einem Gesalbten und höchsten Vertreter der Rechtsinstanz als *de facto* zum nachexilischen König macht." When Nachshon became David's ancestor (Ruth 4:20; 1 Chr 2:10–11), the anointed high priest and the Messiah became relatives (Exod 6:23); Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 295 n. 10.

²⁵ The concept that Israel could be represented by seventy elders was not reflected anywhere else in dt or prophetic literature, except in Ezek 8:11, where a group of seventy elders is blamed for idolatry in the temple during the time after 597 BCE. The Pentateuch Composition invented an institutional group of seventy elders in Num 11:16, 24–25, but the institution of the *gerousia* is attested only in the Hellenistic era. This underlines and confirms the assumption that Exod 24:1, 9–11 is a *Fortschreibung* from late priestly reworking.

struct is to confirm hierocratic leadership in the context of the Mosaic Torah, this layer can be called a *theocratic reworking* (ThR).²⁶

Exodus 6:25 already expounds Eleazar's lineage, mentioning his marriage with a daughter of Putiel and the birth of Phineas. Putiel is not mentioned anywhere else. Itamar's marriage and children are not mentioned in Exodus 6 because their lineage is not important for the genealogy of the high priest. The divine *torah* on the priestly duties after the death of Nadab and Abihu is addressed to Aaron, Eleazar, and Itamar (Lev 10:6, 16), and they have to share the cultic meal of the high priest (Lev 10:12). Consequently, in Num 3:2, 4 the scribe asserts that "Eleazar and Itamar served as priests in the lifetime of their father Aaron" and that Eleazar was the leading chieftain of Levi (נשיא נשיאי הלוי, Num 3:32). His task is described as the oversight of those attending to the duties of the sanctuary (פקדת שמרי) (משמרת הקדש). Before his father, he is responsible for assuring that the high priest is able to perform all his central duties (Num 4:16): He must take care that there is enough oil for the Menorah (שמן המאור, cf. Exod 27:20–21), aromatic incense for the daily incense offering (קטרת סמים, Exod 30:7), bread for the Tamid of the meal offering (מנחה התמיד, Exod 29:38–41), anointing oil (שמן המשח, Exod 30:22–33), and for all other devices and vessels of the sanctuary (וכל אשר בו בודש וכליו).

The text of Numbers thus has the function of canonising the special responsibilities and tasks of the high priest's eldest son. The narrative of Numbers 17:1–5 then wants to show that this son is empowered to handle sacred vessels and holy fire. Thus, it reports that Eleazar removed the copper fire pans of the community following Korah after they had sanctified by the holy fire. They are hammered into plating for the altar as a reminder that no outsider, only Aaron and his offspring, is qualified and permitted to offer incense. Only Aaron or his offspring is also allowed to slaughter the red cow and thus prepare the material to produce the cleansing water that purifies those who have come into contact with the dead (Num 19:3). After the death of his father, Eleazar is invested with Aaron's vestments and becomes his successor (Num 20:25–29). The narrative about the zeal of Pinehas functions to confirm that Eleazar's son was also fit to take over the role of the high priest's eldest son and to succeed him in the holy office (Num 25:7, 11). Eleazar then stands at the side of Moses when Moses mandates the new census

²⁶ The character of this reworking that adds a legend to the tabernacle in the wilderness, the order of priests, Levites, the congregation of Israel, and the division of land (ThR I, Num 1–4*; 10:11, 13–28, 34; [additions in Num 13–14; 16–18], 26–27; 32*; 33:50–56; 34–35; 36:13); later adds further rules on purity and rituals (ThR II, Num 5–6; 15; 19; 28–30*); and adds diverse legends on the origins of vessels and rules for the Second Temple congregation (ThR III, Num 3:11–13, 40–51; 7–9; 10:1–10; 30:2–27; 31; 33; 36), has been described in Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 37–172 and 443–638.

before the conquest of the land (Num 26:1, 3). Together with Moses he presides over the assembly of the Israelite community and their chieftains (לפני הנשיאם וכל) (העדה) in front of the Tent of Meeting (פתח אהל מועד) in the case of Zelophehad's daughters regarding the law of inheritance (Num 27:2). When Joshua is designated and commissioned as Moses's successor, Moses lays his hands upon him in the sight of Eleazar and the whole community (Num 27:18–23). He – as a political leader – is instructed that the high priest had the task to examine all fundamental decisions through the oracles of Urim and Tummim from God (v. 23). In questions of the highest legal authority and of war and peace (Num 31:6), the high priest now holds the ultimate authority. He, together with Joshua, apportions the land (Num 34:17). Other short additions also mark this leading role: Josh 14:1; 17:4; 19:51; 21:1; 22:31–32; 24:33. Judges 20:28 mentions Phineas as Eleazar's successor; cf. Josh 24:33^a LXX.

After that, only the genealogies in Ezra 7:5; 1 Chronicles 5:29–30; and 9:20, as well as the narrative about the priestly obligations of the descendants of Eleazar and his brother Itamar (1 Chr 24:1–6) mention Eleazar again. Again, the Numbers narrative arc on the duties of the high priest's sons continues only in Chronicles.

Itamar, as Eleazar's younger brother, is named in the genealogies (Exod 6:23; 28:1; etc.) and has priestly duties (Lev 10:6, 12). In addition, his task is the oversight of the sanctuary's financial affairs (Exod 38:21; Num 7:8). The legend of 1 Chronicles 24 maintains that David divided the priestly offices among his sons, together with the Zadokite sons of Eleazar. Again, Chronicles takes up the line drawn from the priestly reworking of Numbers.

Phineas first appears in Exodus 6:25. Eleazar took a daughter of a certain Puti-El (פּוּטִי־אֵל) as a wife, and she bore him Phineas. The hybrid name is only mentioned in this context. In analogy to the Egyptian name Poti-pha, Poti-phar (*P3-dj-p3-r[']* – “He whom Ra has given”) the name means “*He-whom-El has given*”, containing both an Egyptian and a West-Semitic name element. At least the name of Phineas's grandfather suggests an Egyptian cultural background. However, there is no further information about the scribes' intention in mentioning this name.²⁷

The Hexateuch Composition narrative in Exodus 32:26–28 proves that the sons of Levi stand behind Yhwh without any doubt as to their loyalty. They are prepared to punish idolatry without compromise, and slay brother, neighbour, and kin (Exod 32:27).²⁸ Therefore, they are qualified for priesthood (cf. Exod 32:28;

²⁷ Potipha is known as priest from On (Heliopolis) and father-in-law of Joseph (Gen 41:45, 50; 46:20), Potiphar was the official who bought Joseph (Gen 37:36; 39:1). Rabbinic interpretation associates the name with Hebr פטר – someone who separated and emancipated himself from idolatry and wrong passion (cf. Sot 43a; Mekh., Amalek 1).

²⁸ Cf. Deut 13:7; 33:9.

Deut 10:8–9). This tradition is confirmed in the Pentateuch Composition in the Blessing of Moses, Deuteronomy 33:9.²⁹ The hierocratic legend of Aaron's sons and grandsons in the priestly reworking of Numbers adds a tradition about the zeal of Phineas (Num 25:6–15): The Moabites and Midianites try to seduce the Israelites to sexual intercourse and idolatry. Yhwh punishes the people with an epidemic. When the people gather before the sanctuary in rites of repentance and mourning, a Midianite woman and an Israelite man meet in a certain tent that may be associated with both sexual intercourse and pagan worship (*qubbah*). Phineas stabs both through the belly (*qebah*) and thus stops the plague, profanation, and fornication (Num 25:1, 8). The priestly reworking of Numbers has its climax in the narrative on the *Covenant of Peace* (ברית שלום) and a *Covenant of Eternal Priesthood* (ברית כהנת עולם) with Phineas ben Eleazar ben Aaron and all his descendants (Num 25:10–13*). This covenantal relationship is affirmed because Phineas had proven himself passionate enough to turn back God's wrath and was able to expiate (כפר) the Israelites' transgressions. The legend thus establishes a permanent genealogical measure for the legacy and legitimacy of Zadokite priesthood in the Pentateuch. A covenant of peace (ברית שלום) is mentioned in Isa 54:10 in parallel with the covenant of Noah (Gen 9:11–17): Yhwh promises not to bring a disastrous catastrophe over Israel again after the exile. Ezekiel 34:23–31 connects the promise of a covenant of peace (v. 25) with the promise to renew the Davidic kingdom, permanent blessing, welfare, and peace under the divine kingship of the shepherd Yhwh (v. 31). Ezekiel 37:25–27 connects the promise of the covenant of peace with the promise that this covenant will be permanent, an everlasting covenant (ברית עולם, v. 26), referring to the renewal of the Second Temple and an eternal presence of Yhwh, who sanctifies Israel (v. 27–28). Numbers 25:12–13 states that the promise of a covenant of peace has roots reaching back to the time of Phineas: By his zeal for holiness and purity he effects a divine covenant of peace for Israel in connection with an eternal covenant of priesthood (ברית כהנת עולם) with the descendants of Aaron, Eleazar, and Phineas. As priest, Phineas leads the war of retaliation against the Midianites, giving the divine signals with the holy trumpets (Num 31:6).³⁰ He leads the negotiations of the *'edah* with the Reubenites,

²⁹ Cf. Eckard Otto, *Deuteronomium 12–34. Zweiter Teilband: 23,16–34,12*, HThK (Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2017), 2204–260, especially 2245–248.

³⁰ Num 10:1–10. The priestly trumpets are furthermore only mentioned in Ezra 3:10; Neh 12:35, 41; and in Chronicles (1 Chr 13:8; 15:24, 28; 16:6, 42; 2 Chr 5:12–13; 13:12, 14; 15:14; 20:28; 23:13; 29:26–28), where the motif has found its most marked reception; cf. Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 373–76. Most significant is the connection between Num 10:10 and 1 Chr 15:24: “Was Mose aufgetragen wurde, nämlich am Tag der Freude (וְיוֹם שִׂמְחָתְכֶם) die Trompete zu blasen, wird in 1 Chr 15:24 umgesetzt, wo nach V. 16.25.28 ausdrücklich ein Tag der Freude annonciert wird.”

never to build an altar for offerings (Josh 22:13–14, 30–34 – presumably a legend directed against the sanctuary of the Samaritans). He is Eleazar’s successor (Josh 24:33) at the the Sanctuary of the Ark (Judg 20:27b–28). Again, Phineas is not mentioned in any other scripture beyond the genealogies in Ezra 7:5; 8:2, 33; and in 1 Chronicles 6:4, 50; 9:20, and in Psalm 106:30 reflecting Numbers 25:8.

The lineage between Phineas and Zadok continues only in the same chronistic contexts, about Abishua: Ezra 7:5; 1 Chronicles 5:30–31; 6:35; about Bukki: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chronicles 5:31; 6:36; about Uzzi: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chronicles 5:31–32; 6:36; about Zeahiah: Ezra 7:4; 1 Chronicles 5:31–32; 6:36; about Meraioth: Ezra 7:3; 1 Chronicles 5:32–33; 6:37; and about Amariah: Ezra 7:3; 1 Chronicles 5:33, 37; 6:37. Simply no other evidence exists for this lineage beyond these late contexts.

Ahitub is known as the father of Zadok in 2 Sam 8:17, a text which still mentions the lineage of the ancient Israelite priesthood of Ahimelekh ben Abiatar, too. Therefore, this name continues the traditional lineage in Chronicles (1 Chr 5:33–34, 37–38; 6:37; 9:11; Ezra 7:2).

It has long been observed that Zadok’s background seems to place his roots in the ancient Jerusalemite priesthood. But he and his descendants remained the leading priests from Solomon’s reign onwards after Abiatar’s removal from his office and banishing (1 Kgs 2:26–27; 4:2). Zadok was therefore integrated into the legend of the Ark and described as being close to it from the beginning of David’s reign (2 Sam 15:24–36). He was believed to have been the priest who was admitted to get the oil from the tent of the Ark and anointed Solomon together with Nathan the prophet (1 Kgs 1:32, 34, 39). His son Ahimaaz is associated with Jonathan, the son of Saul, the first king of Israel, and David’s closest friend and favourite (2 Sam 15:27, 36; 17:20; 18:19–28; 1 Chr 5:34–35; 6:36).

The circle of scribes who developed the book of Ezekiel and its programmatic order for the Second Temple clearly favoured an exclusively Zadokite right to the priesthood against all other Levitical priestly lineages (Ezek 44:15; 48:11). The scribes of the Pentateuch canonised their choice in Exodus 6 and the late priestly layers of Numbers, whereupon a few additions in Joshua, Judges, and Kings, together with a clear choice in Chronicles for the Zadokites followed. As this program was introduced in the final stage of the Pentateuch’s formation, we should assume that this was a post-dtr, post-P, and post-H proto-Chronistic stage in the fourth century BCE, possibly after Ezra’s reforms.

The Levitical lineage described in Numbers 3:14–39 is not only important for identifying Levitical undertakings at the tabernacle (Num 4), but also for taking up (Num 35:16–34) the dtr rule of determining the cities of refuge for asylum seekers (Deut 19:1–13; 4:41–43). It is then connected with the instruction to allocate land from the tribal holdings for the Levites for dwelling and pasture (Num 35:1–15). The ThR thus introduces rules for the subsistence of the increasing number of

Levitical and priestly personnel at the Second Temple. ThR accordingly supplemented the dtr account in Joshua 21 with the account that settlements had been distributed to the Kohathite Aaronides (Josh 21:1–19), the other Kohathites (Josh 21:20–26), the Gershonites (Josh 21:27–33), and the Merarites (Josh 21:34–45). This connection is reflected, in addition, in the Aaronite genealogy in 1 Chronicles 6:39–66 (vv. 35–38), generally affirming the Aaronides' right to priestly possessions (Josh 21:1–4, 10–19//1 Chr 6:39–45), as well as that of all other Levitical clans (Josh 21:5–9//1 Chr 6:46–50), the Kohathites (1 Chr 6:51–55), the Gershonites (1 Chr 6:56–61), and the Merarites (1 Chr 6:62–66).³¹ Again, the concepts of the ThR are incorporated into Chronicles and not recorded before.

5 The Hierocratic Institution of the High Priest in the Theocratic Reworking of the Pentateuch

In the latest texts of the Pentateuch, Moses's position as the preeminent mediator of Divine Torah and Prophecy is illustrated in the Song at the Sea (Exod 15:1–18) and in the Song of Moses (Deut 32:1–43).³² Moses proclaims Yhwh's kingship and uniqueness as God:

Exodus 15:11 "Who is like You, Yhwh, among the gods, who is like You, majestic in holiness, awesome in splendour, working wonders! ... 17 You bring them [your people] and plant them in the mountain of your heritage, the place You made to dwell in, Yhwh! The sanctuary, o Lord, which your hands established. 18 Yhwh will reign as king for ever and ever!"

When this prophetic hymn was placed before the song of the prophetess Miriam, the shorter prophetic version remains only as a repetition of what Moses has already envisioned and pronounced. At the end of his life as presented in the Pentateuch, Moses announces in his prophetic hymn the eschatological legal proceedings of Yhwh, the sole God, the creator, and the highest ruler over the world and over the nations, who proclaims himself as lord of the universe, ruling on life and death, Deuteronomy 32:39:

---

³¹ Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 430–50.

³² John W. Watts, *Psalms and Story. Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*, JSOTS 139 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

“See now, that I, I am He, and there is no god beside me, I deal death and give life, I have wounded and I will heal, and none can deliver from My hand!”³³

When, in the latest phase of reworking, priestly scribes introduced a new priestly hierarchical order into the narrative of the Pentateuch in connection with the introduction of priestly *torot*, they also introduced a legend about Aaron as Moses’s successor in the task of Torah mediator. This meant his authority exceeded all other priestly, Levitical, prophetic, and scribal authority. The authorisation of Aaron superseded the authorisation of the prophets following Moses.

According to the Hexateuch Composition in Deuteronomy 18:15–22, prophetic authority was rooted in the legend about the covenant on Mount Horeb, which included the divine promise to raise a prophet like Moses for Israel and to put his words into the prophet’s mouth (Deut 18:18; Jer 1:9; cf. also Isa 6:6–9; Ezek 3:1–4). When, according to the Pentateuchal reworking, the legend of the tent of meeting introduced a new perspective, it was believed that Moses’s word directly delivered God’s revelation, so that the Torah of Moses surpassed the prophetic word (Deut 34:10–12). The word of Moses became itself divine. In the theocratic priestly reworking of the Pentateuch, the narrative of Moses’s call (Exod 3) therefore was supplemented in Exodus 4:10–17 with the assignment of Aaron the Levite, brother of Moses. Moses received the commandment from the beginning of his work, “speak to him and put the words in his mouth” (וְדַבַּרְתָּ אֵלָיו וְשָׁמַת אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים בְּפִיו) (v. 15). God promised to be with the mouth of Moses as well as with the mouth of Aaron and instruct them both (v. 15). So when Aaron speaks to the people, he will be the mouth of Moses, and Moses will be for him a mediator in a divine position (הוּא יִהְיֶה לְךָ לִפָּהּ וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לוֹ לֵאלֹהִים) (v. 16). Before God promised to send the prophets, Aaron already had been assigned to be the first and *most high authority to proclaim God’s word* through Moses. Thus, all *torot* of the Pentateuch, including the priestly *torot* on offerings and purity were also determined to supersede any further Torah proclaimed in the prophetic scrolls.

The priestly reworking of the Pentateuch effected scribal discourse between the prophetic and Pentateuchal scriptures. As an example, one may have a look at Jer 7:22–23, where it is denied that God commanded anything about burnt offerings or sacrifices on the way from Egypt to the promised land (cf. also Mic

³³ Deuteronomy 32 is probably the latest text in Deuteronomy. The Song of Moses is a canonical and hermeneutical bridge between Torah, Prophets, Psalms, and Wisdom, announcing Yhwh’s judgment over the nations and Israel’s eschatological salvation. Cf. Otto, *Deuteronomium* 23,16–34,12, 2130–203; for a close reading cf. Petra Schmidtkunz, *Das Moselied des Deuteronomium. Untersuchungen zu Text und Theologie von 32,1–43*, FAT II/124 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020).

6:6–8; Amos 5:25). The admission of foreigners to the cult was heavily disputed (Isa 56:3–8; Deut 23:2–9; Exod 12:48–49) and served as a reason to reject a general admission of Levites for worship at the center of the sanctuary and to degrade their majority to *clerus minor* (Ezek 44:9–11).

In the expansions of the priestly legends in Numbers, foundational legends serve to subsequently endow the hierocratic position of the high priest. They confirm that Aaron and his descendants have the *highest priestly authority* among the descendants of Levi and among all other tribes and chieftains of Israel. Numbers 16 reports about a rebellion of Korah the Levite, who claims the right of the priesthood to the assembly (*‘edah*) and is rejected immediately (Num 16:1a, 3–5, 8–11, 16, 19–24, 28–34).³⁴ Thereby Aaron’s preeminent position in the *‘edah* is confirmed. When the *‘edah* rails against Moses and Aaron in an assembly (Num 17:6–7), only Aaron is able to expiate their wrongdoing on their behalf and calm the wrath of Yhwh by the incense ritual (Num 17:8–15).

Numbers 16:2–3 reports about a rebellion of 250 chieftains (נשיאים) of the congregation (עדה), chosen by the assembly (קריאי מועד), against Moses and Aaron. With reference to the account of the Sinai covenant in Exodus 19:6 (אתם דבר אל-כל-עדת) and the program of the Holiness Code (Lev 19:2 תהיו לי ... גוי קדוש) (בני-ישראל ואמרת אלהם קדשים תהיו כי קדוש אני יהוה אלהיכם) the laity doubt the privileged position of Moses and Aaron over the *qahal*, the Assembly of the people (מדוע תתנשאו עליקהל יהוה, Num 16:3). In an ordeal, these laity try to offer incense, but – as in Leviticus 10:2 – “a fire went forth from Yhwh and consumed the 250 men” (Num 16:35). The legend proves that only Aaron and his descendants have the right to offer incense (Num 17:1–5). It is only he who is able to sanctify Israel before God by offering purifying incense. It is the Aaronide high priest alone who is allowed to come close to the adytum of the sanctuary every morning when he tends to the Menorah and offers incense (Exod 37:1–10).

The two legends are intertwined, and thus they make clear that Aaron is the head of the religious assembly (*‘edah*) as well as over the subordinate political assembly (*qahal*). So he also represents the *highest political authority* of all Israelites. When the chieftains of Israel representing the twelve tribes lay down their staffs and the document of covenantal law (העדות, Num 17:19) before the ark

³⁴ For literary-critical analysis, cf. Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 37–123; recent research tends to assume that the motif of Korah’s rebellion was intertwined with the narrative on a rebellion of 250 *nesi’im*; cf. Christoph Berner, “Vom Aufstand Datans und Abirams zum Aufbegehren der 250 Männer. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Anfängen der literarischen Genese von Num 16–17,” *BN* 150 (2012): 9–33; Katharina Pyschny, *Verhandelte Führung. Eine Analyse von Num 16–17 im Kontext der neueren Pentateuchforschung*, HBS 88 (Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2017).

as a symbol of their authority, Aaron's staff brings forth sprouts and blossoms of Almonds (שקדים, v. 18). From Jeremiah 1:11–12 the symbol of the blossoming almond branch is a traditional symbol for Yhwh watching his people (שקד); it seems that the prophetic connotation and the political context have been transferred to the Aaronide high priest in the legend of Numbers 17: He represents the highest authority in the assembly of Israel in religious and in political perspective; he represents Yhwh's watchfulness even over the prophetic tradition.

The Aaron legend of the older layers of the Priestly Code was worked out to confirm the high priest in his succession as the *highest legal authority* in the congregation of Israel ('edah, עדה). The general assembly of the people (qahal, קהל)³⁵ was subordinate to the assembly of the people as a religious community ('edah).³⁶ Since there is no anointed king (משיח), the high priest is the highest and only anointed authority in the society of the Second Temple.³⁷ His vestments express a divine kingly authority. The high priest's turban (Exod 28:40) is designated with a *diadem of the sanctuary* (נזר הקדש); as a representation of Zion, cf. Isa 61:10); he and his sons should, according to the Pentateuch *torah*, be the only anointed authorities (Exod 28:41; 29:7–9; 30:31–33; Lev 9:8–12; Isa 61:1). The clothes for the priestly investiture resemble, on the other hand, a series of symbols that represent Israel before God (Exod 28:12, 29).³⁸ He wears a breastplate as a symbol for the *highest authority over ordeals and the law* (חשן המשפט, Exod 28:30) together with the lots to explore and “obtain God's decision on important questions on which

³⁵ qahal: Deut 5:22; 9:10; 10:4; 18:16; 23:2–9; 31:30; Josh 8:35; 1 Kgs 8:14 as a general term for the assembly of Yhwh's people; in Exod 12:6; Num 14:5 the term is subordinate to the term 'edah (לפני כל קהל עדת בני ישראל); cf. also Lev 4:13, 21; 16:17, 33; 16:3, 33; 17:12; 19:20; 20:6.

³⁶ 'edah: Exod 12:3, 6, 19, 47; 16:1, 2, 9–10, 22; 17:1; 35:20; 34:31; 35:1, 4; 38:25; Lev 4:15; 8:3, 5; 10:6, 17; 16:5; 19:2; Num 1–10; 15; 16–17; 29; 20; 25–35; not in Deuteronomy.

³⁷ Cf. also Isa 61:1–11. The text is a self-proclamation of a person who is “anointed by Yhwh” and bestowed with the “spirit of Lord Yhwh,” i. e., charisma to perform his office and to prove his authority by proclaiming a *derôr*, i. e., a release. The concept of this text is thus clearly connected with an early hierocratic program (cf. Henri Cazelles, “Royaume des prêtres et nation consacrée (Exode 19,6) in: “*Humanisme et foi chrétienne*”: *Mélanges scientifique de l'Institut Catholique Paris*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser / Yves Marchasson, Paris: Beauchesne 1976, 541–545; Pierre Grélot, “Sur Isaïe LXI: la première consécration d'un grand prêtre, (RB 97, Leuven 1990, 414–431; R. Achenbach, “König, Priester und Prophet. Zur Transformation der Konzepte der Herrschafts-legitimation in Jesaja 61,” in: R. Achenbach – Martin Arneith – Eckart Otto, *Tora in der Hebräischen Bibel. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte und synchronen Logik diachroner Transformationen* (BZAR 7 – Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2007, 196–244).

³⁸ In Isa 61:10 the anointed thus appears “like a bridegroom adorned with a turban,” i. e., a representative of the (divine) royal authority with respect to the congregation who is addressed as “priests of Yhwh” and “servants of our God” (v. 6), and – at the same time – “like a bride bedecked with her finery,” the anointed is a representative of Zion with respect to Yhwh.

human judgment was found inadequate, such as military actions, allocation of land, legal verdicts in the absence of evidence, and choice of leaders”³⁹ They are called *urîm* and *tummim* (Exod 28:30; Lev 8:8), possibly representing a symbol for lights (אור > אורים) and for perfection and integrity (תמים / תם > תמים). They express the will of Yhwh as the creator of light (Gen 1:3–5, 18) and the origins of blessings (Num 6:23–27) and life (Ps 36:10), and as the God of complete revelation (תמים, Deut 31:24, 30), who has power to watch over integrity and righteousness (Gen 6:9: נוח איש צדיק תמים) and to determine the end of life (Num 14:35; 17:28; 32:13). The application of the lots in preexilic contexts is mentioned in 1 Sam 14:41 (LXX*) and 2 Sam 28:6 in the context of *divination* during war. In the context of the late priestly reworking of Numbers they mark out a decisive function because it is Eleazar the high priest who seeks the decision of the *urîm* and *tummim* before Yhwh in situations of war and – more importantly – the division of the land, that is, the irrevocable inheritance of land for Israelite families. In remembrance of the postexilic history the administration of *urîm* and *tummim* was decisive for all Jewish rights of personal possession and heritage (cf. Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65). According to Numbers 20:28–29, immediately after the death of Aaron, the vestments were handed over to his next eldest son Eleazar. In the priestly legend about a legal case that intends revising the laws of inheritance (Num 27:1–11), the place of negotiations of the highest court is before the sanctuary in its function as the Tent of Meeting. The court is the full assembly of the congregation – of the *‘edah* (כל העדה) – all its representatives (לפני הנשיאים), presided over by Moses and Eleazar the high priest. The divine decision is requested and proclaimed by Moses.

The subsequent part of the narrative reflects on Joshua’s succession again.⁴⁰ The designation of Joshua is described in several steps. Yhwh commands Moses to single out Joshua as a person qualified with special charisma and an inspired man (רוח בן, Num 27:18). In the ritual, he has to stand before Eleazar and the congregation, who have to witness the act (v. 19). Moses must lay his hands upon him (v. 23) and transfer a part of his authority to him (ונתתה מהידן אליו, v. 20a), so that the community will obey him. By this act he is filled with a “spirit of wisdom” (רוח חכמה, Deut 34:9) and qualified as a political leader. But when he has to make

³⁹ Jeffrey H. Tigay, “Exodus,” in *The Jewish Study Bible*, ed. Adele Berlin, Marc Zvi Brettler and Michael Fishbane (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 102–202, here 172–73, with references to Num 27:21; 1 Sam 14:37–42; Ezra 2:63; Exod 22:8; Josh 7:14–18; Judg 1:1–2; 20:18; 1 Sam 10; 20–22; 2 Sam 2:1; 5:23–24.

⁴⁰ There are four versions of a succession story for Joshua: in Josh 1:1–6* (dtr. reworking of a pre-dtr version); in Deut 31:7–8 (dtr.) with a *Fortschreibung* of the Hexateuch redactor (Deut 31:9–13*); a *Fortschreibung* of the Pentateuch redaction (Deut 31:14–15, 23); and a late priestly version by the ThR (Num 27:12–23; Deut 34:9).

decisions, he is obliged to request the divine decision first from Eleazar the priest via the “legal decision by *urîm* before Yhwh” (ושאל לו במשפט האורים לפני יהוה) (v. 21a). This will impact all his undertakings in times of peace and war (v. 21b), and this will concern especially the decisions about the allotment of land and inheritance in Israel (Num 34:16–17). The role to augur divine decisions and thus to assign ultimate authority in lawsuits and to answer questions of law and justice has not been transferred to Joshua, but to Eleazar – and thus to the high priest.

The institutional power is specifically represented by the legend of a portable shrine, where cultic, ritual, and legal activities can be performed. Therefore, the theocratic reworking of the Pentateuch identified the Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד) with the desert shrine (משכן).⁴¹ These editors also assumed that priests and Levites had transported the shrine through the desert during the forty years and had brought it into the promised land (Num 1–10*, 15–19*, 26–31, 33–35). The idea of already recognising the priestly institutions as a fundamental part of Israel’s constitution from the beginning led to the narrative not only of the wandering *kabôd* of Yhwh, but also of a wandering *sanctuary*.

In Chronicles, the identification of the divine dwelling (משכן) with the Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד) is connected with the temple building in the rules of the temple offices in 1 Chronicles 6:16–17:

16 “These are the persons whom David put in charge of the service of song in the temple of Yhwh (בית יהוה), after the ark came to rest (ממנוח הארון),⁴² 17 that they ministered with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting (משכן אהל מועד) ...”⁴³

They believe that the final resting place of the ark before it was transferred to Jerusalem was Gibeon (1 Chr 16:39; 21:29), because according to 1 Kings 3:4 Solomon had brought sacrifices there and Yhwh appeared to him (cf. also 1 Kgs 9:2). Chronicles does not mention the former sanctuary in Shiloh, which had become unclean because of the wicked priests (1 Sam 1:3, 9, 24; 2:14–4:12; 14:3; 1 Kgs 2:27). According to 2 Chronicles 1:3, 13, after Solomon became king, he visited the sanctuary of the “Tent of Meeting, which Moses the servant of Yhwh had made in the wilderness” there. Before Solomon had built the temple as a permanent house, Yhwh had been worshiped in several tent sanctuaries (1 Chr 17:5 וממשכן אל-אהל). When the ark was transferred to Jerusalem, the *mishkan* remained in Gibeon, so

⁴¹ Cf. Reinhard Achenbach, “*Mishkan* – ‘*Arôn* – ‘*Ohael Mo’ed*. Concepts of Divine Presence in the Pentateuch,” ZAR 23 (2017): 151–61.

⁴² Cf. Num 10:33.

⁴³ LXX confuses the functions once again, translating with ἐναντίον τῆς σκηνῆς οἴκου μαρτυρίου “before the tent of the house of witness”.

that the obligatory offerings could be offered (1 Chr 16:37–40). The Levites continued their service as guardians at the entrance of the tent, where the ark is placed (1 Chr 9:19–35), as they did before under the surveillance of Phineas ben Eleazar (1 Chr 9:20: ופינחס בן אלעזר נגיד היה עליהם לפנים יהוה עמו). Even descendants of Korah are found among them (v. 19), corresponding to the remark in Numbers 26:9 that “the sons of Korah did not die.” In order to harmonise 2 Sam 6:17–19 and the narrative of Numbers, the Chronicler assumes that David had prepared a separate tent for the ark (1 Chr 15:1), where burnt offerings and *shelamîm* were brought before God after the transfer had been completed (1 Chr 16:1–3//2 Sam 6:17–19). Chronicles thus takes up the motifs of the theocratic reworking (ThR) in Numbers and tries to harmonise them with the dtr texts, that had already been reworked by ThR, rewriting and continuing Dtr in *Fortschreibung* from the perspective of ThR. With respect to the orders of offices in the Second Temple during the late Persian period, the roles of the Levite take on renewed weight.⁴⁴

In the ancient dtr report on the consecration of Solomon’s temple, the priests bore the ark from David’s tent into the building and deposited it beneath the throne of cherubim that served as symbol for divine presence (1 Kgs 8:3b, 6). Late priestly scribes inserted 1 Kings 8:4,6 (קדש הקדשים / ברית יהוה) and vv. 10b–11 with respect to Exod 40:34–35, bringing in late elements from the late priestly narrative of the ThR.⁴⁵ Since, according to Numbers 4:15, 19b, the Aaronide priests are responsible for organising the duties for each Levitical unit, priests and Levites are responsible for the transport of the tabernacle (1 Kgs 8:4b). The priests take care that the other Levites do not touch the holy artifact, and they take care of the holy oil and the Menorah (Num 4:16), but the Levites have to bear the ark and the *mishkan* (Num 4:15b, 17–33). And since they had guarded the ark while the *mishkan* had remained in Gibeon, Chronicles assigns the responsibility for bearing it to them (2 Chr 4:4b). However, since the holy vessels are in the hands of the priests, it is the common responsibility of all “the levitical priests”, הכהנים הלויים, Zadokites and Levites (Ezek 44:15), to bring everything up into the temple building (2 Chr 4:4b, leaves out the *waw*, but is corrected again in several manuscripts).

⁴⁴ Gary N. Knoppers, “Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of Israelite Priesthood,” *JBL* 118 (1999), 49–72. For a closer discussion, cf. Jaeyoung Jeon, “The Priestly Tent of Meeting in Chronicles: Pro-Priestly or Anti-Priestly?” *JHS* 18, Article #7 (DOI:10.5508/jhs.2018.v18.a7). Jeon assumes continuous conflicts between Zadokites and Levites. Cf. Jaeyoung Jeon, “The Zadokite and Levite Scribal Conflicts and Hegemonic Struggles,” in *Scripture as Social Discourse: Social-Scientific Perspectives on Early Jewish and Christian Writings*, ed. Todd Klutz et al. (New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 97–110.

⁴⁵ Achenbach, “Der Pentateuch,” 225–54. See also Albertz, *Die kanonische Anpassung des Josuabuches*, 199–216.

1 Kgs 8:3b–4, 6, 10b–11⁴⁶

2 Chr 5:4b–5, 7, 13b, 14

3 ... וישאו הכהנים את־הארון	4 ... וישאו הלויים את הארון
4 ויעלו את ארון יהוה ואת אהל מועד	5 ויעלו את ארון ואת אהל מועד
ואת כל כלי הקדש אשר באהל	ואת כל כלי הקדש אשר באהל
ויעלו אתם הכהנים והלויים ...	העלו אתם הכהנים והלויים ⁴⁷
6 ויבאו הכהנים את ארון	7 ויבאו הכהנים את ארון ברית יהוה
ברית יהוה	
אל דביר הבית אל קדש הקדשים אל מקומו	אל מקומו אל דביר הבית אל קדש הקדשים
אל תחת כנפי הכרובים	אל תחת כנפי הכרובים
10 ... והענן מלא את בית יהוה	13 ... והבית מלא ענן בית יהוה
11 ולא יכלו הכהנים לעמד לשרת מפני הענן	14 ולא יכלו הכהנים לעמוד לשרת מפני הענן
כי מלא כבוד יהוה את בית יהוה	כי מלא כבוד יהוה את בית האלהים

When the temple was finished, the office of the Levites to transport the ark according to Numbers 4 ceases (1 Chr 23:16). Now the temple is the dwelling of Yhwh (2 Chr 1:5), even when the Israelites turn their faces away from it (2 Chr 29:6).

Chronicles takes up issues from ThR in Numbers and thus documents further scribal reception and debate, as Hans-Peter Mathys has already shown.⁴⁷ The position of the Levites is under on-going debate in Chronicles (cf. Num 18:3–4; 2 Chr 29:16, 34; 30:16; 35:11), and the Chronicler even added to the descriptions of Levitical tasks at *Pesach* (2 Chr 30:16; 35:11). Second Chronicles 30:2, 15 are the only other texts where the rules on a second *Pesach* (Numbers 9:10–13) are referred to in the Hebrew Bible. Levites not only receive the tithes (cf. Num 18:21–24), but also guard and administer them (2 Chr 31:11–13).

In his work on Torah in Chronicles, Lars Maskow has described how this narrative was received and expounded in Chronicles.⁴⁸ Here the Levitical genealogies, the sanctuary, the ark, the holy vessels, and the cultic calendar were transferred into the narratives received from the already reworked dtr tradition and described in further detail. The proto-Chronistic theocratic reworking of the Pentateuch led to the first extensive and complete work of “Rewritten Bible” in the book of Chronicles.

⁴⁶ 1 Kgs 8:4 is missing in LXX. In v. 6 אל קדש הקדשים is missing in LXX. And instead of ארון ברית יהוה in v.6, LXX only had הארון in its *Vorlage*, and instead of יהוה בית just הבית, v. 10b, 11b.

⁴⁷ Mathys, “Numeri and Chronik,” n. 10, 20.

⁴⁸ Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 239–550; on “Kult-Personal”, 240–334, “Kult-Gegenstand”, 335–384; “Kult-Kalender”, 477–542.