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Abstract

As the title implies, this thesis aims at identifying who the “prophet like Moses”, promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, is. This thesis first of all studies the wider context of the text of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, and seeks to identify the Sitz im Leben in which this text was written. Then, it analyses the figure of Moses and the traditions surrounding his person. Sifting through the layers of traditions, this work concludes that it was indeed the Deuteronomistic School, late during the Babylonian Exile, that vested Moses with the prophetic garb. The intention was to create strong propaganda in favour of the great prophets of the past, who after all, were proven right when they foresaw and foretold the Exile. With this background in mind the author of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 sought to give authority to the prophets by aetiological tracing the origins of prophecy back to the Sinai/Horeb Covenant, where the people explicitly called for Moses to mediate for them. In short, Moses was the one to receive the ultimate revelation of God, the one who spoke with YHWH face to face, indeed, mouth to mouth. The Torah was revealed once, but it had to be interpreted and applied. It would then be the task of the prophets to continue interpreting and applying the Torah to the concrete evolving situations within the life of the community, much like Moses used to do in Exodus 18:15-16. The exegesis of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 reveals that the text underwent various stages of development. Built upon an older to’ebah law prohibiting the offices, which was probably part of Urdeuteronomium, the Deuteronomistic author extended and transformed this law into the Deuteronomic law of the prophets. This law, together with the other laws of offices running from Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 and penned towards the end of the Exile, aimed at reforming the offices of power, setting clear criteria for when the return into the Land would occur. Deuteronomy 18:15 and 18 promise a “prophet like Moses”. This study concludes that the syntax of the text implies that Moses was the first within a line of prophets. Every other authentic prophet in Israel would fall within the title “prophet like Moses”. Whilst this is true, the strong parallels that exist between the texts of Deuteronomy 18:18, Jeremiah 1:7,9, and Exodus 3-4, show that there was a clear redactional intention in depicting Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses” par excellence. As this study shows, the correspondence between the divine affirmation of the prophetic word within the pun of Jeremiah’s first vision (Jer 1:11-12), as well as the
very peculiar criterion of prophetic verification of Deuteronomy 18:21-22, seem to corroborate this conclusion. Jeremiah was the prophet to foretell the Exile, and thus was the authentic prophet. I conclude that the texts of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, Jeremiah 1:4-12, and Exodus 3-4, evolved contemporaneously, all within the efforts of the Deuteronomists to form a strong propaganda in favour of the prophets, whom the people must heed, if they are ever to be successful. Within this propaganda, we can say that Moses was the first and Jeremiah, the “prophet like Moses” par excellence, was the “last” prophet of what we can call the “Deuteronomistic Library”, with the rest of the prophets, all “prophets like Moses” towing the line.
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Introduction
0.0 Introductory Remarks

It is common knowledge that the person of Moses has always been and will always remain the central figure in Judaism. Consequently, being such a central figure, the importance of the “prophet like Moses” promised in Deuteronomy 18:15 and 18, appears to have grown in both Jewish as well as Christian theology. From an apparent reference to a line of prophets, the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15 and 18 slowly started being interpreted into the promise of the future coming of the eschatological “prophet like Moses”. Christianity on the other hand, started seeing this promise as fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ (Acts 7:2-53), who in the New Testament emerges as the “New Moses”. With this study, I intend to analyse the relevance and importance of the “prophet like Moses” within the Hebrew Scriptures, hopefully being able to identify, who this “prophet like Moses” was in the Hebrew Scriptures.

0.1 Aims and Scope

The scope of this thesis is the close study of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, whilst also analysing the relevant texts which have a bearing on its interpretation. The thesis will also study intertextual links between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and other texts that were authored or redacted in a way to create allusions to this text.

My aim in this thesis, as the title implies, will be to identify the “prophet like Moses”, within the Hebrew Scriptures. I aim at identifying the various roles of Moses, and specify whether such roles pertained to the “Historical Moses” or to the “Literary Moses”, namely, whether they were actually roles held by Moses, or else whether they were later attributed to Moses through redactional activity. I obviously focus my greatest attention on the role of Moses as prophet. Through an exegetical study of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 in chapter 4, I intend to detect the intention/s of the author/redactor, particularly as regards the identity of the “prophet like Moses”.

0.2 Method and Sources

The method used in this study is that of the Historical Critical Method. This is particularly important since this method enables us to work at identifying the *intentio auctoris* and *intentio redactoris*.\(^1\) This will also be supplemented with a thorough analysis of the development of traditions along the years. My studies, as well as those of others, have also shown that there are strong intertextual connections between many key texts that are relevant to my study, the most notable being between Deuteronomy 18:18; Jeremiah 1:4-9; and Exodus 3-4; connections that can be considered as allusions, sometimes even as a promise-fulfilment relation. The Historical Critical Method is therefore supplemented with an intertextual analysis, to identify the relationship and influence that exists between these texts. This proves invaluable, particularly at identifying the *intentio redactoris*. As sources I have used the BHS, and for the Hebrew quotes within this thesis I have used BibleWorks version 8.0.013z.1. Wherever deemed useful, I used the LXX and the Targums.\(^2\) In this study I also use the Qumran texts as published in DJD. The Qumran texts have proven invaluable for the study of the development in the late eschatological understanding of the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18.

0.2.1 Terminology

This study inevitably deals extensively with deuteronomistic traditions. It is a well-known fact among scholars that there is a “Babel-like confusion” as regards the terminology and its use surrounding the so-called Deuteronomistic History.\(^3\) I retain that it is essential at this point to distinguish between the terms “deuteronomistic

---


\(^2\) For the LXX I used Rahlfs – HANHART, *Septuaginta*, editio altera, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, Stuttgart 2006, whereas for the Targums, I used BibleWorks.

redaction”, Deuteronomistic History, and the Deuteronomistic School, since they form the basis for any studies on Deuteronomistic Literature. Unfortunately their use was not uniform among scholars and the same terminology is often understood differently.

Together with many other scholars, I retain that the so-called Deuteronomistic History is the work of many hands and not one, so with the Deuteronomistic School, I understand a scribal guild beginning in the 7th century B.C.E. working well into the exilic and Persian periods that authored, preserved, and reinterpreted earlier material, such as the preaching of Jeremiah and the prophets, the earlier forms of Deuteronomy and the laws therein from the time of the kings, according to their theological perspective. With deuteronomistic work I understand the compilation of the history, as well as the process of reinterpretation and redactional work, carried out according to this literary tradition. With the terms “Deuteronomists” I understand the members of this scribal guild or Deuteronomistic School. With the term “Deuteronomistic History”, I understand the compilation of the Deuteronomistic School extending from Joshua to 2 Kings. With “deuteronomistic redaction” I understand the redactive work of the Deuteronomistic School on certain individual texts of the Hebrew Bible. Such a distinction is very important particularly when discussing the layers of Deuteronomy where we distinguish the original deuteronomistic layer (Urdeuteronomium) from the deuteronomistic one, comprised of the various additions and later retouches of the Deuteronomistic School.

---

4 “It is a condition sine qua non to determine exactly what is meant when talking about the Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic literature that is used as the frame of reference”. See Ausloos, “Les extrêmes se touchent”, 347.

5 Following the lack of consensus among scholars I follow Person who underlines the importance that one qualifies the terms he uses in his work. “Whether one chooses to coin some new term to refer to the individual(s) behind the Deuteronomic History (or sections of the Deuteronomic History) or chooses to continue to use “Deuteronomic” and/or “Deuteronomistic”, it is especially clear that one must define one’s terms well to enable readers to fully understand one’s work”. See PERSON, The Deuteronomic School, 6.

6 The term Deuteronomistic History was coined by Noth. He understood the books from Joshua – 2 Kings, as being a literary unit which he called Deuteronomistic History, because these books were composed, with the laws of Deuteronomy in the background. As we shall see, many scholars continued to work with Noth’s hypothesis. What was once an unshakeable theory, has today been questioned extensively! Today scholars no longer see Josh-2 Kings as a single literary unit, but rather, as a collection of narratives, that do contain deuteronomistic overtones. I therefore choose to use the term Deuteronomistic History when referring to Josh-2 Kings. We shall discuss these issues in more detail in chapter 1.

7 Römer, together with other contemporary scholars, is of the idea that the deuteronomistic editing of the old deuteronomic law code is more pervasive than it was previously thought. He calls such editing: “deuteronomistic Deuteronomy”. See THOMAS CHRISTIAN RÖMER, “Deuteronomy in Search of Origins”, in Reconsidering Israel and Judah, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2000, 112.
0.2.2 The Historicity of Moses

Whilst this work is not a quest for the historical Moses, I inevitably had to deal with Moses as a historical figure. This is dealt with extensively in Chapter 2, where I distinguish between the Historical Moses and the Literary Moses. Indeed, some scholars retain that such a distinction is impossible to achieve, because the Historical Moses is forever lost under the countless layers of tradition. Van Seters in fact claims: “The quest for the historical Moses is a futile exercise. He now only belongs to legend”.8 I nevertheless attempt such a study, as I do consider that our texts have something historical to tell us. Countless scholars have negated the historicity of the Exodus and of Moses altogether, even though these are surrounded by very strong traditions within the Hebrew Scriptures themselves. My underlying presupposition is that Moses existed, and that the Exodus event did indeed occur, no matter how it actually took place, and that our texts build upon this basic historical kernel. The biblical text, as well as other sources, such as extra-biblical texts and the field of biblical archaeology, can aid in getting an historical glimpse, however small that might be. In this thesis then, I shall be sifting through the various layers of tradition which embellished Moses’ figure to the point of presenting him as the epitome of every Jewish institution.

0.3 A Brief Literature Review

As concerns the status questionis, I shall deal extensively with each author in the course of this study. Here I only present a very brief summary of what has been proposed so far:

The issue of the “prophet like Moses”, has been studied in a few articles and monographs. Two particular monographs that deal with this subject are Jeffrey Stackert’s A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion,9 and Havilah

Dharamraj’s *A Prophet like Moses? A Narrative-Theological Reading of the Elijah Stories*. Stackert’s main aim is to study the relationship between law and prophecy. As a Neo-Documentarian, he accepts the documentary hypothesis and works extensively in identifying how each pentateuchal source identified Moses as a prophet and how each worked on underlining the importance of law over prophecy. Dharamraj presents a monograph which studies the Elijah stories, especially the extensive parallels that can be observed between Elijah and Moses. Given these parallels, Dharamraj suggests that Elijah could very well be the promised “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18.

Within the list of candidates for the “prophet like Moses”, some scholars suggest that we also find female prophets. The studies conducted are not many. Most probably, these prophetesses could be considered as prophets like Moses, inasmuch as they form part of the list of the prophets who came after Moses. Bruce Herzberg made a detailed study of the parallels that exist between Deborah and Moses. He argues that it was very likely that Deborah was seen as the “prophet like Moses” of her time. Hugh Williamson studies the parallel between Deborah and Huldah, and also their link with Moses. He focuses on a rather overlooked parallel between Judges 4:4-5 and 2 Kings 22:14, that seems to betray a late deuteronomistic redaction. Apparently the narrative presenting Deborah as prophetess appears to be secondary to the narrative, and heavily dependent on that of Huldah, most probably coming from the hands of a deuteronomistic redactor and there, as the prophetess consulted by King Josiah, she appears to be presented in the vestige of the “prophet like Moses”. Williamson

---


11 In short, he concludes that the E source gave absolute precedence to the Law and thus considered Moses as the first and last prophet of Israel (Stackert, *A Prophet like Moses*, 70-125). The D source on its part re-interpreted E’s position by “redeeming” the prophets, seeking to accommodate both law and prophecy. According to Stackert, D reinterprets E’s Deuteronomy 34:10-12, concluding that the incomparability of Moses stated there allows for the prophets coming after Moses to be prophets similar to, but nowhere equal to, Moses (Ibid, 126-167). He concludes that P goes even further than E, by eliminating prophecy, and imagining a world where prophecy does not even exist. P does consider Moses as a prophet, “yet because Moses stands so exceptionally outside of P’s religious system, he poses no threat to it” (Ibid, 169-190, 192). J portrays Moses as prophet, however, since its main aim was presenting Israel’s history, it did not focus on either prophecy or law (Ibid, 191, 193).


13 Ibid, 33.

suggests that there seems to be a clear effort by the Deuteronomist to link these two prophetesses with the “prophet like Moses”.

Mark Leuchter studies the parallels between Moses and Samuel, especially where leadership, intercession, and prophetic teaching is concerned. He argues that these parallels were drawn within the tenth century context, to establish priestly supremacy within the sanctuary at Shiloh, and to address the abuses of Eli’s sons within that same sanctuary. This tradition survived in Psalms 99:6. Leuchter argues that these parallels were then assimilated by the Deuteronomistic School in an attempt to present Samuel as a “prophet like Moses”, thus giving authority to the prophets, presenting them as a united front.15

In his doctoral thesis, Blažej Štrba makes an exegetical study of Joshua 5:13-15. In chapter 4 of his work, he suggests that Joshua is the “incomparable prophet like Moses”, arguing that the formula of incomparability of Deuteronomy 34:9-12, syntactically refers to Joshua and not Moses.16 Barstad too concludes that Joshua is the “prophet like Moses”. He argues that Deuteronomy is the last essential revelation of YHWH, and thus he interprets the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15 as a one-time phenomenon that does not refer to a series of prophets, but rather refers specifically to the direct successor of Moses.17

In his article, Meindert Dijkstra18 suggests that Amos is being presented as a “prophet like Moses”, especially in the way Amos defends himself from Amaziah in Amos 7:9-17. Dijkstra sees a strong parallel with Moses’ call narrative in Exodus 3-4. However, as we shall see, if indeed Exodus 3-4 are very late, as many commentators today contend, this direction of influence would not be possible, since the book of Amos was written at a much earlier date.

Martin O’Kane observes that what Moses predicts in his song in Deuteronomy 31:30-32:44 is fulfilled in the narrative of 2 Kings 21. According to O’Kane, Isaiah is

---

presented in the narrative sequence of 2 Kings 17:13 and 2 Kings 21:10 as the “authoritative successor of Moses”. Alphonso Groenewald studies the parallels between the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 31, and Isaiah 1:2-3. He concludes that the opening words in Isaiah 1:2-3 recall Moses’ words in Deuteronomy, and were presented by the compilers of the book of Isaiah who wished to present Isaiah as someone who repeats Moses’ Torah and applies it in a new setting.

Georg Fischer named his anthology of studies on Jeremiah as Der Prophet wie Mose. The fact that he used the definite article implies that he interprets Jeremiah as being “the prophet like Moses” promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. As he explains in the preface, the prophet Jeremiah is presented as God’s promised prophet, as is evidenced by the strict parallel that exists between Jeremiah 1:7, 9, and Deuteronomy 18:18. Unfortunately Fischer does not elaborate on this parallel. These parallels have been studied extensively by Holladay and Broughton. However, both scholars argue that Deuteronomy 18 was part of Urdeuteronomium, and therefore such a text served as the background for Jeremiah’s self-understanding. The same conclusion is reached by Lundbom in his recent book Jeremiah: Prophet like Moses. Commenting on Jeremiah’s call narrative, he too concludes that the prophet’s own self-understanding was built upon the figure of Moses. Lundbom considers Deuteronomy 18:18 to have been written in the late monarchy, the period when Moses too “had become” a prophet. He argues that Jeremiah understood himself as this “prophet like Moses”. I study these issues extensively in chapter five, arguing that Jeremiah 1 and Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, were both developed contemporaneously by the same deuteronomistic redactor.

---

Ezekiel too has been suggested as being the “prophet like Moses”. Risa Levitt Kohn in an article\textsuperscript{25} studies the P and D materials in the book of Ezekiel. It is clear that Ezekiel was acquainted with the priestly Torah, and clearly shows that he knows it, quotes it, and also, at times, modifies it. Yet it is also clear that Ezekiel draws from deuteronomistic terminology as well. It is apparent that the prophet’s retelling of Israel’s history in Ezekiel 20 shows him to be well versed in the sources that made up the redacted Torah. The D and P materials used in Ezekiel were not simply imitated, but rather integrated, and used in a way as to create a parallel with Moses.\textsuperscript{26} Heather Mckeating argues that the redactors who organised the P and D materials in the book wanted to convey that Ezekiel was a Moses figure: “whether these organisers connected him specifically with Deuteronomy 18:15 and with the “prophet like Moses” who is mentioned there we cannot say. That they saw him as a “prophet like Moses” seems very certain”.\textsuperscript{27}

0.4 Structure

This study is divided into five chapters. In chapter 1, I lay the foundations for the rest of this work. In fact, any serious textual interpretation has to take into account the context of the text. Every text has in reality two contexts, the immediate context and the wider context. As a starting point I therefore set out to identify these contexts. As already mentioned above, Deuteronomy 18:9-22 forms part of the legislative body called the Deuteronomic Laws of Office (Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22). This is the immediate context. As we shall see below, Deuteronomy has a particular literary and theological relation between the block Genesis – Numbers and Joshua – 2 Kings. This is the wider context. If it is true that Deuteronomy functions as a prism that filters the old traditions of the so-called Tetrateuch and gives them a deuteronomic stamp under

\textsuperscript{25} RISA LEVITT KOHN, “A Prophet Like Moses?: Rethinking Ezekiel’s Relationship to the Torah”, \textit{ZAW} 114 (2002) 236-254.
which they appear in the succeeding books, can we say that Moses’ figure underwent the same filtering through Deuteronomy’s prism?

In chapter 2, I focus on the figure of Moses, identifying the various roles that Moses is given within the Pentateuch. It is evident that throughout the years Moses as a figure increased in importance, and he thus became the central figure in Judaism. As such therefore, traditions started making Moses the prototype and epitome of every Jewish institution, especially the more important ones such as those of the prophet, priest, and king. As stated above, I seek to distinguish between the historical and literary Moses, and within the obvious limits, I seek to understand which roles pertained to the historical Moses, and which were assigned to him on the literary level. Chapter 3 deals with the issue of what constitutes a prophet, and in what way can Moses be considered a prophet. Whilst Moses, as the great mediator between God and Israel, as well as the great intercessor of his people, has every credential to be considered a prophet, the Pentateuch never explicitly calls Moses a prophet. There are however some late texts which implicitly imply that Moses was considered a prophet. This fact alone helps us conclude that “Moses the prophet” is a later literary construct, rather than an historical fact.

In chapter 4 I seek to work out the intentio auctoris of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, by doing a thorough exegetical study of the text. It emerges, that the first part of the law of the prophets (Deut 18:9-13) dealt with a to’eba law, namely, the interdiction of divinatory practices. Most probably this law was part of Urdeuteronomium. This law was probably the first step in presenting in verse 15 prophecy as the only alternative to such practices, and was subsequently expanded by two further deuteronomistic redactions. The Sitz im Leben for these deuteronomistic redactions is the late Exile. At this time, the to’eba law was redacted into the law of the prophets (Deut 18:9-22) and as such added with the Deuteronomic laws of offices extending from Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22. The aim of such work was that of legislating a law controlling the important offices of judges, priests, kings, and prophets, who would

eventually guide the community when they would return in the Land. The syntax, as well as the exegesis of the text, made evident that the author/redactor of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, had a particular intention of presenting each and every prophet of Israel as the legitimate successor of Moses, and hence, each prophet of his/her time was to be considered as a “prophet like Moses”. However, it is very evident, that the same redactor aimed at creating clear allusions and parallels between Moses and Jeremiah through the Deuteronomistic redaction of Exodus 3-4 and Jeremiah 1:4-19. These parallels also aimed at creating a clear pattern of promise/fulfilment between Deuteronomy 18:18 and Jeremiah 1:4-19. These parallels were studied extensively in chapter 5.

Chapter 5 presents a study on those prophets who were apparently being presented by the redactors of their books as “prophets like Moses”. Whereas in chapter 4 it became evident, that strictly speaking, each prophet of his/her time was indeed, a “prophet like Moses”, in this chapter I study those prophets whose narratives or books were redacted in such a way to present them as “prophets like Moses”. In the light of the parallels that exist between Moses and the particular prophet in question, I seek to identify whether indeed, the redactor had a particular agenda in presenting his prophet as “the prophet like Moses”. Various scholars have already noticed that there are most obvious parallels between Jeremiah 1:7, 9 and Deuteronomy 18:18, and that there are allusions to the call of Moses in Ex 3–4. There is clear evidence that the hand of the deuteronomistic redactor was at work in these texts. I contend that the late exilic/early post-exilic deuteronomistic redactor wanted to make Moses a prophet. That way, this redactor could have presented his propaganda through Jeremiah, his champion prophet. The book of Jeremiah is in fact the book that most underwent heavy deuteronomistic redaction. I contend that these texts evolved together within the work of the Deuteronomistic School that sought to create a propaganda to give authority to the prophets, who were considered the authentic interpreters of the Torah.

0.5 Conclusion

Having given a brief overview of this work, as concerns aims, method, and outline, I now set off to lay the foundations for this whole thesis. In the next chapter I
shall study the immediate context of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, and the place and function which this pericope holds within the book of Deuteronomy. The wider context, namely the Pentateuch, will also be studied, in which Moses emerges as protagonist, and the so-called Deuteronomistic History, where the “prophet like Moses” becomes a very important figure.
Chapter 1 – Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History
1.0 Introduction

In this chapter we shall analyse the wider context of our text. Indeed, if Moses is the human protagonist within the Pentateuch, the “prophet like Moses” is expected to be a similar protagonist within the Former and the Latter Prophets. This chapter therefore, seeks to identify the background against which Deuteronomy 18:9-22 was authored and redacted.

1.1 The Formation of the Pentateuch

As Thomas Römer puts it: “Were somebody able to describe in a comprehensive way the present state of pentateuchal debate in a couple of pages, he should be given an award for scientific conciseness.”¹ It is neither my aim nor the scope of this work to accomplish such a feat. In this section, I shall therefore offer just some presuppositions that lie at the basis of this work. There is widespread agreement that the Pentateuch had a long history of formation and that it took its present form in the Persian period.² The current state of the various proposals as to the formation of the Pentateuch is quite vast and intricate.³

Scholars today agree that Wellhausen’s documentary hypothesis is long past.⁴ There are however, Neo-Documentarians, such as Joel Baden, who strongly defend the documentary hypothesis today.⁵ It is very unfortunate that scholars use a “war-

---

like” language when describing the disputes between the so-called “documentarians” and “anti-documentarians”. In reality, these disputes would only be the case if the Documentary Hypothesis and the Supplementary/Fragmentary Hypothesis were to be considered as mutually exclusive alternatives. Konrad Schmid in fact makes a very pertinent observation that European scholarship never aimed at overthrowing the Documentary Hypothesis, but only at trying to explain the origins of the Pentateuch. At the end of the day, as Schmid notes: “in the current European discussion nearly everyone considers P a source document”. Wellhausen himself had noted that the sources J and E were themselves part of a “multistage history”. J and E were probably augmented and edited several times, and as such, the supplementation hypothesis can be used as subordinate to the documentary hypothesis. Gressman considered J and E as redactors or collectors. Hermann Gunkel argued that the literary collection of the narratives was a long process and the product of many hands. Their sub-sources were based on circulating popular oral traditions, and in this sense are called collections. Schmid concludes: “It is more or less obvious that the Pentateuch includes documents, fragments and supplements”. The majority of scholars today accept that during the exilic period there existed two main redactions which used

---

6 See for example the strong assertions such as “swiftness and force of assault” and “taken up arms”. BADEN, J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch, 1-4.
8 See SCHMID, “Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis?”, 18, and references therein.
10 WELLHAUSEN, Die Composition, 207.
13 GUNKEL, Genesis, 82.
previous sources, namely the D-composition and the P-Composition. For Erhard Blum, the Pentateuch is the result of a historical compromise between these two compositions represented by the two dominant schools, namely the Priestly and the Deuteronomistic schools. Such compromise implies that there was more than one single group of people behind the formation of the Torah. Contemporary scholarship no longer sees P as the final editor of the Pentateuch, as there are texts which appear to be of the post-sacerdotal redaction.

1.1.1 The “Publication” of the Pentateuch

Some consider the Pentateuch/Torah “as an official document that first saw the light of day in the context of the Persian policy known as imperial authorisation.” The theory of imperial authorisation was proposed by Peter Frei. He argues that the Persian Empire had a particular policy of having an individual legislation for every individual province. Such a legislation was compiled by the scribes of the province, who would then present it to the empire for authorisation. The theory proposes that the Pentateuch became the imperial law for every Jew of the Persian Empire. The internal contradictions that are found in the Pentateuch can thus be explained as the compromise reached between the different schools of thought in Judaism of the post-exilic period. Even though extra-biblical evidence is scarce, it is a fact that the biblical accounts of the presentation of the Torah by Ezra seem to be in conformity with the

---

16 BLUM, Studien, 76-88.
17 MICHELANGelo PRIOTTO, Esodo, (=I Libri Biblici, Primo Testamento, 2), Milano: Paoline, 2014, 35. As Priotto notes, the independence of these sources/traditions lies only in the fact that these were not united literally. But at the same time this does not mean that they constituted isolated blocks, which never came into contact with one another. See also SKA, Il cantiere, I, 16-17.
will of the Achaemenid Ruler. However, Frei’s theory is much debated, particularly due to the fact that the extra-biblical evidence presented by Frei is very limited, not clear enough, and none of it is as extensive as the Pentateuch.

Whether one accepts Frei’s theory or not, the majority of scholars are prone to date the combination of the sources of the Pentateuch during the Persian Period, probably through a harmonisation or a fusion between the priestly school, which focused on the Holiness Code and the Torah, and the Deuteronomistic School, which focused on the land. The Priestly school gathered older traditions into a coherent account comprised of the Covenant Code. This process of synthesis was a long and complex one, but it eventually reached its climax in the fifth cent. B.C.E. during the Persian Period. Ultimately, the prevailing tradition in the Pentateuch is that of P, for it gives precedence to the centrality of the Torah. The theme of the land, therefore, becomes secondary and subordinate to God’s ultimate revelation that is the Torah.

1.1.2 Pentateuch? Hexateuch? Or Both?

Some scholars identify the death of Moses in Deuteronomy 34 as a fitting conclusion to the Pentateuch. Others however, consider the promise of the land as a central theme in Genesis –Deut, and therefore tend to include the book of Joshua, which narrates the conquest of the land, thus proposing a Hexateuch. Gerhard von Rad identified various “historical creeds” that according to him were the basic sources for the Yahwist. Such creeds are Deuteronomy 6:20-24; 26:5-9; and Joshua 24:2-13, which he considers to be a “Hexateuch in miniature”. The problem is that these texts

---

21 For arguments and criticism of Frei’s theory, see SKA, Il cantiere, II, 107-108.
are of deuteronomistic origins and therefore are not pre-monarchical. Joshua 24 appears to be disrupting the deuteronomistic transition between Joshua 23 and Judges 2:6ff. Could this be evidence of a “hexateuchal redaction”? Joshua 24 presents Joshua in prophetic terms, where he starts his speech with the prophetic formula: כל ישראל אומר יהוה א. Moreover, in v26 Joshua writes the words spoken in the book of the Law, like Moses does previously. As Römer notes, the redactor of this text wanted to present Joshua as the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15. Eckart Otto concludes that there was actually a “Hexateuchal redaction” and a “Pentateuchal redaction”. Otto observes that these redactions both had their own cardinal theme upon which the Judaism of the Persian Period was based. For the Hexateuchal redaction, the main theme was that of the land whilst for the Pentateuchal redaction the main theme was the Torah. Initially both themes were conflated to form the Hexateuch. However, the land had already been lost once, so for the Judeans of the diaspora the Torah was God’s main gift, and therefore the Torah became the epitome of revelation. It was the Pentateuchal redaction that brought the Pentateuch to a conclusion in Deuteronomy 34 with the death of Moses. “With Moses’ death ended the time of the Torah’s revelation. From then on, the Torah that Moses wrote down the day he died took over his function of mediating between God’s will and his people’s ethos.” It is at this stage that Deuteronomy 34:10 presents Moses’ incomparability.
of the Pentateuchal redactor, seeking to create a hiatus with the succeeding books.\textsuperscript{32} The incomparability of Moses in Deuteronomy 34:10 establishes the Torah as the textual authority of “archetypal prophecy” over and against the other books. It is also interesting to note that in v7 Moses dies in good health at the age of one hundred and twenty years, creating a correspondence with Genesis 6:3, where God restricts human life precisely to one hundred and twenty years.\textsuperscript{33} If we accept that there were such movements behind the formation of the Torah, it becomes apparent that the figure of Moses, and consequently the figure of the “prophet like Moses”, underwent several stages of evolution in the biblical tradition. Identifying such stages is one of the aims of this thesis.

1.1.3 The Question of the Enneateuch

Some scholars propose that Genesis 1 – 2 Kings constitute a single narrative, an Enneateuch.\textsuperscript{34} David Noel Freedman was the most influential when he proposed this idea calling this collection of books “the Primary History of Israel”.\textsuperscript{35} Joseph

\textsuperscript{33} Konrad Schmid, “The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observations on Deuteronomy 34”, in Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E., Oded Lipschits (ed.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007, 241. For Schmid, the “pentateuchal redaction” created strong parallels about the promise of the land between Deuteronomy 34:1-4 and Genesis 12-13, thus giving to the Torah “a prophetic flavour”. IDEM, 244.
\textsuperscript{35} David Noel Freedman, “Pentateuch”, IDB, Vol 3, New York – Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965, 711-727. For Freedman this history, originally contained in an Enneateuch, was only divided later as the last stage into the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets to give the Pentateuch “a unique place of honour and authority in Israel”. For him this linear history is a coherent whole, extending from “the Primeval History” which places Israel in relation with the nations; the Patriarchal narratives, recounting the birth of Israel as a people; the Exodus and desert accounts; the conquest of the land and the subsequent history leading up till the Exile. Abela considers Genesis to be a fitting introduction to this Primary History which, he argues, was penned by a single “creative artist” during the middle of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. The work endows a basic coherence, story-line, plot, thematic evolvement and narrative strategies. The incongruences in the texts are a result of inevitable differences found in the sources of
Blenkinsopp calls it “a consecutive history from creation to the Exile”, a “national history”. Proponents of the Enneateuch face the difficulty in explaining how the Pentateuch was then cut off from the rest of the books. However, it could well be the case that during the Persian Period, when emphasis was laid on the Torah, the Pentateuch could have been cut off from the Enneateuch to be delimited as the Torah. Various arguments have been put forward. Herbert Schmid, Martin Rose and John Van Seters, whilst understanding the Yahwist in very different terms, all consider the Yahwist as a prologue to the Deuteronomistic History. Van Seters bypasses the problem altogether by stating that the Pentateuch was only separated as a composition from the rest of the books in the 1st cent. C.E. “separated in time from the composition of the Pentateuch’s context by perhaps several centuries”. Hans-Christoff Schmitt argues that the concept of the Pentateuch only arose during the Hellenistic Period, when Moses became the only mediator of the Torah. Deuteronomy 34 and Joshua 24, the former aiming at a Pentateuch, the latter at a Hexateuch, remain a problem to the proponents of an Enneateuch. Schmitt tries to solve this problem by considering Deuteronomy 34 and Joshua 24 as transitions, not which the author was well aware.


JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP, The Pentateuch: an Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible, (=ABRL), New York: Doubleday, 1992, 34. “There is little doubt that Pentateuch and Former Prophets may be and at some stage of the tradition were intended to be read as one consecutive history”. ID.EM, 35.


This conclusion is however highly problematic in my opinion. The LXX already gives prominence to the Pentateuch, indicating that by the third century B.C.E. the Pentateuch was already separated from the rest of the books.

JOHN VAN SETERS, The Pentateuch, 16; for him the Yahwist was a comprehensive, unified literary work, extending from the primeval history in Genesis to the death of Moses. It was not intended to exist on its own, but as a prologue to the national history of the deuteronomistic historian. He rejects the idea of multiple sources. See VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 457. Van Seters’ Yahwist has much in common with Blum’s D-Komposition. Van Seters sees them however as fundamentally different. Ibid, 467.

conclusions. Similarly, Schmid argues that Joshua 24 was a pivot aimed at creating two major parts in this primary history, namely the time of salvation, from Genesis up until the conquest, and the time of decline and judgement, from the judges up until the Exile. In his study, Schmid argues that the overarching themes that run from Genesis–2 Kings hint at the existence of an Enneateuch. In my opinion, however, such overarching themes were the result of a narrative compiled by a group of “historians” whom we might call Deuteronomists. Most probably, this narrative aimed at giving a sense of identity to “exilic Israel”, and itself underwent various deuteronomistic redactions.

1.1.4 Concluding Remarks

As things stand, the only canonical reality we possess is the Pentateuch. There are however textual markers in the Pentateuch and outside of it that enable us to propose the historical existence of a Hexateuch. Römer and Brettler conclude:

Two of these corpora, the Tetratuch (followed by the DtrH) and the Hexateuch, are constructions of modern scholarship. But it seems to us that these constructions reflect ancient realities, as reflected in the structure of the final chapters of Deuteronomy and Joshua. Thus, the Tetratuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch debate may not only reflect modern scholarly concerns, but might be a case where these concerns actually mirror those that were played out in the early post-exilic community.

In my opinion, it could well have been the case that initially there was a collection of writings that aimed at reaching a historical theology of the People of Israel, a sort of Enneateuch. At a later stage, namely during the Exile and the early post-exilic period, the need was felt to identify the main constitutive element of

---

44 Schmid highlights vv19-20 where Joshua tells the people that they will ultimately fail to serve YHWH. But as Römer notes, vv19-20 interpret the narrative logic of the people’s commitment. This text, together with the others, which Schmid quotes (Judg 6:7-10; 10:6-16), seem to be late interpolations, added to the text after the Hexateuch was rejected. These texts served to integrate the book of Joshua with the rest of the former prophets. See THOMAS RÖMER, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch,’” *ZAW* 118 (2006) 539.
Judaism thus giving rise to Römer’s Hexateuchal and Pentateuchal Redactions. Or else it could well have been the case that there was a third movement, which through its redactional work, unifying the various narratives through overarching themes, and highly influenced by D, was aiming at the “Primary History” that sought to give an identity to the people in Exile. Whatever these collections of books were called, the terms Hexateuch, Pentateuch, or Enneateuch, are mere “scholarly constructions” which were however proposed thanks to pertinent observations and conclusions drawn from indicators in the texts that all hint at an evolution in the theology and traditions of Israel.

1.2 The Book of Deuteronomy

The Pentateuch presents a comprehensive history of the origins of the universe (Genesis 1–11), and the origins of Israel, which can be further subdivided in the period of the great ancestors (Genesis 12–50), and the birth of the people of Israel (Exodus–Deuteronomy). In this narrative sequence, Deuteronomy is presented as a farewell speech of Moses on the last day of his life where he recounts to the people the laws which they are bound to follow in the land to which YHWH was bringing them. This legal material corresponds to that which was previously received at Mount Sinai in Exodus 20, as is evidenced by the double tradition of the Decalogue, presenting Moses’ speech as an explanation of this Torah. Read in conjunction with Genesis-Numbers, Deuteronomy should therefore be understood as the divine Sinaitic Law’s Mosaic interpretation, whose correspondent trajectory is secured by the two Decalogues. One could even venture to say that the current narrative sequence of events coincides with the actual conditions behind the formation of Deuteronomy, the design of which

46 Ska, Il cantiere, II, 84.

reformulates the “Book of the Covenant” under the guiding principle of cult centralisation.\textsuperscript{48}

Though the book contains laws, it is not a law code in itself. The book, presented as the last words of Moses on Mount Nebo, is rather a work intended for religious instruction and education.\textsuperscript{49} As such, the book is intended to maintain the loyalty of the people towards God, a loyalty that was previously professed when the covenant at Sinai was ratified. Every religious institution therefore, from the king to the prophet, to every adult and child in the nation, was to be instructed through the use of this book. “Deuteronomy represents a very early and remarkably comprehensive attempt to reform and transmit religion by means of a programme of religious education in which every person was to be included, from the king as the head of the nation to each child in every home.”\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{1.2.1 The Genre of the Book}

Scholars have identified two literary genres for the book of Deuteronomy. The majority argue that it is primarily an instruction, especially in its hortatory sections, others argue that Deuteronomy is Israel’s first constitution. As I already noted above, Deuteronomy is best understood as a book of instruction, at least in its final form. Maybe the best description is that of von Rad who sees Deuteronomy as a homiletic/sermonic presentation of the law with the aim of encouraging obedience to the divine will, namely, a sort of “preached law”.\textsuperscript{51} Some scholars however tend to see in Deuteronomy a first attempt at a constitution.\textsuperscript{52} Moshe Weinfeld proposes that

\textsuperscript{48} SCHMID, “Deuteronomy”, 17.
\textsuperscript{50} CHRISTENSEN, Deuteronomy, lvii.
\textsuperscript{51} Von Rad argues against the view that Deuteronomy is a constitution stating: “Deuteronomy does not set out to be a civil law – none of the legal codes in the Old Testament is to be understood in this way”. See GERHARD VON RAD, Old Testament Theology: Vol 1, The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1962, 228.
\textsuperscript{52} This idea was first put forward by Josephus in Contra Appion, 2:151-188, who considers Jewish law as a Divine Polity. See also NORBERT LOHFK, “Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Torah und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt16,18-18,22)”, in Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I, Norbert Lohfink (ed.), Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990, 314.
Deuteronomy is “an ideal constitution representing all the official institutions of the state”. The book contains both rhetorical features and motivational clauses typical of didactic literature aimed at persuading the reader, as well as various prohibitions and sanctions (especially in the curses), typical of binding legal material. Both persuasion and force are used.

In my opinion Deuteronomy in its final form contains idealised laws that in reality were an instruction on how to reach an ideal state upon the return from the Exile. If we accept that there was an *Urdeuteronomium*, we must admit that this was a legislative corpus, though probably not a constitution in the strict sense of the word. Redactional studies show that Deuteronomy was probably transformed into a “preached law” especially through the addition of the narrative framework of the book in chapters 1-4 and 28-30. As Patrick Miller notes, Deuteronomy 4:9-10 is a clue to the purpose of Deuteronomy as it stands, where Moses is supposed to gather the people to teach them the commandments, and the people in turn are to teach them to their children, with each generation being obliged to do the same. It is interesting to note that the only positive role of the king in Deuteronomy 17:18-19, falls exactly within these parameters. Deuteronomy as it stands thus seems to have been intended as a vehicle of social order, a sort of “didactic constitution”. *Urdeuteronomium* was composed in the pre-exilic period and extended in the exilic period with the aim of creating a new social order should the exiles eventually return to the land.

---


It is also true, however, that the curses and blessings are also typical of the vassal treaties. Weinfeld and Mayes conclude that Deuteronomy contains a mixture of both law codes and vassal treaties. See WEINFELD, *Deuteronomic School*, 146; ANDREW D.H. MAYES, “Deuteronomy: Law of Moses or Law of God?”, *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 5 (1981) 40.


PERLITT argues that Josiah did not understand the book found in the temple as addressing a state reform, but rather a religious one, since the laws extending from Deuteronomy 12-16:18 all treat worship and not social order. See LOTHAR PERLITT, “Der Staatsgedanke im Deuteronomium”, in *Language, Theology, and the Bible. Essays in Honour of James Barr*, Samuel E. Balentine – John Barton (eds.), London: Clarendon Press, 1994, 192. In my opinion, however, there was absolutely no distinction between state and religion, so much so, that a constitution could very well have contained religious laws.

MILLER, “Constitution”, 140.

original form, the “Josianic Deuteronomy”, which remains difficult to determine, “was probably not yet conceived as a Mosaic discourse”. The rhetorical strategy of the Deuteronomists was to link its 7th century audience with the age of Moses by collapsing the temporal distance between them. It was only at a second stage, during or early after the Exile, that a school or coalition of scribes introduced the “mosaic fiction” of Deuteronomy as a discourse of Moses. This “deuteronomistic Deuteronomy” was presented as a mosaic discourse with the aim of transporting the addressees, namely the exilic community, back into the situation of the origins. The deuteronomists thus made of the exiles contemporaries of Moses, a fiction that corresponds well with the fact that the kingdom, the Temple, and the land, were no more. Deuteronomy seems therefore to have started as a law/constitution, but later expanded and reformulated as a didactic “preached law”.

1.2.2 The Formation, Dating and the Various Redactions of Deuteronomy

The formation and the redaction of the majority of biblical books is a complex issue and Deuteronomy is no exception. We also have to keep in mind the relationship between Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomistic History, both marked with a common language. Weinfeld’s exhaustive list of deuteronomistic terms and phrases is a useful tool indeed; however, the use of such language is so extensive, that linguistic criteria alone cannot suffice for the study of the various redactional

59 Ibid, 115.
61 Römer explains: ‘The Literary fiction of Deuteronomy as Moses’ last speech reflects the situation after 597 and 587 B.C.E. By directly addressing their audience, the Deuteronomists in a way, made them contemporaries to Moses, and this fiction corresponds to the actual situation of the group in Babylon to which the Deuteronomists address their narrative: much like in the time of Moses, they find themselves outside the land, waiting for instructions about the possibility of entering this land. Since the monarchy failed, the Deuteronomists locate all-important institutions back to the period of the ‘origins’, making Moses the mediator between Yahweh and Israel. Traditionally it was the king who represents the deity and transmits the law; these functions are now taken over by Moses.” See RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 124.
63 WEINFELD, Deuteronomistic School, 320-365.
layers. It is impossible to give an exhaustive picture of the formation of and the redactional layers for the book of Deuteronomy in this study. Such a matter is not the scope of this thesis. What I intend to do here is present a summary of the formation of the book as we have it today focusing particularly on the parts that are important to our study of Deuteronomy 18:9-22.

The study of redactions has to deal intrinsically with the issue of dating. Since DeWette, who identified Urdeuteronomium with the scroll found in the Temple at the time of Josiah (2 Kgs 22-23), scholars have tended to stick to a 7th century B.C.E. dating. Scholars however, who consider the laws concerning cult centralisation as utopian, date Urdeuteronomium as post 586 B.C.E. There is evidence that some parts of Deuteronomy are later than Exodus and the former prophets. Exodus 20:25 permits the building of altars and offerings to YHWH, something practised from the time of Joshua up till Solomon without any indication that any contravention was being made. The prohibition of the use of pillars in the worship of YHWH in Deuteronomy 16:22 also appears in contrast with the earlier stories legitimising such practice as in Genesis 28:18; 35:14; Exodus 24:4 and Joshua 24:26. All these data show that there was a shift in practice, a shift which many identify with the historical period of the Josianic reform of the 7th century B.C.E. Some scholars tend to confirm de Wette’s hypothesis that the book found in the Temple by Hilkiah in 622/620 B.C.E. (2 Kings 22:8) was actually Urdeuteronomium. Even if it is argued that the literary genre of

---


65 De Wette put forward this theory in his Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur, (Jena 1805). He presented his argument for the dating of the earliest form of Deuteronomy through the following syllogism: 1) From all the books of the Pentateuch, only Deuteronomy deals with the issue of cult centralisation. 2) The only evidence for a historical context of cult centralisation lies during the reign of Hezekiah 727-698 B.C.E. and the Torah discovered in the temple under the reign of Josiah in 622 B.C.E. 3) It follows therefore, that the Torah discovered in the temple was an early form of Deuteronomy written in the 7th century.


67 DRIVER, Deuteronomy, xliii.


69 The identification of Urdeuteronomium with the book found in the temple in 2 Kings 22 is not without its problems. Though Urdeuteronomium was actually the book influencing the Josianic reform, the
“book finding” is quite late, a genre probably used to legitimise such reforms, scholars still identify Josiah’s reforms as grounded on the early editions of Deuteronomy. Veijola concludes that it is very difficult to identify a later context than Josiah’s reforms for the early version of Deuteronomy. Further discussion as regards the dating of Deuteronomy arose with the discovery of Neo-Assyrian vassal treaties which offer a good parallel to the book of Deuteronomy. The treaty of Esarhaddon contains a series of oaths imposed by the retiring king on his vassals regarding his successor Assurbanipal. Strikingly similar to this treaty is Deuteronomy 31:1-8, where at the covenant at Moab, Moses nominates Joshua his successor, and commands the people to observe the Torah. Many scholars have thus argued that such parallels indicate the general period for Deuteronomy’s original context, background and dating, which is that of the 7th century. Others argue that such treaties tend to retain their form through the ages and as such could have been used as a source much later. Juha Pakkala argues for a later dating of Urdeuteronomium since it does not mention the monarch, the state and its structures, Judah, Jerusalem, and the Temple. He states that the laws of Deuteronomy 14:22-26 appear logistically impossible and unrealistic for the whole nation to go to “the place which YHWH will choose” and there consume the tenth of the agricultural products and the first born of the livestock. It appears that these laws


72 WEINFELD, “Deuteronomy”, 169. See also IDEM, “The Loyalty Oath in the Ancient Near East”, UF 8 (1976) 392-393. In this article, Weinfeld studies extensively the influence that these treaties had, not only in the Near East, but in the West as well, namely, Greek and Roman treaties.

73 Otto suggests that such treaties, in particular the vassal treaty of Esarhaddon, are the immediate source for Deuteronomy. See ECKART OTTO, “Das Deuteronomium. Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien”, BZAW 284 (1999) 14-90. See also ALEXANDER ROFÉ, Deuteronomy, Issues and Interpretation, London – New York: T&T Clark, 2002, 5. Rofé concludes that the rebukes of Deuteronomy 28-29 are curses borrowed from these Assyrian treaties. For example the question and response in Deuteronomy 29:21ff “Why did YHWH do this to this land...” “Because they forsook the covenant that YHWH, God of their fathers, made with them...” are parallel to questions-responses in the inscription of Assurbanipal of Assyria 668-638 B.C.E.

74 Pakkala argues that Deuteronomy and the Hittite Vassal treaties of the Late Bronze Age also contain striking parallels. He however argues that these sources were used at a much later period, and gives the example of the Chronicler who used 1 and 2 Kings centuries after these were written. See PAKKALA, “The Oldest Edition”, 389. This argument however presents a major problem. Neo-Assyrian texts were certainly not available after 586 B.C.E. and therefore, could not have been used as direct sources.

were not applied in practice during the monarchy but rather reflect an idealistic/utopian vision and plan for a future society.\footnote{HÖLSCHER, “Komposition und Ursprung des Deutonomiums”, ZAW 40 (1922) 183-187.} Another problem lies in the fact that whilst the book deals with centralisation, the Temple, so central and important for the cult, is simply referred to as “the place which YHWH will choose”. This would seem to be reflecting the situation of the Exile where and when the Temple and the institutions tied to it were no longer existent. The text appears to leave these issues open as to the possibility of their reinstatement.\footnote{“The author intentionally avoided referring to the main institutions of the monarchy because he did not know whether these institutions would ever exist again in the form they once did.” See PAKKALA, “The Oldest Edition”, 400.} Nathan MacDonald argues that since Deuteronomy knows and re-interprets the Covenant Code and not \textit{vice versa}, and the covenant code itself “offers a pretty threadbare portrayal of Israelite social structures”, such a lack of state infrastructure reflects not the Exile, but rather Urdeuteronomium’s reliance on the Covenant Code.\footnote{NATHAN MACDONALD, “Issues in the Dating of Deuteronomy: A Response to Juha Pakkala”, ZAW 122 (2010) 431-435.} MacDonald argues that whilst it is true that Deuteronomy attempts to claim authority by projecting later ideas back onto Moses, it cannot be denied that the book matched its literarily constructed historical context. The authors at the time of the monarchy did a very good job in envisaging and imaginatively constructing a pre-state Israel, thus projecting the book back to the time of Moses.\footnote{MACDONALD, “Dating of Deuteronomy”, 432.} In my opinion, however, the very authors from the time of the Exile could be using such a constructive imagination aided very well by the historical context of the Exile in legislating an idealistic law for a future Israel. Römer argues that the narrative framework of Deuteronomy was inserted by the deuteronomistic redactor to present Deuteronomy as a mosaic discourse intended to transport the community of the Exile, for whom the new edition of Deuteronomy was intended, back into the situation of the origins.\footnote{RÖMER, “Deuteronomy in Search of Origins”, 117.} The exiles were thus made contemporaries of Moses.\footnote{Römer concludes that the “mosaic fiction” of Deuteronomy is part of what he calls “deuteronomistic Deuteronomy”, namely, a later edition by the Deuteronomistic School with the aim of inducing the readers to feel as contemporaries of Moses and Israel, just before entering into the Promised Land, a situation which the exiles themselves were living. See RÖMER, “Deuteronomy in Search of Origins”, 117-118.}

It is a fact that the lack of mention of the king in Deuteronomy has troubled many scholars on issues of dating and redaction criticism. Deuteronomy 17:14-20
presents problems in itself because it limits the actions of the king, thus offering an excellent argument against a monarchic setting of the Deuteronomic Laws of Offices. Peter Vogt argues that within the laws of offices, the role of the king is the least important. He states: “The very office of the king is not required but it is permitted if the people desire it. In contrast, the offices of judges, priests and prophets are required by Deuteronomy.” As already mentioned above, Pakkala argues that it probably reflects an attempt to limit any possible future powers of the king, should the monarchy be reinstated after the Exile. Bernard Levinson rightly concludes that the legal corpus of Deuteronomy conceptualises the king in a way that it completely rejects all prevailing models of monarchic power within both Israel and the broader Near East. The figure of the king does not feature in the laws of Deuteronomy 7-16; it is only in Deuteronomy 17:14-20 that the king is mentioned, and even here, the law presents nothing but a list of prohibitions for the king. The only positive law concerning the king states that he is to approach a Levitical priest and obtain a copy of the law from which he is to “read all the days of his life”. The Torah appears to occupy the central role, with the king being nothing but a mere titular figurehead. Levinson is aware of the problem on how to reconcile such limitations with a 7th century dating, when the monarchy was still such a central institution. He argues that Urdeuteronomium was an earlier document composed by a group of disillusioned scribes from the time of Manasseh who drafted a utopian legal program which rejected the conventional royal ideology and created a blueprint for a constitutional monarchy. He concludes:

---

85 BERNARD M. LEVINSON, “The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History’s Transformation of Torah,” VT 51 (2001) 511. Levinson identifies six characteristics which the Israelite monarchic model shares with that of the ancient Near East: 1) the monarch was considered the adopted son of God; 2) God grants the kings special judicial insight; 3) the primary duty of the monarch was to administer justice; 4) On accession to the throne the king established justice and equity for all the people; 5) the king served as defender and patron of the cult; 6) the king was the military commander-in-chief and as such was expected to personally lead the nation into war. See Ibid, 512-518.
86 LEVINSON, “Reconceptualization of Kingship”, 531.
So radical was it in its own time that, shortly after its promulgation it was effectively abrogated, as the Deuteronomistic Historian, while purporting to implement the norms of Deuteronomy, restored the king precisely those powers denied him by Deuteronomy… The utopian elevation of Deuteronomic Torah to sovereign power encountered the renewed utopian hopes pinned onto the Davidic dynasty by the Deuteronomistic Historian, whose character for a political community conforming to Torah departed from Torah in order to reinvigorate the monarchy.\(^\text{87}\)

Ernest Nicholson too argues for a late dating of the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17.\(^\text{88}\) He casts doubt as to the close association of Deuteronomy and Josiah’s reform, stating that it would be very strange for such a law to be promulgated under a royal prerogative. Whilst acknowledging a pre-exilic core, Nicholson proposes that Deuteronomy in its final form is “oppositional literature”\(^\text{89}\) to the “idolatrous” cults of Babylonian culture and was intended for the people who lived during the Exile and those who remained and formed the first diaspora, as a manual which helped them retain their cultural and religious identity.\(^\text{90}\) Nicholson concludes that the fall of Judah is the more likely terminus a quo for the emergence of the leading concerns of Deuteronomy.\(^\text{91}\)

In my opinion, the answer to the problem lies in identifying the legislative block of Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22 as a later addition stemming from a Deuteronomistic redaction.\(^\text{92}\) Whilst there is general agreement that Deuteronomy 5–

\(^\text{87}\) Ibid, 533-534.
\(^\text{89}\) NICHOLSON, “Provenance of Deuteronomy”, 532. Nicholson offers some examples such as the ardour with which the author appeals for faithfulness to YHWH and the vehemence against apostasy and idolatry. Deuteronomy 4:1-14 is widely agreed to be exilic or early post-exilic where v28 echoes Deutero Isaiah. The Decalogue, in Deuteronomy 5, places emphasis on the Sabbath as if it were central to the Decalogue. It emerges as the distinctive way of expressing and conserving cultural and religious identity.
28 constitutes the original book. I am of the opinion that this material is not homogenous, not only as concerns genre but especially as concerns its composition. Given such heterogeneity, when studying a particular text one has to go through the painstaking work of identifying its redactional stratum. It is therefore essential to identify whether a pericope in Deuteronomy comes from the older deuteronomistic material, or else from the later deuteronomistic redaction. I agree with Pakkala and Nicholson that there are instances where the Sitz im Leben of the text appears to be the Exile, and this is particularly true of the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17:14-20 and the law of the prophets in 18:9-22. Deuteronomy is comprised of Urdeuteronomium of the 7th century B.C.E. with subsequent deuteronomistic additions and retouching from the exilic and post-exilic era. Our text on the law of the prophets, which is part of a larger programme for the distribution of power amongst the institutions extending from 16:16-18:22, was added at a later stage in the exilic period by the Deuteronomistic School probably expanding the few references/verses, mentioning these institutions that existed in Urdeuteronomium. The compilers of the so-called Deuteronomistic History used Urdeuteronomium to charge the king with securing orthopraxis and eradicating heteropractice, judging the past kings as to whether they had managed to do so or not. The block extending from 16:16-18:22 was composed during the Exile when the institutions were missing, as a programme for a new order. The fact that the Torah gains such a central place particularly in the Law of the King in Deuteronomy 17:18-19, even as opposed to the Temple, referred to as איש יִבְחַר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר in 17:10, is a good indication of such a historical background for this block.

---

93 WEINFELD, “Deuteronomy”, 171.
94 See UDO RÜTERSWORDEN, Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16,18-18,22, (=BBB; 65), Meisenheim am Glan: Peter Hanstein, 1987, 90, where he presents a schema with the few verses from Deut 16:18-18,22 that could be deemed as belonging to Urdeuteronomium.
95 The only institution that seems to remain central is the book of the Torah. Ska concludes that the Torah is the true successor of Moses according to Deuteronomy. The Treaty of Esarhaddon imposes obligations towards the successors of the king, Deuteronomy 32:46-47 imposes obligations towards the Torah. See SKA, Il cantiere, II, 97-103; see also VOGT, Deuteronomical Theology, 230: “The significance of Torah is further seen in the fact that there is no single successor of Moses. Rather, Torah itself emerges as the successor to Moses because it provides for the offices that will partly fill Moses’ various roles.”
There is no denying that the main theme for the basic text of the first editions of both Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings is the location of the cult. I conclude that Urdeuteronomium was composed in the 7th century B.C.E. and comprised the theme of centralisation, the central problem on which 1-2 Kings judges the kings. Scholars tend to identify Urdeuteronomium with Deuteronomy 6:4 as title, followed immediately by the laws of Deuteronomy 12-26. However it has to be stated that such a division is not so straightforward. In brief, Urdeuteronoium was a body of laws that were composed or already existed at the time of Josiah. During the Exile this body of laws was extended and further elaborated to address the situation and amend past mistakes. Most of Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 is of this later redaction. In the post-exilic era, this legislative body was further transformed into a preached law through the addition of the narrative framework, making of it a fitting end to the Pentateuch and putting forward the centrality of the Torah ever more so.

1.2.3 Urdeuteronomium and the Book found in the Temple in 2 Kings 22

The issue of Urdeuteronomium is a complex one indeed. Here I shall only discuss those points relevant to my study. As already stated above, scholars have identified Deuteronomy 12–26 as being the book which influenced Josiah’s reform. On a close analysis of the text it becomes evident that the Josianic reform as depicted in 2 Kings 22-23 is based on Deuteronomy 7:5; 12-13; 16:1-8, 21; 17:3; 18:10-11. Jack Lundbom is convinced that Deuteronomy 5–26 and 28 were not the law book found in the Temple, but rather the reform document from Hezekiah’s time which later influenced Josiah’s reform. For Lundbom the law book found in the Temple in 2

98 Wellhausen proposed that this core (Deut 12–26) was written by a prophet who hid it in the temple so that it might be found later and used to promote the reform as dictated by the book. See WELLHAUSEN, Prolegomena, 1885, 9ff.
99 ANTOON SCHOORS, The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E., Michael Lesley (trans.), (=BE; 5), Atlanta (Ga.): Society of Biblical Literature, 2013, 189.
Kings 22 was actually Deuteronomy 32. William Holladay too argues that Deuteronomy 32 is to be included in Urdeuteronomium, since Jeremiah’s dictions contain strong echoes from this song. Ernst Axel Knauf argues that the laws extending from chapters 12-26 cannot belong to the 7th century B.C.E. since the laws do not reflect the societal context of that time. According to him these laws seem to reflect the meek economic system typical of the socio-economic depression of the Babylonian Province of Judah. Knauf deems it impossible that the law of the king in Deut 17 could be part of such a codified law which did nothing but erode and impinge on the king’s royal prerogative.

Today critical scholarship denies that the book found in the Temple of 2 Kings 22 was actually Urdeuteronomium. The account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles mentions no such book discovery, and places the reform in the 12th year of Josiah’s reign. This is further strengthened by a critical study of 2 Kings 22. Verse 8, narrating the discovery of the book, seems to interrupt the original narrative where Shaphan is sent by the king to the Temple to reckon the amount of money brought into the Temple to be distributed for its restoration. There is widespread consensus that the discovery of the book (2 Kings 22:8, 10, 11, 13, 16-18, 19, 20; 23:1-3) is a later insertion, considered to be the “founding myth” of the Deuteronomistic School. The theme of “book finding” is in fact very common in ancient literature, serving as

---

101 Lundbom argues that the Chronicler’s account of the reform (which according to him is “better press” than the Deuteronomistic Historian) places such a reform before the actual finding of the scroll in the Temple. 2 Chronicles 34:3 places Josiah’s reform in his twelfth year, whilst 2 Kings 22:3 places the discovery of the book in his eighteenth year. Through a rhetorical analysis of the content of Hulda’s oracle in 2 Kings 22:16-17 and Deuteronomy 32:15-22, he concludes that Huldah translates the vocabulary of Moses’ song into the current idiom of the time. He thus concludes that the lawbook of the Josianic reform is actually the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32. See LUNDBOM, “The Lawbook”, 295-299.


the prime motivator and legitimation for a religious, political or social reformation. Keeping this in mind, scholars today also tend to link 2 Kings 22 with Nehemiah 8. Common elements are: 1) the people lived in ignorance of the Torah (2 Kings 21; Esd 10:2); 2) the Torah is discovered or reintroduced (2 Kings 22:8; Neh 8:1-2); 3) a covenant is established between God and the people (2 Kings; Esd 10,3); 4) further reforms are undertaken (2 Kings 23:4-20; Esd 10:14,16-17). The authors of both texts seem to be emphasising the fact that the period after Joshua is characterised by a dark period of ignorance of the Torah. The golden era came to an end right after Joshua who is ordered by God to meditate it day and night (Josh 1:7), something that was to become the only positive role the king was to undertake in Deuteronomy 17:18. The Torah will be the only institution to survive the Exile.

In the light of all these recent studies I conclude that Urdeuteronomium existed at the time of Josiah and was the main motor behind the reform consisting mainly of laws that dealt with centralisation of cult. The literary theme of “book finding” was later added by an exilic deuteronomistic redaction to 2 Kings 22 so as to give primacy to the book of the law. The Deuteronomic Law of the King in Deuteronomy 17:18 appears to be in line with this ideology. In my opinion Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 are not part of Urdeuteronomium, except for maybe a few verses, but rather seem to be

---


110 “The reintroduction of the Torah (in Neh 8) is portrayed as an event parallel in importance to Josiah’s reform and as a turning point in Israel’s history”. See JUHA PAKKALA, Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7 and Nehemiah 8, (=BZAW 347), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004, 278. Ska states that it is very difficult to establish which of the two texts is the older. See Ska, Il cantiere, II, 76.

111 Ska, Il cantiere, II, 74-75

112 Ibid, 75.

113 It is interesting to note that the term הַורָה סֵפ is used for the last time in Joshua 23:6 and 24:26. It will not reappear until the time of Josiah in 2 Kings 22, 8, namely with the discovery of the book in the temple. See RICHARD D. NELSON, “Josiah in the Book of Joshua” JBL 100 (1981) 535. The only occurrence before 2 Kings 22 is 2 Kings 14:6, with the negative reference to king Amaziah, not having acted according to the Torah of Moses.


115 See RÜTERSWORDEN, Gemeinschaft, 90.
a later addition, focusing primarily on the primacy of Torah and the relation of the various social and political institutions to it.\textsuperscript{116}

1.2.4 Structure of the Book of Deuteronomy

Scholars tend to divide the book of Deuteronomy into three distinct orations. The first extends from Deuteronomy 1:3–4:40. Moses through a narrative discourse, gives a historical review of the main events and dealings of God with his people from Horeb to Moab, ending with a stern appeal to remain faithful and obedient to YHWH. The second is a direct discourse extending from 4:44 to 28:68, which is a body of laws or “a hortatory résumé of Israel’s moral civil statutory rulings”.\textsuperscript{117} The last discourse starts in 28:69 and ends in 30:20 and is an exhortation to follow the Torah, enlisting the covenant blessings and curses, and ends with Moses’ farewell to Israel and the commissioning of Joshua. These three discourses are followed by Deuteronomy 32 the “Song of Moses”, Deuteronomy 33 the “Blessing of Moses” and Deuteronomy 34, the account of Moses’ death and burial.

Duane Christensen identified a concentric structure of Deuteronomy, which I reproduce here:\textsuperscript{118}

A The outer frame: a look backward – Deuteronomy 1–3

B The inner frame: the great peroration – Deuteronomy 4–11

C The central core: covenant stipulations – Deuteronomy 12–26

B\textsuperscript{1} The inner frame: the covenant ceremony – Deuteronomy 27–30

A\textsuperscript{1} The outer frame: a look forward – Deuteronomy 31–34

The outer frame (Deut 1–3 and 31–34) is tied together by the figure of Joshua, Moses’ successor. The inner frame (Deut 4–11 and 27–30) is joined by the reference to blessings and curses according to whether the people prove to be faithful and obedient

\textsuperscript{116} VOGT, Deuteronomic Theology, 204-229. Indeed the roles of the King, the Judge, the Priest and the Prophet are all linked to the Torah. The King is a brother Israelite who is to adhere to the Torah, the priests are teachers of the Torah, and the prophets are its interpreters in the changing circumstances of the time.

\textsuperscript{117} CHRISTENSEN, Deuteronomy, lviii.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
or not. At the centre of the structure (Deut 12–26) lies the Deuteronomic law code
(Urdeuteronomium).

Christensen’s concentric structure deals with the text as it stands in its final
form. The picture is however much more complex and a close analysis of the structure
reveals some of the redactional activity which the text underwent. Deuteronomy 1–3
(4) is a section added later to unite the originally independent collection of laws which
included Urdeuteronomium with the rest of the Pentateuch, thanks to its retrospection
referring back to the narratives of Ex–Num.119 Yet even Deuteronomy 1–3(4) has a
complex redactional history.120 I agree that probably chapters 1–3 were added to
Urdeuteronomium by the post-exilic Pentateuchal redaction,121 which sought to
crystallise the Pentateuch as Torah. Chapter 4 is an exhortative chapter also containing
recalls of history. It was probably added later than chapters 1-3.122

Deuteronomy 4:44-49123 introduces chapters 5-11, which form a prelude to the law
full of reminiscences from the Exodus event and the desert. These chapters are full of
parenetic meaning and present historical examples to strengthen such exhortations.
Chapter 5, in fact, serves to emphasise the relationship, and thus bridges Deuteronomy
with the covenant code.124 Here Sinai/Horeb and the plains of Moab are united, the
past and the present are bridged, what God gave to Moses, Moses now gives to the
people. Chapters 5-11 are thus considered to be part of the later additions,125 which I
also attribute to the Pentateuchal redaction. Scholars note the stark parallels between
Deuteronomy 1:1(-4) and Deuteronomy 4:41-43, as both are a narrative of the author
and both offer geographical details and reminisce about the battles with Sihon and Og.
Scholars disagree as to whether Deuteronomy 4:45 is the oldest heading with
Deuteronomy 1:1(-5) being dependent on it.126 Since I consider chapter 4 as a later

119 KRATZ, “The Headings”, 32-37. Rofé attributes the addition of this section to the Deuteronomistic
historian, dating it to the 6th cent. B.C.E. ROFE, Deuteronomy, 9.
120 I cannot enter into the complex details of this section’s redactional history. For a study of this section,
121 Since I accept Römer – Brettler’s theory of the existence of a Persian Hexateuch and that the
Pentateuch arose as a compromise between the Pentateuchal and the Hexateuchal redactions, I do not
exclude that these chapters were actually added by the Hexateuchal redaction and were ultimately
retained by the Pentateuchal Redaction.
122 ROFE, Deuteronomy, 9. Rofé argues that Deuteronomy 4 also contains several priestly expressions.
123 The literary composition of Deuteronomy 4:44-49 is a complex one. For its detailed study see
KRATZ, “The Headings”, 38-41 and references there.
124 The repetition of the Decalogue seals this bridging.
125 KRATZ, “The Headings”, 42.
126 VEDOLA, Das fünfte Buch Mose, 122-123.
addition, which the Pentateuchal redaction added at a second stage after chapters 1-3, I consider 4:41-43 as part of this addition, bridging with the next block, which extends from chapters 5-11. Most probably, *Urdeuteronomium* was introduced bluntly with the imperative of Deuteronomy 6:4 שְמַע יִשְרָאֵל. 127 The ending of *Urdeuteronomium* can be found in 26:16 which is an inclusio with 6:5 with the phrase בָכָל לְבָנָה. 128 Again, this legislative block is the product of a long redactional process, the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this thesis. The block Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 is also the product of such a long redactional process, as can be seen in the next section. The redactional process of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.

Ronald Clements considers the block extending from 26:16-34:12 as forming the epilogue to the central law code. 26:16-27:10 presents the law as the path to holiness, 27:11-26 the curses, chapter 28 is the presentation of the two ways, namely, blessing and curse, chapter 29 the covenant in the Land of Moab, chapter 30 presents perspectives on the law, and chapter 31 the provision for the Law. 129 Deuteronomy has a number of appendices (32-34) containing old materials, added by a late editor, probably the final editor. Chapter 32 is the Song of Moses, introduced by Deuteronomy 31:16-22, chapter 33, contains the blessings of Moses, and chapter 34 concludes the book, as well as the Pentateuch, with the narration of Moses’ death.

Obviously, this presentation is only a brief outline, which serves well in giving a good overview of the book and the major retouchings it underwent through the ages. This section thus identified the immediate and wider literary contexts and frameworks to Deuteronomy 18:9-22. As we have seen, the various blocks are composite in themselves. A quick look at the various structures proposed by commentators will show that the story is a much more complex one.

127 Scholars see *Urdeuteronomium* as being composed of 6:4(-6) followed by Deuteronomy 12-26. See PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 100-101; VEDOLA, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*, 175; Kratz, “The Headings”, 42.
131 RÖMER – BRETTLER, “Persian Hexateuch”, 401-419.
Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22 is a section called the Deuteronomic Laws of Offices, and due to their nature, these are distinct from other laws.\(^{132}\) As the name implies this whole block deals with the major offices that regulated Israel’s society. These are: the law of the Judges (Deut 16:18-20), judgement of the Levitical Priests and the Judge in “the place which YHWH will choose” (Deut 17:8-13); the law of the King (Deut 17:14-20); the law of Levitical Priests (Deut 18:1-8); and the law of the Prophets (Deut 18:9-22). As already pointed out, since these laws deal with such central and important offices, some consider them as forming a draft constitution.\(^{133}\)

Other scholars propose that this section is a series of sermons on the four principal authorities that regulate the life of the people.\(^{134}\) Georg Braulik considered this section as forming the basic State Law, which was also the basis for Josiah’s reform.\(^{135}\) As already noted above however, it is very difficult to consider this section as part of the law that led to the Josianic reform. In my opinion, the much-reduced power of the king offers too strong an argument against it being dated to the time of the monarchy. The same applies for the other laws of offices. Norbert Lohfink argues that the laws of offices form part of a draft constitution (Verfassungsentwurf) based on the distribution of the functions of power.\(^{136}\) He argues that these laws should be dated very late in the 6\(^{th}\) century B.C.E. at least as a collection.\(^{137}\) The law of the priests gave the prerogative to every rural Levite to offer sacrifices in Jerusalem (Deut 18:6-8), something that was not granted by Josiah’s reform in 621 B.C.E. (2 Kings 23:8-9). Likewise, the Law of the Prophets, particularly in distinguishing true from false prophets, is heavily linked with the problems Jeremiah had late in his ministry.\(^{138}\) Lohfink understands this block as forming the basic State Law, which was also the basis for Josiah’s reform.\(^{135}\) As already noted above however, it is very difficult to consider this section as part of the law that led to the Josianic reform. In my opinion, the much-reduced power of the king offers too strong an argument against it being dated to the time of the monarchy. The same applies for the other laws of offices. Norbert Lohfink argues that the laws of offices form part of a draft constitution (Verfassungsentwurf) based on the distribution of the functions of power.\(^{136}\) He argues that these laws should be dated very late in the 6\(^{th}\) century B.C.E. at least as a collection.\(^{137}\) The law of the priests gave the prerogative to every rural Levite to offer sacrifices in Jerusalem (Deut 18:6-8), something that was not granted by Josiah’s reform in 621 B.C.E. (2 Kings 23:8-9). Likewise, the Law of the Prophets, particularly in distinguishing true from false prophets, is heavily linked with the problems Jeremiah had late in his ministry.\(^{138}\) Lohfink understands this block


\(^{133}\) Rüterswörden, Gemeinschaft, 94-111.

\(^{134}\) Enzo Cortese, Le tradizioni storiche di Israele da Mosè a Esdra, (=La Bibbia nella storia), Bologna: EDB, 2001, 209. Cortese is of the idea that this whole section is pre-exilic. One particular reason being that Josiah and his son Jehoahaz are the only kings to be chosen by the people in accordance with Deuteronomy 17. Rüterswörden identifies a primitive pericope which was further augmented by later additions (see Rüterswörden, Gemeinschaft, 90). Cortese considers these additions as pre-exilic as well. Ibid, 217.

\(^{135}\) George Braulik, Deuteronomium 1-16,17, (=NEB; 15), Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986, 11.


\(^{137}\) In fact, he rightfully notes that these laws are not of the same antiquity and intrinsically manifest several strata. See Lohfink, “Distribution”, 343.

\(^{138}\) Ibid, 346. See also Jeremiah 28.
of laws as being guided by the principle of the distribution of power with no single individual being able to represent every office,\textsuperscript{139} and therefore he dates this section as late exilic.\textsuperscript{140} This is a very important point in my opinion, for the monarchy, which had excessive power, actually led to the disaster of the Exile. These laws were thus aiming at a new social order where power was well distributed.\textsuperscript{141}

In the end, the monarchy was never reinstated, and therefore some scholars tend to consider these laws “utopian”. Others consider them a “model”.\textsuperscript{142} Lothar Perlitt denies that this legislative block reflects a state and argues that the series of prohibitions found in this section, particularly the law of the king, reflects nothing more than the ideology of the “puritan deuteronomists” who had read the prophets well before carrying their message into the law of the king. That way they could draw their accusations on the history extending from 1 Samuel – 2 Kings.\textsuperscript{143} Gordon McConville is opposed to the idea that Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22 is supportive of Josiah’s reform, particularly the law of the king, which presents a king that is much less powerful than Josiah actually was.\textsuperscript{144} However, this does not necessarily mean that this block is exilic. It could very well be that the laws of the officials are not a mere response to the crisis of the Exile, but could very well reflect a primary deuteronomistic vision. The deuteronomistic vision was not merely a reflex reaction to the Exile.\textsuperscript{145} In these laws, whilst power in itself remains intact, there is only refusal on concentrating it on just one person. Restoration after the Exile lies in the continuous possibilities of new beginnings.

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid, 346-347.
\textsuperscript{141} LOHFINK, “Distribution”, 348. Lohfink argues that it had always been the case that such an introduction of distribution of power was a means of correcting a previous abuse of power by a particular institution. This was especially true for the king.
\textsuperscript{142} For Perlitt this law is neither a constitution nor a utopian vision or a historical reality. The introduction of these laws such as 16:18; 16:21; and 17:1 appear to be casuistically applied and thus appear to have been intended as “model judicial processes”. See PERLITT, “Staatsgedanke”, 186.
\textsuperscript{143} “Diese dtr Puristen, deren Spuren in 1 Sam - 2 Kön tief genug sind, haben ihre Propheten gelesen und tragen deren Botschaft in das Gesetz ein, um die Königsschelte in den Geschitsbuchern auf festen Grund stellen zu können”, see PERLITT, “Staatsgedanke”, 190.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid, 31.
1.2.6 Deuteronomy between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets

There is a consensus among scholars that Deuteronomy has always been important for the study of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, and since there are significant influences on the rest of biblical literature, Deuteronomy is also important for the interpretation of the Latter Prophets. Such influences can be attributed to the activity of the Deuteronomistic School. As already discussed above, Deuteronomy is considered as the literary testament of Moses or rather Moses’ explanation of the law, as the caption of Deuteronomy 1:5 hints to. Such an explanation serves very well as the literary bridge connecting the first two major segments of the Hebrew Scriptures, namely the Torah and the Former Prophets. As such, Deuteronomy is a fitting conclusion to the Pentateuch, bringing the previous accounts and law collections to an end. It also paves the way for the following books, thus being a fitting introduction to the former prophets, namely the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings.

Weinfeld was the pioneer in identifying the close affinity between Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets, giving an extensive list of common terminology. Enzo Cortese too noted such an affinity claiming that it is evident even to the untrained reader. When reading the various translations of the texts from Joshua-2 Kings, “one easily recognises the same style and vocabulary as in the book of Deuteronomy.” Cortese gives a brief list of the typical deuteronomistic vocabulary

---

149 See HALOT av. "אר".
150 CHRISTENSEN, Deuteronomy I-22, lvii.
151 WEINFELD, The Deuteronomical School, 320-365.
152 RÖMER, The So-called Deuteronomistic History, 1. For an excellent study on the deuteronomistic style characterising these books see the work of ENZO CORTESE, Deuteronomistic Work, Jerusalem,
and expressions. From this very brief list of “deuteronomisms”, it can be concluded that the narrative block from Genesis–Numbers did undergo some Deuteronomistic retouches. When considering the vocabulary and the various literary arches in the texts it becomes evident that they are much more than simple retouches.

Jeffrey Geoghegan offers an interesting study of such a continuity in the books by studying the phrase “until this day” (הַזִּמַּוֶּדַעַם). This phrase is generally considered to be the Deuteronomist’s attestation to the various institutions that existed up till his time. This phrase has generally been attributed to the pre-exilic redaction of the so-called Deuteronomistic History and has been dated to the time of the Josianic reform. It could also be, however, that a later redaction is “justifying” a present institution by pushing it backwards in time, showing that it has been attested in the past, especially as concerns the pushing back of institutions into the Torah. In both

1999. Indeed as he claims in the introduction, “a knowledge of the deuteronomistic style is indispensable for the study of these books”.

153 See Appendix 1 where I present the typical Hebrew expressions, these expressions may vary somewhat especially in the Hebrew original. This list serves as an example and is by no means exhaustive. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present a complete account of the various deuteronomistic expressions.


156 Syntactically I consider these phrases as “comments” in the true sense of the word following Weinrich who speaks of “commenting” (besprechen) in the sense of when the one who is speaking or writing interrupts his narrating (erzählen) and takes the opportunity to comment on the circumstances of the case being narrated. See Harald Weinrich, Tempus Besprochene und erzählte Welt, München: C.H. Beck, 2001, 26. See also Alviero Nicacci, Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica classica, (=SBFA; 23), Jerusalem, 1986, §92, 80-81. He studies in detail 2 Kings 17:34-41, concluding: “Questo dato letterario mostra che tutto il brano è un commento redazionale sull’argomento dei Samaritani di cui si parla in precedenza.” The phrase הַזִּמַּוֶּדַעַם is in my opinion a clear example of such comments by the narrator/redactor.


159 A clear example is the deuteronomic “Law of the King” in Deuteronomy 17:14-20, which reflects the institution of the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8 and stands to its justification as being foreseen by the Torah. There are countless examples where the Deuteronomistic School tends to push institutions and
cases, however, the use of this phrase is very important for it is very telling of the theological and political interests of the Deuteronomistic School.\textsuperscript{160} In my opinion, when studying such overarching themes and recurrences, it is essential to identify whether such cross references are actually pre-deuteronomic, proto-deuteronomic, deuteronomic, early deuteronomistic, late deuteronomistic, post-deuteronomistic or simili-deuteronomistic, as Marc Vervenne and Hans Ausloos propose.\textsuperscript{161}

### 1.3 The So-Called Deuteronomistic History\textsuperscript{162}

A closer look at the so-called Deuteronomistic History is essential here since, as I already argued above, it forms the wider context to our text. This thesis presupposes that there is a compiled history of Israel and that this history contains overarching themes that reflect the work and redactions of a “Deuteronomistic School”. I also argue that there is a deuteronomistic redaction in the prophetic books as well. I maintain therefore that it is essential to give here an overview of the previous and recent studies on the so-called Deuteronomistic History, and then state which I shall be following as the basis for the wider textual context which affects the interpretation of Deuteronomy 18:9-22.

\textsuperscript{160} Eventual claims and inheritance rights (Deut 3:14; 10:8-9; Josh 13:13-14; 14:14; Judg 10:14; 1 Kings 9:13); the use of non-Israelite forced labour at the Jerusalem Temple (Josh 9:27; 15:63; Judg 1:21; 1 Kings 9:21); a concern for centralized worship (Josh 9:27; Judg 6:24; 2 Kings 10:27); the ark of the covenant of the Lord (Deut 10:8-9; Josh 4:9; 8:29-35; 1 Sam 4:3; 5:5; 2 Sam 6:8; 1 Kings 8:8); the efficacy of prophecy (Josh 6:26; 2 Kings 2:22); Judahite landholdings and territorial expansions (Josh 14:14; 1 Sam 27:6; 2 Kings 8:22, 14:7; 16:6); the reforms of Josiah (2 Kings 23:1-3, 21-23; Josh 5:9-10; 8:29-35). See GEOHEGAN, “Deuteronomistic Redaction,” 407.


\textsuperscript{162} Schmid argues for the plural, namely Deuteronomistic Histories, an issue which we shall tackle later; see KONRAD SCHMID, “Deuteronomistic Histories in Genesis-2 Kings”, 8-30.
From the list of “deuteronomisms” in Appendix 1, it is evident that the book of Deuteronomy has many affinities with the book of Joshua as far as vocabulary is concerned. This is further strengthened by the literary continuity that is present between the two books, namely that Joshua is Moses’ successor in Deuteronomy 31, and Moses, in his last speech, constantly refers to the crossing of the Jordan (cfr. Deut 2:29; 3:27; 4: 21, 22, 26; 9:1, 11, 31; 12:10; 27:2, 4, 12; 30:18; 31: 2, 13; 32:47), a goal only reached by Joshua, Moses’ successor. These literary affinities induced many scholars to conclude that Joshua was in fact part of the Pentateuch and thus identified a new literary unit, which they called Hexateuch. 163 It is also evident that there are also various affinities and allusions to the Former Prophets in Deuteronomy. To mention one example, the Babylonian Exile in 2 Kings 25:21 is already alluded to in Deuteronomy 6:15 and in Deuteronomy 28:63. 164

These affinities have led scholars to see a literary unity, which they called “Deuteronomistic History”. This history is the product of the Deuteronomistic Work, a work aimed not only at providing a comprehensive history of Israel, but also a meta-historic theological message, aimed at touching the heart of the readers. 165 Deuteronomy 18:9-22 forms part of this greater whole, and keeping in mind that the “whole is greater than the sum of its parts”, it is essential to consider this greater whole for the interpretation of the individual texts. It is within the intended final theology of

163 ROBERT BOLING, Joshua, (=TAYB; 6), New York et al. 1982, 55-59; RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 1. In the light of the many literary continuities between the books, many scholars concluded that the separation of Joshua from the rest of the Torah was an artificial one dictated by theological reasons particularly for presenting the Pentateuch as the central core of the Hebrew Canon. Whilst the Pentateuch remained the central core of the Torah, these scholars worked with a literary unit they called the Hexateuch. For the classical statements regarding this position see JULIUS WELLHAUSEN, Die Komposition des Hexateuchs; SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1893; OTTO ESFELDT, The Old Testament: An Introduction, Peter Akroyd (trans.), New York: Harper and Row, 1965, 248-257. Noth does not agree, but rather sees that critical research at his time had assumed too much that Joshua is a mere continuation of what is narrated in the Pentateuch. Joshua contains material clearly linkable to Deuteronomy before it and Judges after it, thus Noth identified what is known as the deuteronomistic work, which had knowledge of but was independent of the Pentateuchal narratives. Noth therefore reduced the literary unit into a Tetratueuch. He denies that there is a deuteronomistic redaction in the Pentateuch. „In den Büchern Gen.-Num. fehlt jede Spur einer ‘deuteronomistischen Redaktion’, wie allgemein anerkannt ist“. See MARTIN NOTH, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1943, 13.

164 It is important to note that these two examples have literary parallels in the Latter Prophets as well. The theme of “going after other gods” (לֹֽהַ אֲחֵרִים) is very common in the Latter Prophets, most notably in Jeremiah 7:6, 9; 11:10; 13:10; 16:11; 25:6; 35:15. It is also interesting to note that Deuteronomy 28:63 presents a particular verb, “to be plucked out”, the niphal of נָֽשָׁתָה, to refer to the Exile. Jeremiah uses extensively the synonymous verb וֹֽשָׁתָה, which also means “to pluck”. Cfr Jeremiah 1:10; 12:14, 15, 17; 18:7; 31:28; 42:10.

165 CORTESE, Deuteronomistic Work, 12.
this history that we might find more answers to our questions posed to the text of Deuteronomy 18:9-22.

1.3.1 Martin Noth

The pioneer of the theory of the Deuteronomistic History was Martin Noth who saw a literary unity in style and content in the seven books starting from Deuteronomy 1 and ending in 2 Kings 25. According to him, evidence for this single redaction can be found in the texts he called “chapters of reflection”. He concluded that “at all the important points in the course of history, the Deuteronomist brings forward the leading personages with a speech, which looks forward and backward in an attempt to interpret the courses of events… elsewhere the summarising reflections upon history are presented by the Deuteronomist himself… because there were no suitable historical figures to make the speeches.” He concluded that the Deuteronomist integrated into this history the Urdeuteronomium (the first edition of Deuteronomy 5-30) providing it with this historic framework. Noth therefore had identified one single author called “the Deuteronomist” and one single redaction behind this work. Since Noth, Deuteronomy has therefore become the hermeneutical key for the interpretation of the Former Prophets, this being the reason why scholarship called this collection of books “the Deuteronomistic History”. This history relates the story of Israel from the Exodus down to the Babylonian Exile and is a reflection of the author on that history contributing to “the understanding of the situation of his own time”. In other words, this author wanted to show that the destruction of the kingdom and the Exile was all a result of the incapacity of the kings, leaders, and the people in observing the Deuteronomic law. For Noth this author used

166 NOTH, Überlieferungs. For the English translation of the section concerning the Deuteronomistic History see IDEM, The Deuteronomistic History, (=JSOTS; 15), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
169 As we shall see, it is quite difficult to attribute this whole work to one single hand and one single redaction. There are still some scholars who advocate the work of a single author: HANS DETLEF HOFFMAN, Reform and Reformen, (=ATANT; 66), Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980; BURKE O. LONG, I Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature, (FOTL; 9), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984; ROBERT POLZIN, David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
170 NOTH, Deuteronomistic History, 122.
older sources such as Urdeuteronomium with fidelity and “arranged the material according to his own judgement”,\textsuperscript{171} making of him both an author and a redactor.

\textbf{1.3.2 After Noth}

Since Noth, various scholars have grappled with the issue as to whether we are dealing with one redaction or more, or whether it is one single hand or a school of thought that produced this work.\textsuperscript{172} It is quite difficult to imagine that such an extensive work was the product of one hand.\textsuperscript{173} Noth had also separated Deuteronomy from the rest of the Pentateuch and concluded that the Tetrateuch did not contain any deuteronomistic redaction.\textsuperscript{174} However as Schmid notes, considering Genesis–Numbers as the surviving remnant of an older account, it must have included the conquest of the land for it to be complete. It is quite difficult to suppose that such an account was lost from the original source when it was combined with the Deuteronomistic History. Schmid concludes that whilst Noth’s Deuteronomistic History is ingenious, the theory that it was independent of the Tetrateuch, though not ignoring it, and that it was written by one author is “as simplistic as is widely accepted”.\textsuperscript{175} The list of deuteronomistic vocabulary/expressions in Appendix 1 confirms that such “deuteronomisms” are in fact present throughout the Pentateuch, particularly in Exodus and in Numbers. The question is how to interpret and date them. Some scholars saw in them evidence for the existence of an Enneateuch, others state that it is essential to treat every case on its own, identifying whether the “deuteronomism” in question is in fact pre-deuteronomic, proto-deuteronomic, deuteronomic, early deuteronomistic, late deuteronomistic, post-deuteronomistic or simil-deuteronomistic.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid, 26.
\textsuperscript{172} CORTESE, Deuteronomistic Work, 12.
\textsuperscript{173} Römer notes that this is in fact an anachronism as evidenced from sociological, archaeological and historical research. In the monarchic period writing was an institutional occupation and was done in groups. Only in the Hellenistic period did individual writing start. The book of Qoheleth is probably one of the first examples. See RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 46.
\textsuperscript{174} NOTH, Überlieferungs, 13.
\textsuperscript{175} SCHMID, “Deuteronomy”, 10: “It appears, then, that the standard thesis representing Genesis–Numbers as “non-Deuteronomistic” and Deuteronomy-2 Kings as “Deuteronomistic” cannot withstand scrutiny”.
\textsuperscript{176} AUSLOOS, “Les extrêmes”, 350.
1.3.3 The Various Redactions of the Deuteronomistic History

Scholars found it difficult to accept that the Deuteronomistic History was the work of one hand and consequently that it is one redaction, and many therefore concluded that there are more than one. After Noth, two models have been proposed, namely the “block model” first proposed by Frank Moore Cross\footnote{FRANK MOORE CROSS, “The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History”, in, Frank Moore Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973, 274-289.} and the “layer model” introduced by Rudolf Smend and followed by the Göttingen School.\footnote{See WALTER DIETRICH, “The Layer Model of the Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Samuel”, in Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?: Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History, Cynthia Edenburg – Juha Pakalala (eds.), Atlanta: SBL, 2013, 41.} Cross identified a double redaction in this history. He observed that 2 Samuel 7, written in typical deuteronomistic style, contradicts the inevitable pessimism of the Exile with which this history ends in 2 Kings 25:27-30.\footnote{See CROSS, “The Themes”, 274-289.} He therefore identified two editions, the first dated at the time of the reign of Josiah, and the second, consisting of a revision, dated during the Exile.\footnote{CORTES, Deuteronomistic Work, 13.} Cortese adopts Cross’ position of the double redaction as a starting point but points out that Cross reduced the second redaction excessively.\footnote{See ENZO CORTES, Da Mosè a Esdra: I libri storici dell’antico Israele, (=La Bibbia nella storia), Bologna: Dehoniane, 1985; and his more recent work IDEM, Le tradizioni storiche di Israele da Mosè a Esdra, (=La Bibbia nella storia), Bologna: EDB, 2001.}

The Göttingen School had as its pioneer Rudolf Smend who observed that the texts of the Deuteronomistic History are composite. On a close study of Joshua 1:1-9 he identified two clear redactions. In the first, YHWH addresses Joshua as a military leader (Josh 1:1-6), whilst in the second (Josh 1:7-9), YHWH admonishes him to study and observe the Law.\footnote{According to him, this shift is an attempt to correct the military language of Joshua, focusing more on obedience to the Law.} The texts of Joshua 13:1-6:23 and Judges 1:1-2, 5 and 2:20-23 mention the non-conquest of the land and these contradict the Deuteronomistic texts of the conquest. Smend named these later additions the Nomistic Redaction (DtrN). He labelled the first exilic edition Deuteronomist Historian (DtrH). Smend identified in DtrH “the Law of the King”, which already includes in it the ambivalence of the monarchy as expressed in 1 Samuel 8:11-27, counterpart to the warning of Deuteronomy 17:16-17.\footnote{DIETRICH, “The Layer Model”, 53.} When studying Kings, his
student, Walter Dietrich, identified another Deuteronomistic layer, which he called the prophetic Deuteronomist (DtrP). According to him, DtrP corresponds to the “Law of the Prophets” of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 which has been reworked if not composed by the Deuteronomistic School. Dietrich also studied closely the books of Samuel, which contain the early texts of DtrH, which deal with the inauguration of the monarchy. As such, DtrH contains an ambivalent attitude towards the monarchy. In DtrN he identified the antimonarchic passages which demand of the king total submission to the law. The focus of DtrN is on the Torah and the king should have a copy of the Torah, which he is to read his entire life. DtrP also contains texts with some antimonarchic perspectives where DtrP is characterised with a series of confrontations between prophets and kings. Dietrich dates DtrN in the Persian Period. DtrN texts communicate a strict monotheism, which according to him reflects a sociological shift. In the late exilic and early post-exilic period, foreign armies no longer threatened the Jews, but rather, within the stability of the Persian Empire, serious threats came from the foreign religions through their attractive cults. In the face of this lure from such religions, DtrN was set as decidedly monotheistic. Whilst Römer accepts the fact that there were various secondary additions to the Deuteronomistic History, he criticises the Göttingen School for the fact that it inflates the number of redactional layers and siglas. He admits that we do not have sufficient

188 See Deuteronomy 17:18-19 and Joshua 1:6-9 and the positive judgement expressed for David for obeying the commandments of the Lord “for all the days of his life” in 1 Kings 15:5.
189 Dietrich identifies the interventions of DtrP through the use of verbs like הָלַג יְהוָה and רָחַב, and the typical prophetic expressions of נאם יהוה and התћלך לפני יהוה.
190 This is the argument also put forward by Pakkala who dates the oldest edition of Deuteronomy during the Persian Period, particularly the strictly monotheistic texts. PAKKALA, “The Oldest Edition”, 387-401. For him the Deuteronomistic Ideology prior and during the Exile was: “intolerant monolatry”. See IDEM. Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History, (=PFES; 76), Helsinki-Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
linguistic and redactional criteria to distinguish all secondary additions, so whilst acknowledging the existence of an exilic edition of the Deuteronomistic History which underwent various additions, he lumps all of them together under the term deuteronomistic.\textsuperscript{192}

1.3.4 The Deuteronomistic History – Multiple Redactions or Multiple Histories?

Schmid criticised the Göttingen School because, according to him, the multiple redactional layers destroy the unity of the Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{193} Schmid, who adheres to the theory of the Enneateuch, solves this problem of unity by identifying “various ‘Deuteronomistic Histories’ in the Enneateuch”.\textsuperscript{194} He identified at least three, the first being based on the principle of cult centralisation in Jerusalem, on which the later Deuteronomy 12 is based; the second is shaped by the first commandment, “deriving its theological thrust in the literary arches of Exod 32 and 1 Kings 12; finally, the third is based on the central theme of the Law or Torah of Moses. Exponents of the Göttingen School on the other hand opt for layers of redactions rather than seeing various histories. As one might note there is a certain degree of correspondence between these two scholarly positions. Schmid proposes a series of “Deuteronomistic Histories” in Genesis – 2 Kings”.\textsuperscript{195} Smend focuses more on the content of the particular redactional layer. Both agree that the third layer/history focuses on the centrality of the Torah. Clements identifies an original work in the former prophets, which he calls “a revisionist pro-monarchic history’. According to him, this document was later revised and enlarged by the Deuteronomistic School to place emphasis on the book of the Law.\textsuperscript{196} Clements argues that it is the subordination of kingship to the law that should be given the adjective “deuteronomistic”; the “royal ideology” was transformed into a “law-book ideology” in both the Deuteronomistic

\textsuperscript{192} RÖMER, “Deuteronomy in Search of Origins”, 117. It is a fact that many scholars criticise the Göttingen School on these grounds. See for example SCHMID, “Deuteronomy”, 28.
\textsuperscript{193} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid.
History as well as Deuteronomy.\textsuperscript{197} This, as will be seen later, was also proposed for the figure of Moses’ successor, whom many identify as the Torah.\textsuperscript{198}

In reality, the theory of the Deuteronomistic History has been widely challenged today. As Römer notes, what he himself “believed to be one of the most reliable constructs in Old Testament research… is now more and more disputed”.\textsuperscript{199} The fact that scholars have identified so many layers of redactions has led scholars to conclude that at the end of the day, the Former Prophets form a collection of texts of different forms and origins. Some scholars go as far as stating that this collection is a random one. Claus Westermann, for instance, concludes that each book arises from a different social and historical context, and as such, it is impossible to consider these books as a coherent work. The book of Judges, for example, starkly contradicts the conquest stories of Joshua.\textsuperscript{200} In Joshua 21:43-45, Israel exterminates all of its enemies, whereas in Judges, these enemies still occupy the land, and continuously challenge Israel. Westerman does not consider this collection of books as a historical work, though he does admit that it does convey a strong historical consciousness.\textsuperscript{201} Römer observes that whilst it cannot be denied that this collection of books contains different genres, at the same time, one observes a certain unity within the collection.\textsuperscript{202} Whilst the term Deuteronomistic History is a scholarly construct, we have to admit that there was indeed a history that was collected through various texts of different origins. The Deuteronomists collected these various texts with the aim of putting forward their own deuteronomistic agenda and propaganda.\textsuperscript{203} Obviously, the texts have their own form and origins, and each would have had its date of formation.\textsuperscript{204}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Clements, “The Former Prophets”, 93.}
\footnote{See for example: Ska, Il cantiere, II, 102 “la vera eredità di Mosè e l’autentico successore di Mosè è la Torah”; Vogt, Deuteronomic Theology, 230: “Torah itself emerges as the successor to Moses because it provides for the offices that will partly fill Moses’ various roles.”}
\footnote{Claus Westermann, Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?, (=TB; 87), Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994, 122.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Römer, “The Form-Critical Problem of the So-Called Deuteronomistic History”, 246.}
\footnote{The books of the so-called Deuteronomistic History are in fact bound together by the fact that they seek to explain why Israel and Judah had to face the Exile. It was an inevitable consequence of their disobedience, just as Moses “had predicted” in Deuteronomy 28:63-64. See Ibid, 247.}
\footnote{Römer suggests that this collection was a “Deuteronomistic Library”. The Deuteronomists took up older materials that were probably a loose collection of books within the royal library in Jerusalem, from the time of Josiah, that could have been used as royal propaganda. It was after the Exile that the Deuteronomists edited them according to their agenda working them into a coherent “library”. See Ibid, 251. According to Römer, the book of Jeremiah was heavily redacted by the Deuteronomists, so that it}
\end{footnotes}
would identify the Exile as the date and the *Sitz im Leben* of this Deuteronomistic Work. Through such a “history”, the Deuteronomists would have wanted to address the identity crisis that the people would have gone through, because of the Exile. The Exile was the result of the people’s disobedience, as predicted by Moses himself in Deuteronomy 28:63-64. It is within this context that, as we shall see, the epithet of Moses as prophet sets in.

1.3.5 The Message of the so-called Deuteronomistic History

As already discussed above, the former prophets pronounce harsh judgements and accusations, identifying the reasons for the catastrophe of the Exile. There are various offences leading to the Exile, and these, in my opinion, communicate the evolution of the history through time. Schmid identified the first offence of the kings as being against cult centralisation. The northern kingdom persisted in Jeroboam’s transgression of the shrines at Bethel and Dan in 1 Kings 12:25-30. The cult was thus split between the Temple in Jerusalem in the South and the two shrines of Bethel and Dan in the north. Jeroboam was motivated by a fear of loss of power. The problem did not stop there for Jeroboam also instituted cultic houses on high places. Even worse, the problem persisted and deteriorated with his descendants: Nadab (1 Kings 15:25-30), Baasha (1 Kings 15:33-16:5), Zimri (1 Kings 16:18-20), Omri (1 Kings 16:23-28), Ahab (1 Kings 16:29-22:39), Ahaziah (1 Kings 22:40-2 Kings 1:18), Jehoram (2 Kings 3:1-3), Jehu (2 Kings 9:2-10:36), Jehoahaz (2 Kings 13:1-9), Jehoash (2 Kings 13:10-15), Jeroboam II (2 Kings 14:23-29), Zechariah (2 Kings 15:8-11), Menahem (2 Kings 15:17-21), Pekahiah (2 Kings 15:23-26), Pekah (2 Kings 15:27-31), Hoshea (2 Kings 17:1-18:10).

---


206 1 Kings 12:26-27 “And Jeroboam said in his heart, ‘Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; if the people will go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem, then the heart of the people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah’.”
The same problem was attributed to the southern kingdom, where the various kings starting from Solomon (1 Kings 11:4ff particularly vv7-8) instituted a multitude of cultic sites. His descendants likewise: Judah (1 Kings 14:22), Abijam (1 Kings 15:1-3), Asa (1 Kings 15:11-15), Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22:41-45), Jehoram (2 Kings 8:16-19), Ahaziah (2 Kings 8:25-27), Jehoash (2 Kings 12:1-4), Amaziah (2 Kings 14:1-4), Azariah (2 Kings 15:1-4), Joatham (2 Kings 15:32-35), Ahaz (2 Kings 16:1-4), Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:2-7), Manasseh (2 Kings 21:2-18), Amon (2 Kings 21:19-22), Jehoahaz (2 Kings 23:31-32), Jehoiakim (2 Kings 23:36-37), Jehoiachin (2 Kings 24:8-9), Zedekiah (2 Kings 24:17-20). The only positive judgement in these royal assessments is that of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:3-8) and the incomparability of Josiah in 2 Kings 23:25. It is clear that the redaction responsible for these royal assessments was supportive of King Josiah and his reform.

Schmid identified a threefold development in the judgements pronounced against the kings. Originally, the high places as well as the non-central cultic places were an actual cult to YHWH, which the laws dealing with cult centralisation deemed as, ex post facto, illicit. Archaeological evidence shows that YHWH was here adored together with his consort. According to the Deuteronomists, this quickly degenerated into idolatry and thus they express their negative judgments on the kings, the accusation being idolatry. Later the third judgment was based on the accusation of having violated “all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded”. This criterion

207 This was already noted by Wellhausen, „Der Schriftsteller, der dies Skelett des Buchs Könige gebildet hat, steht mit Leib und Seele zu der Reformation Josias“, WELLHAUSEN, Komposition, 295.

208 SCHMID, Deuteronomy, 20-21.


210 Indeed this was the case already under Solomon who left his wives “turn his heart away after the other gods” and ended up building a high place for Chemosh and Molek in 1 Kings 11:4-8.
of “observing all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded” became the only way leading to life/success,\textsuperscript{211} which was however transgressed with the inevitable consequence of destruction.\textsuperscript{212} Polzin claims that the main aim of the Deuteronomistic History was to find the fault and “describe the cause of the Exile”.\textsuperscript{213}

1.3.5.1 The “Kerygma” of the Deuteronomistic History

Some scholars argue that the Deuteronomistic History ends on a negative note with the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the elite of Judah into Exile. Noth was quite pessimistic in stating that the main aim of the author was that of giving a theological reason for the disaster, which was final, and did not communicate any future hope.\textsuperscript{214} For him this history was the product of a single private author seeking to explain the disaster.\textsuperscript{215} Scholars, however, were conscious that this work could not come from one single hand and that, whilst it addressed problems, it also had to present a positive message of hope. Many therefore sought to identify the “kerygma” of the Deuteronomistic History. Von Rad saw the positive message in Nathan’s oracle to David as the hope of reinstatement of the Davidic house, once the Exile ended. He identified grace as the “major deuteronomistic theme”. Thus, 2 Kings 25:27-30, narrating how King Jehoiachin was granted by Evil-merodach to sit at the kings’ table, would be a fitting conclusion to this history, since it hints at such a “restoration”.\textsuperscript{216} Whilst this has been generally understood as a sign of messianic hope,\textsuperscript{217} it is also true that the land still lies “desolate”, something which led to Noth’s pessimism, namely

\textsuperscript{211} This criterion was presented by God: to Joshua (Josh 1:7-8; 8:30-32), to the people through Joshua (Josh 22:5; 23:6-13), to Solomon through David (1 Kings 2:1-3), and by God himself to Solomon (1 Kings 6:11-13).
\textsuperscript{212} Transgression against the Torah of the Lord God of Israel is said of Jehu in 2 Kings 10:31; Joash in 2 Kings 14:6; the transgression of the Northern Kingdom leading to the destruction by Assyria in 2 Kings 18:12; Manasseh in 2 Kings 21:8. Josiah is the only king to have followed such commandments as expressed in 2 Kings 23:1-3. 2 Kings 23:25 expresses Josiah’s uniqueness “Before him there was no king like him, who turned to YHWH with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; nor did any like him arise after him.”
\textsuperscript{214} NOTH, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 143-145.
\textsuperscript{215} Ibid, 145.
\textsuperscript{216} GERHARD VON RAD, \textit{Studies in Deuteronomy}, (=SBT; 9), London, 1953, 74-79.
that the Deuteronomistic History expressed “no hope for the future”. Hans Walter Wolff on the other hand, focuses on the theme of repentance (שׁוּב), identifying various passages in the Deuteronomistic History that call Israel to cry out to God. The main texts are: Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kings 8:46-53 and Deuteronomy 30:1-10, both of which presuppose the Exile and a possible restoration. Restoration would be possible after the people repent and cry out to God, who would “repent” from his punishing the people and restore them. Walter Brueggemann considers the Deuteronomistic History as “gospel to the exiles”. He argues that this work is not just a reflection on the past, but also on the present situation faced by the exiles, particularly their identity crisis. Brueggemann proposes the theme of the good (טוב) as being the main motif and motivator leading to repentance, showing that God is gracious and ever faithful to the covenant. This idea “stands as the foundation for Dtr’s theology”. In this light, the Exile turns out to be an opportunity to repent and to turn to the original requests of God, ultimately leading to goodness. Deuteronomy 30:5 represents this idea well, showing that there will be more than a simple restoration but an actual increase in prosperity in comparison to the fathers. McConville identified a linear notion of restoration. He suggests that the phrase “the place which YHWH will choose” should not be identified with the Temple and according to him it stands to emphasise a succession of places just as this history shows, namely that everything starts at Horeb, followed by Shechem, then Shiloh and Jerusalem, ultimately ending up in the diaspora. Similarly, Römer sees the exilic redaction of the Deuteronomistic History as crisis literature and therefore “in the exilic edition of the Deuteronomistic History there was not much concern about the future”. The reinstating of Jehoiachin is rather the work of the Persian redactors of the Deuteronomistic History, accepting a diaspora

218 NOTH, *Deuteronomistic History*, 143.
219 Wolff also notes the affinities with the prophets, particularly the אַשְׁרֵי of Deuteronomy 30:3 with Jeremiah 29:14; 30:3,18 and the circumcision of the heart in Deuteronomy 30:6 with Jeremiah 4:4; 9:25-26.
222 Ibid, 388.
223 Ibid, 393. According to Brueggemann, reading the Deuteronomistic History only in terms of retribution impoverishes it. So whilst it does offer the reasons leading up to the Exile, it also offers the view that the affirmation of faith in YHWH would ultimately lead to restoration as is evidenced by Deuteronomy 30:1-10.
224 McCONVILLE, “Restoration”, 33-34.
225 RÖMER, The So-called Deuteronomistic History, 164.
situation. Knauf solved the problem of the negative ending by stating a continuity between the Former and the Latter Prophets. According to him, 2 Kings narrates the decline and the destruction of both monarchies, thus functioning as a fitting introduction to the next section within the Nebi’im, the prophetic oracles of judgment and salvation. There are various parallels which show that there was a will to unite these two collections into one. “The link between the Former and the Latter Prophets may therefore be stronger than is commonly acknowledged”.

In my opinion, Brueggemann manages to marry the ideas of von Rad and Wolff very well. Whilst the first redaction of this compiled history could have been very much in line with the preaching of the prophets, thus encouraging the return to YHWH, the theme of God’s graciousness and the possibility of reaching a new level of goodness, is very much in line with the much-needed hope of the exiles and with Deuteronomy 30:1-10. Römer argues that during or after the Exile, the library comprising this history was further united through cross-references, overarching themes and structures, such as the Exile, which ultimately sought “to explain the present by constructing the past”. It is in this sense that Römer calls the so-called Deuteronomistic History: “crisis literature”. To this, I would add: “seeking to instil better hope for the future”.

1.3.6 Concluding Remarks on the so-called Deuteronomistic History

This brief overview of the so-called Deuteronomistic History shows that it presents “clear historiographical interests” that attempt to give a linear continuum from the time of the Exodus up to the conquest of the land and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Exile. Obviously, this historiography does not imply pure

---

226 Ibid, 177.
228 The most notable being the land lying desolate in 2 Kings 25 and the opening oracle in Isaiah 1:7 “your country lies desolate, your cities are burned with fire”.
231 Römer applies Steil’s sociological theory on the response to crisis identifying in the Deuteronomistic History the mandarin response to crisis, producing a history. See RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 111.
historicity, but rather deals with source material where historical connections are made, and the circumstances emerging are described from a theological perspective. The Deuteronomistic Work of the Deuteronomistic School compiled this history, with the aim of presenting its readers with a theological historiography. We have to keep in mind the various processes that have produced this history, the various traditions and their evolution, to see where our text of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 fits into this grand scheme of things. An attentive exegesis of the text and the evolution of the history of traditions will enable us to identify who this “prophet like Moses” is in the Hebrew Bible. When studying the evolution of these traditions and the theology behind them, it is important to identify the direction of influence, namely whether it is the Deuteronomistic tradition which influenced the Historical/Prophetic tradition, or vice versa. Whilst most scholars have taken Deuteronomy to be the basis of the deuteronomistic redaction of the prophets, Auld suggests that the direction of influence is the reverse!\textsuperscript{232} I follow Person in stating that “such unidirectional understanding of literary influence ought to be rejected, because of the complexity of the redaction history of the Deuteronomic literature.”\textsuperscript{233} The direction of influence has therefore to be established for each pericope.

1.4 Deuteronomistic Redaction in the Pentateuch

Wilhelm M. L. De Wette\textsuperscript{234} noted that texts in Gen-Num, contain a language very similar to that of Deuteronomy. In his view, these texts were a source for the book of Deuteronomy. Friedrich Bleek was of the idea that the first comprehensive redaction of the Pentateuch occurred at the time of Solomon’s reign and that a second redaction was undertaken by the author of Deuteronomy at the end of the kingdom,

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
  \bibitem{232} Hyatt, for instance, considers Deuteronomy as the theological basis for the Deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah whilst Auld suggests that the influence runs from the story of the Kings onto Deuteronomy. See Hyatt, “Jeremiah and Deuteronomy”, 113-127; Graeme A. Auld, “The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?”, in Those Elusive Deuteronomists, Linda S. Schearing (ed.), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 123.
  \bibitem{233} Person, The Deuteronomic School, 8.
  \bibitem{234} De Wette, Dissertatio Critico-Exegetica.
\end{thebibliography}
thus accounting for certain similarities between them. Samuel Driver concluded that the texts in the Pentateuch that are similar to Deuteronomy were actually the source for Deuteronomy. In a sense, like De Wette, he preceded Christiaan Brekelmans and Lohfink who independently of each other came to the conclusion that such texts are actually a sort of “pre-history” to Deuteronomy. They argue that the language, style and theology of Deuteronomy and the subsequent Deuteronomistic History did not fall out of the blue. Like every other current of thought, it had to have its incubatory period, and as such these scholars identify the “deuteronomistic” passages in the Pentateuch as the seeds leading up to the development of deuteronomistic language, style and theology, something that we could term “proto-deuteronomistic”. Ausloos presents a methodology to identify such proto-deuteronomic elements in a pericope, stressing the need for a thorough study of language, structure and style to determine the direction of influence between the two similar texts being studied. He warns of the dangers of Pan-Deuteronomism, especially where the use of deuteronomistic language is concerned, for if taken to extremes every individual passage of the Old Testament could be identified as Deuteronomistic.

---

236 “Certain sections of JE (in particular Gen 26:5; Ex 13:3-16; 15:26; 19:3-6; parts of 20:20-33; 34:20-26), in which the author (or compiler) adopts a parenetic tone, and where his style displays what may be termed an approximation to the style of Dt.; and these sections appear to have been the source from which the author of Dt. adopted some of the expressions currently used by him.” See Driver, Deuteronomy, 77-78.
239 Ausloos, “Les extrêmes”, 341-366. It could very well be the case that a late post-deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch made it possible for such deuteronomistic language to creep in. Ausloos is well aware of the fact that the texts and redactions of the Pentateuch are being dated late in the Persian Period. It is therefore very easy to mix up the not yet of the proto-deuteronomic into the no longer of the post-deuteronomistic. To determine the direction of influence it is important to analyse affinities with the prophetic books which offer a considerable amount of relative certainty as concerns their dating as old or new, and thus can offer a “controlling framework” for a definite and well-founded judgement as concerns the nature of the material as to it being proto-deuteronomic or post/simili-deuteronomistic. See Idem, 365.
241 Cornelis Houtman, Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung, Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994, 342: „Verschiedentlich versteht man die Begriffe deuteronomisch bzw. deuteronomistisch in so breitem Sinne und verwendet sie zur Bezeichnung eines
As shown above, Blum proposed the late formation of the Pentateuch as a compromise between the Deuteronomistic Composition (KD) and the Pentateuchal Composition (KP). For him therefore, the deuteronomistic elements in the Pentateuch are post-deuteronomistic. Van Seters too considers the Pentateuch as a very late composition, and identifies the non-P material as the Yahwist, whom he considers as a historian supplying a prologue to the Deuteronomistic History.242 “The non-P (J) work was composed as a prologue to the national history of DtrH and never existed as a separate corpus.”243 The Yahwist came from a similar milieu to that of the Deuteronomistic School and was thus well aware of the language and theology of the work he was supplementing. According to him, since the Yahwist composed the Tetratureh as prologue supplementing the Deuteronomistic History, the D material in the Pentateuch is “all accounted for”.244 The deuteronomistic elements in Genesis–Numbers are therefore of a post-deuteronomistic composition.

Schmitt expanded the redactional work of DtrN of the Göttingen School, stating that it was responsible for the combined work of Gen-Kings. He argues that in the Tetratureh and the Deuteronomistic History there are overarching concepts that are typical of late deuteronomistic editing.245 For Schmitt, the deuteronomistic circle of scribes gave unity and identity to the Israelite post-exilic community. Thanks to the Urprophet Moses, they were able to create a continuation between the Torah and the Prophets.246

As things stand now there seem to be three key positions on this issue in the current state of studies, as Vervenne points out:247

---

244 VAN SETERS, “The So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction”, 77.
246 Ibid, 293.
1) Proto-deuteronomistic as first identified by De Wette and Driver, and confirmed by Brekelmans and Lohfink as those texts which have affinities with and are actually the source for Deuteronomy and the subsequent deuteronomistic tradition.

2) Deuteronomistic redaction: the deutoronic affinities in Genesis to Numbers are part of a late deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch as a whole.

3) Post-Deuteronomistic: Deuteronomic elements are not of a deuteronomistic redaction but are the post-deuteronomistic reworking of a late “J” historian, a creative author imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomistic History.\(^{248}\)

The fact that there are Deuteronomic elements in the Pentateuch seems to hint that there was at one point an attempt at creating a single history, namely an Enneateuch. If one accepts a deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch, then one would be inclined to accept that at one point in time, the Deuteronomists wanted their work to form one single historical work extending from Genesis–2 Kings. Similarly, if one accepts, like Lohfink and Brekelmans, that these deuteronomistic elements are actually the prehistory of Deuteronomistic terminology (proto-deuteronomistic), this linear evolution also shows that the Deuteronomists not only inherited vocabulary and terminology, but also used it intentionally to “continue” the history extending it from Genesis–Numbers up to 2 Kings. Even the existence of post-deuteronomistic elements, such as van Seters’ late Yahwistic composition aimed at supplementing the Deuteronomistic History with a prologue, would hint at an Enneateuch was intended. So whilst it remains difficult to lump all of the deuteronomistic elements in the Pentateuch into one of the above categories, we can safely conclude that there was an aim at forming a literary unity amongst these books.

1.5 Conclusion

Apart from the various theories, it seems to me that at some point in time the Deuteronomistic School did intend to compile a history extending from Genesis – 2

\(^{248}\) VAN SETERS, “The So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction”, 58.
Kings,\textsuperscript{249} probably a short-lived composition of the Persian Period.\textsuperscript{250} There are clear deuteronomistic elements and language in the block from Genesis–Numbers that suggest that the Deuteronomistic School redacted these books. Such a redaction meant that the deuteronomist intended these books to form part of his collection.\textsuperscript{251} This so-called Primary History deals with specific reasons that led to the crisis of the Exile, interpreting and judging history. This history had a long and complicated process of formation. The destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem meant a major blow to every institution and to the identity of the people in general. Such a history was meant to address this problem, seeking to consolidate that identity and instil a sense of optimism for the future. The account of the patriarchs is one such example, exceedingly valuable for the deuteronomistic historian in providing optimism for the generation of the Exile. Like Abraham, the exiles have to be “men of faith”; the command that Abraham leave his native Mesopotamia to go and live in a land yet to be revealed by YHWH “could not but strike a bell for the Jews of the Exile” about the need for their return.\textsuperscript{252} Abraham thus becomes a “paradigm”, a “model of the ideal”, a “typical Israelite”.\textsuperscript{253} Likewise, Isaac becomes a model for the exiles, who like him, have to remain tied to their land; like Jacob, they have to return to the land. “The land” has always been one of the main themes of deuteronomistic theology.\textsuperscript{254} The legislative block of Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22, which Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is part of, seems to reflect the blueprint for the new social order of the future, when the people would eventually return and re-establish themselves in “the land”. It is only at a later moment that the Pentateuch was editorially separated from the Primary History. This was probably done in the Persian Era when the Torah started gaining greater importance. The affinities between Gen-Deuteronomy and Joshua noted above cannot be overlooked.

\textsuperscript{249} Freedman was the first to propose such a comprehensive history which he called the “Primary History of Israel”. See Freedman, “Pentateuch”, 716-717.
\textsuperscript{250} Romer, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 179.
\textsuperscript{251} Some scholars suggest that the Deuteronomistic historian is actually behind the unification of both J & E. Geoghegan notes that the Deuteronomistic phrase “until this day” occurs six times within the Tetratuch. After studying the striking linguistic similarities and literary contexts where these phrases are used in Genesis and the Deuteronomistic History, he notes that the use of this phrase always occurs at the source/tradition breaks, where the sources are being united. For Geoghegan this phrase provides important new evidence for arguing that the Deuteronomistic historian “combined northern and southern traditions in both the “Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in order to give Israel an account of its past.” See Jeffrey Geoghegan, “Additional Evidence for a Deuteronomistic Redaction of the “Tetrateuch”, CBO 67 (2005) 405-421.
\textsuperscript{252} ABELO, “Is Genesis the Introduction?”, 406.
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{254} Not, Deuteronomistic History, 134-145; Cortese, Deuteronomistic Work, 142.
As already discussed above, Römer sees the Hexateuch as a possible historical reality. In the Persian Era, Israel started evolving as a religion of the book. Such is understandable, since the Torah was the only institution that preserved the traditions of old, since the Temple, the monarchy, the cult, and the social order known until then, ceased to exist with the Exile. Römer identified a further movement which united both the Deuteronomistic and the Priestly traditions, and this was responsible for presenting Joshua as part of the previous five books as a completion of the promises to the patriarchs in Genesis. He dates this composition in the Persian Era, the era of the return of the exiles, and proposes that the קָבְסֶפֶר הָאֱלֹהִים of Joshua 24:26 is the same as that of קָבְסֶפֶר הָאֱלֹהִים in Nehemiah 8:18. Römer suggests that scribes of both the Deuteronomistic and Priestly ideologies merged forces to propose the Hexateuch as the book of instruction (Torah) to the people with the aim of building a new social order based upon it. One can notice a shift from history to instruction to law in these redactions. In fact, it turns out that the Pentateuch emerged as the work of an even later redaction (the Pentateuchal redaction) that sought to crystallize the Torah as law. In the end, whilst it remains true that the Pentateuch is the only canonical reality we possess today, the Tetrateuch, Hexateuch, and Enneateuch, might not be mere constructions of modern scholarship after all. These scholarly constructions could very well mirror scribal concerns of the early exilic and post-exilic communities, whatever such collections were called then.

255 RÖMER – BRETTLER, “Persian Hexateuch”, 401-419.
256 Römer and Brettler base their conclusions on a thorough study of the redactions behind Deuteronomy 34. They conclude that Deuteronomy 34 is composed of three distinct redactions, the earliest of which is deuteronomistic Deuteronomy 34:1-6 which recounts the death and burial of Moses and is the natural end to Deuteronomy forming an inclusion with Deuteronomy 1:5 & 3:25-29. It forms the natural end to the book leading to the next one where Joshua 1:1 picks off with the news of the death of Moses and the start of Joshua’s ministry as Moses’ successor. Deuteronomy 34:7-9 forms the second section, which breaks off the former historical line. Römer and Brettler attribute this section to the deuteronomistic and priestly redactors, linking Deuteronomy further with Joshua. It therefore builds on the previous transition and reflects a clear effort in creating a Hexateuch. Deuteronomy 34:10-12 are from the hand of the Pentateuchal redactor who underlines the incomparability of Moses, to counter the idea of the Dtr-P redactors that Joshua was in a way equal to Moses. Such an idea is consolidated in Joshua 24, where Joshua appears to be the promulgator of the Law, the stipulator of the covenant, and the one responsible for the קָבְסֶפֶר הָאֱלֹהִים. Römer – Brettler then analyse the strict parallels between Joshua 24 and the Joseph story in Genesis to consolidate the argument in favour of such a Persian Hexateuch. See RÖMER – BRETTLER, “Persian Hexateuch”, 401-419.
257 Ibid, 405-407.
258 Ibid, 417. Römer – Brettler do not mention the Enneateuch in their list because they exclude its existence. I include it for the reasons explained above.
The beginning of the deuteronomistic literary productions should be located in the Jerusalem court during the 7th cent. B.C.E. The first deuteronomists were probably high officials, most of them scribes who used a number of Assyrian literary conventions, especially in Deuteronomy and Joshua. As a movement, it probably originated during the reign of Hezekiah and became well established during the reign of Josiah. It sought to compile a history with the aim of propaganda, to aid the process of religious centralisation. It presented Judah as the “real Israel”, especially after the events of 722 B.C.E., when with the destruction of Samaria, Jerusalem became the “real capital”. With the Babylonian Exile, the Deuteronomistic school underwent a crisis. At this point, the exilic editing of the history would make of this history a “crisis literature” seeking to explain the crisis through composing a history. The loss of the land was the result of YHWH’s anger at the kings and the people for having broken the covenant. Römer comments: “Exploring or even inventing the past provides a possibility to explain the present which is not easily acceptable by the Judean elites. The Exile became such an important experience that during the Persian period it became a new foundation myth for the “real Israel”.

Scholars who agree with Noth’s single author or Cross’ block model all argue that the editing of the Deuteronomistic History came to an end during the Babylonian Period. Those who follow Smend’s layer model, as we have seen, posit a further redaction (DtrN) during the Persian Period. Person confirmed that there was a Persian redaction through text-critical studies. He has shown that the LXX lacks various additions full of deuteronomistic language which are present in the Masoretic text. He considers this as important evidence for the ongoing deuteronomistic activity going on during the Persian Period. The main paradigm shift in the Persian Period was from “intolerant monolatry” to blatant monotheism as evidenced in the polemic against cultic statues in Isaiah 40-55. Some late texts in the so-called Deuteronomistic History reflect this

259 It would be difficult to see how the work would be all exilic, as Noth claimed, when there are so many passages that contain a positive message, particularly about David, Hezekiah and Josiah. See RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 67.
261 Ibid, 164.
change, especially Deuteronomy 4, considered to be amongst the latest additions to Deuteronomy.263

The Persian Period also brought the “Birth of the Torah”. In Nehemiah 8, Ezra reads from the book of the Law publicly. Scholars unanimously agree that the various law codes and narratives were collected into one book in this period.264 “Interestingly Ezra is presented in Ezra 7:1-6 simultaneously as a priest and a scribe; he symbolizes the fact that the publication of the Pentateuch resulted mainly from a compromise between the Priestly School and the Deuteronomistic School.”265 Rather than positing the theory of “imperial authorisation”, much debated and difficult to prove, it would be better to consider the Torah as published for reasons internal to the nascent Judaism of the time. The Word of God was the only entity that survived the crisis unfazed. It was therefore inevitable that the Word of God would be the main provider of identity to the Jews of the land and even more so to those of the diaspora. It is at this point that monotheism was sealed with the creation accounts of Genesis and the various law codes and narratives that were united. The work of the Deuteronomists was probably added at this time, providing a linear historical time-frame. Soon however, there was the need to separate the accounts of the monarchy. “There was probably soon an agreement that this new document should be restricted to the pre-monarchic origins, since monarchy was not an option for the Jewish elites under Persian domination.”266

The Persian period therefore marked the start of the debate as to whether the Torah should comprise a Hexateuch or a Pentateuch. A Deuteronomistic and Priestly minority, having the theme of the land at heart, sought to promote a Hexateuch, including the book of Joshua and consequently the theme of the conquest of the land. They composed Joshua 24 to present Joshua as the second Moses. The majority of both schools on the other hand, felt the need to focus on the law in itself and, therefore, ended the Torah without including the theme of the conquest of the land and ended it with the death of Moses in Deuteronomy 34, there stating the incomparability of Moses in vv10-12. Such would have been an ideal address for the Jews of the

263 RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 173. Römer states that the statement that no form of YHWH was seen at Horeb in v15, could actually allude to a statue of YHWH that probably stood in the temple during the monarchy.
265 RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 179.
266 Ibid, 179.
Exile/diaspora, being encouraged to identify with the Exodus generation, and possibly encouraged to return to the land. It is at this point that the Torah became the centre of Judaism and Moses’ true successor as Vogt concludes: “The significance of Torah is further seen in the fact that there is no single successor to Moses. Rather, Torah itself emerges as the successor to Moses, because it provides for the offices that will partly fill Moses’ various roles. No single person, office, or institutional arrangement is absolutely essential to living in relationship to Yahweh.” The addition of Deuteronomy 34 and the other last additions, spelt the end of the Deuteronomistic History where Deuteronomy was detached and became part of the Pentateuch, and Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings became the Former Prophets.

It is in the face of such major changes and paradigm shifts in tradition, that the image of Moses, and consequently the identity of the “prophet like Moses”, underwent major paradigm shifts as well. In the light of the above complex discussion, this thesis sets out to identify such paradigm shifts in mosaic identity and to pinpoint who the “prophet like Moses” is in this evolution of tradition. Having set this background I now embark on an in-depth study of the figure of Moses as it evolved within this complex evolutionary process within these traditions.

---

267 Vogt, Deuteronomic Theology, 230.
Chapter 2 – Moses the Man
2.0 Introduction – The Person of Moses

The question “who is Moses?” presents a problem because he does not seem to fit a particular role. Rudolph Smend appears to have made the most pertinent statement when claiming: “Mose ist inkommensurabel”. 1 In this chapter I will look at the various portraits of Moses as depicted in the texts of the Pentateuch. Indeed, whilst the Pentateuch has God as the subject and true protagonist, it is also true that the Pentateuch can be called “the biography of Moses”, who late during the Persian Period and the beginning of the Hellenistic period, became the foundational figure of emerging Judaism. 2 Knauf would appear to disagree, since according to him, the redactors of the 5th century, who used and built upon earlier material from the 7th century, sought to build a law and not a history. 3 Van Seters concluded: “the quest for the Historical Moses is a futile quest. He now belongs only to Legend”. 4 I do not agree. Whilst it is very true that the person of Moses is enshrouded in many layers of tradition, I do consider it possible to arrive at some historically plausible conclusions as regards this prominent figure in Judaism. Robert Miller asks the question: “Is then the quest for the historical Moses futile?” and answers: “It is not, if by historical the object is not wie es eigentlich gewesen”. 5 Apart from this we must also consider Tucker’s remarks on what he calls “a major fallacy in critical scholarship” which is the Wellhausenian maxim that “the older is better”. In Tucker’s terms, this is “a confusion of value judgements”. 6 We have to accept that Moses in the Pentateuch is a received character, and that he has been presented according to horizons of expectations of both the authors and the audience. 7 In the light of such claims I will

1 RUDOLF SMEND, Das Mosebild von Heinrich Ewald bis Martin Noth, (=BGDE; 3), Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959, 48.
7 Jan Assmann, for example, draws the parallel between Moses and Pharaoh Amenophis IV, who called himself Akhenaton. It is interesting to note that both were the founders of a monotheistic religion.
start with a brief look at the historicity of the Exodus and of the person Moses. After establishing what is possible in the light of the biblical text and other evidence, I shall then consider the literary study of the Moses tradition, and the way it evolved over the years. I shall focus primarily on the various roles of Moses in the Pentateuch, presenting each role according to the timeline presented in the texts. This is the method proposed by Miller: the analysis of the roles of Moses should cover his birth, the exile in Midian, confrontation with Pharaoh, the Exodus, theophany at Sinai, the wilderness wanderings, and finally death. Since it is evident that Moses features in an account that is the product of multiple authors over a span of centuries, it is essential, as Miller points out, to identify the historical context of each Mosaic portrait and why it was created, with particular social and theological ends in mind. I will then proceed to identify the tradition and the theology behind each role, ideally arriving at a convincing conclusion as regards its origins and dating. George Coats notes that the quest for the historical Moses cannot be the first task. First we have to take into account the literary aspect. One apparent problem is that the earliest historical summaries do not mention Moses. The literary career of Moses apparently starts with the emergence of the Deuteronomic school. According to Römer therefore, the figure of Moses has to be read in the light of Deuteronomistic theology.

2.1 The Historicity of the Exodus and of Moses

This is not the place to discuss at length the historicity of Moses and the Exodus event, but since, it is the basic assumption of this thesis that there was an Exodus, and that a man called Moses truly existed, I feel compelled to write a few words on the matter, quoting the works of other authors and experts in the field of archaeology. Whilst it is very true that the persons and events described in these texts are covered

Assmann concludes that Akhenaton was lost to memory only to be rediscovered to history in the 19th century. For Moses the opposite is true, for whilst he was never lost to memory, he is apparently forever lost to history. See JAN ASSMANN, Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism, Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press, 1997, chapter 2.

by layers upon layers of traditions and literary constructs, I retain that it is almost impossible that such strong traditions lasting millennia, were mere invented stories without at least some historical context, however minimal that might be! John Bright had concluded: “Although there is no direct witness in Egyptian records to Israel’s presence in Egypt, the biblical tradition a priori demands belief: it is not the sort of tradition any people would invent!” Various studies have shown that although archaeological evidence is lacking, there are at least points on which scholars agree as to a minimal historical context to these texts. For centuries the historicity of the Exodus and the persons tied to it was never questioned. The only questions surrounding this event appear to have been: “When did it happen?” “Which route did the Exodus group really take?” and “How many persons were actually involved?” But there was a sudden shift in the understanding of the biblical texts. Many concluded that since the archaeological evidence is scant, if not absent altogether, the biblical data cannot offer anything to the historian. Lemche states that literary analysis itself shows that these texts are not reliable sources for the historian. I disagree. The root of the problem lies in the fact that biblical data were being doubted right from the start. Archaeological data started being used as the criterion for proving the historicity of the biblical text. This methodological approach meant that many scholars dismissed the biblical texts altogether as offering any historical kernel. James Hoffmeier, the director of the North SinaiArchaeological Project, notes that scholars have had

12 When discussing the historicity of the Exodus, Berner argues that the biblical text describes the situation of Israel in Egypt through a literary development that was undertaken during the post-exilic period and therefore, as a result, the biblical account cannot be used as a historical source in the strict sense of the word, providing first-hand information about the event itself. However, Berner does admit: “Despite the scarcity of external evidence, it cannot be denied that the key points of the biblical account of the Exodus can be related to certain historical phenomena”; CHRISTOPH BERNER, “The Exodus Narrative between History and Literary Fiction: The Portrayal of the Egyptian Burden as a Test Case”, in *Israel’s Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*, Thomas E. Levy – Thomas Schneider – William H.C. Propp (eds.), Switzerland: Springer, 2015, 285. Berner also contends that whilst the narrative had been much expanded on the literary level by post-exilic scribes, it does not follow that such a tradition was invented. He concludes: “However, this is not to say that the Egyptian bondage or the Exodus in general should be regarded entirely as scribal inventions. On the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that the Exodus tradition had not developed out of thin air, but was based on a historical event of some sort, even if it was a marginal one”; Ibid 291.


“unrealistic expectations as to what archaeology can deliver”. One cannot emphasise enough that “the Biblical evidence, the archaeological evidence and other extrabiblical evidence, should all be given their due weight”.Apparently, the Biblical accounts have been discredited because the biblical authors extensively embellished the accounts that have arrived to us. It is a fact that the authors did not want to convey a history as such, but this does not mean either that the biblical text does not offer anything historical at all. Whilst archaeology offers an important contribution, the historian cannot simply ignore all the textual evidence that exists and is relevant to the issue, simply because archaeology has not offered any evidence to that text. Whenever archaeological data does not corroborate the text, our scholarly efforts should be in trying harder to understand the text at hand, rather than dismissing it as an unreliable source. Literary criticism helps us to better understand the text and may allow us to be in a better position to arrive at a basic understanding of the historical event. Coats states: “before the work of the historian or the theologian can be undertaken, the work of a literary critic must be completed”. In the introduction to his monograph on Moses he writes: “Historical reconstruction must depend on careful evaluation of the literary shape in the sources. The prospects of developing any notion of the historical Moses, given the sources now available, must await the satisfactory evaluation of the traditions as literary art.”

---

18 Albright claims that we should be thankful to the biblical authors, for in their genius, they picked up historical details and rather than develop them into a pedagogically dull record of clan and tribal history, elaborated those details into the literary genre of saga. See WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1932, 150-151.
20 As Frendo notes: “it certainly does not follow that the text is necessarily false”. See FREND’O, “Back to Basics”, 42.
2.1.1 The Historical Context of the Exodus

The Conference, “The Exodus Egyptian Evidence”, held at Brown University in Providence Road Island in 1997 arrived at the following conclusions:

For this event there is no archaeological context into which it can be placed, no hint from Egypt from whence such hints would have come… All we can currently produce are minor parallels here and there that show that foreigners did wander into Egypt and out again, that a much toned-down version of the biblical narrative could have happened, that the possibility of some historical kernel is there. But there is no single iota of proof. Basically, Egypt remains uninterested and silent on the matter, as it always has.23

So despite the lack of direct evidence, we can glean a lot of information from indirect evidence. Cuneiform and Egyptian texts speak of an alien people called Hapiru who were employed in harsh servitude of the Egyptians in Goshen.24 Many lived under guards in the walled villages. It was quite possible that Israelite groups were amongst these Hapiru.25 The Mernptah Stele is considered very important because it identifies Israel as a people.26 The stele makes no reference to the geographical location where this group of people was settled. Pietro Kaswalder suggests: “se si volesse ricavare un ordine geografico dalla stele, Israele si trova nel nord-est del Canaan, nella regione di Issachar, a nord di Bet Shean”.27 It thus enables us to at least affirm a compatibility with the biblical datum that attests to the arrival of a clan of Israelites from Egypt who settled down on the hills of Ephraim.28

There are various archaeological data that seem to point at the plausibility that there were population groups from the southern Levant in Egypt, and such groups would have represented “early” Israel.29 The famous tomb painting of Rekhmire, Vizier of Thutmoses III (1457–1425 B.C.E.) depicts prisoners of war employed in making mud bricks and hauling them to a nearby building project, supervised by

---

24 An important text is Papyrus Anastasi VI. See ANET, 259.
27 Ibid, 28.
Egyptian taskmasters with sticks in their hands. Third and second millennia B.C.E. Egyptian texts attest to how work quota were imposed on brick makers, much as attested in Exodus 5:7-8. Hoffmeier concludes:

I have shown that the Biblical description of the entry into Egypt, the enslavement and the Exodus are all plausible. I have also shown that several of the geographical sites on the Exodus route are attested in Egyptian records of the New Kingdom. But what about the Biblical text itself? I may be charged with circularity because I look in part to the Biblical text to determine the historicity of the Biblical text. But I do believe the text is entitled to some weight, especially because the Exodus is such a central event—and remembered as such—in the long history of ancient Israel, and the Bible offers no other story about Israel’s origins. It is so in the Torah (the Pentateuch or Five Books of Moses), as well as in the historical books and in the Prophets.

For a fuller account on the historicity of the Exodus I refer the reader to the research presented in the recent symposium “Out of Egypt: Israel’s Exodus between Text and Memory, History and Imagination” held in 2013 at the Qualcomm Institute of the University of California, San Diego. The research presented there makes it evident that the issue of the historicity of the Exodus will always remain a heated debate among scholars. William Propp denies that we can know anything about the historicity of the Exodus, and according to him “we must simply resign ourselves to ignorance”. Manfred Bietak deduces the historicity of the Exodus by presenting corroborating data from contemporary Egyptology. Christoff Berner studies the account of the sojourn in Egypt and concludes that it is evidently the result of a continuous process of literary expansion. The text basically communicates “how different generations of postexilic scribes imagined these circumstances.” However, despite this literary critical conclusion he does afford a basic kernel of historicity to the

31 “Records of brick-making teams, targets and shortfalls, are found on a leather scroll now in the Louvre that dates to the fifth year of Ramesses II (1275 B.C.).” See HOFFMEIER, “Out of Egypt”, 8.
35 Bietak starts with the assumption that the Exodus tradition must have some historical basis: “The storyline of the Exodus, of a people fleeing from a humiliating slavery, suggests elements that are historically credible. Normally, it is tales of glory and victory that are preserved in narratives from one generation to the next.” See BIETAK, “On the Historicity of the Exodus”, 17-38.
sojourn in Egypt and to the Exodus. In my opinion, it is clear that the biblical texts in themselves are not a historical documentation as such, however, these texts do contain indications that do at least orient us at identifying a basic historical kernel.

2.1.2 The Emergence of Israel

The origins of Israel have long been discussed in scholarly circles and especially among archaeologists. The problem of the historicity of the Exodus became ever more pronounced because of the issue of the emergence of Israel in Canaan. William Dever had concluded that the origins of Israel can be accounted for archaeologically without the need of positing the Exodus. Dever arrived at this conclusion because archaeological evidence supports the thesis of the Canaanite origins of Israel. Canaanites made their way up the hills and built their iron age I settlements. Yet Dever himself later recognised the possibility of the Exodus. Scholars had been divided, some posited the Exodus as the origins of Israel, others its Canaanite origins. However it does not follow that these theories are mutually exclusive, as Graham Davies suggests: “more moderate versions of both theories could, however, be readily combined”. He concludes:

“Among the principal architects who shaped the biblical overall tradition we assume that there were elements of the House of Joseph. Although a minority, they told their story as the story of all Israel. That would explain how the Exodus/Sinai tradition came into being. Some of these groups probably had come out of Egypt to Canaan, and in a way that upon reflection seemed miraculous to them… it is not the whole story of Israelite origins to be sure; but it would suggest that it may rest on some historical foundations, however minimal.”

As concerns the emergence of Israel in Canaan, scholars have proposed various models. This is not the place to enter into this complex issue. I mention the two main

38 DAVIES, “Was there an Exodus?”, 24.
40 DAVIES, “Was there an Exodus?”, 25.
models proposed namely, “the Conquest Model” and “the Peaceful Infiltration Model”. Unfortunately these models were initially considered as mutually exclusive. When integrated, however, the picture becomes fuller and clearer, since after all, both the biblical as well as the archaeological data attest to such a complex picture.\textsuperscript{42} There are in fact three biblical traditions as regards the settling of Israel in Canaan: 1) the Blitzkrieg as depicted in Numbers 21:21-35 and Joshua 1-12, which depicts the entry into the land as a sweeping conquest; 2) the slow and variegated entry into the land as depicted in Joshua 13:1-7 in the theme of unconquered land; 3) the tradition of peaceful settlement in Numbers 32:1-38 and Judges 5, giving the idea of military operations without full blown Blitzkrieg.\textsuperscript{43} The accounts of Joshua 1-13 appear to be a hyperbole, done through re-reading and intertwining conquest stories that are more typical of the seventh century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{44} The biblical evidence itself regards the emergence of Israel in Canaan through an entry that is partly peaceful and partly violent. It is these tribes coming from the desert that bring with them the Yahwistic faith, and settled in the central hills of the country. This appears to be corroborated by an important archaeological datum, in that the hill country of Palestine appears to have undergone a population explosion in the Early Iron age. The population grew from 12,000 up to 55,000, which seems to point to the actual immigration of the Exodus group from Transjordan.\textsuperscript{45} Late Bronze age Hazor was destroyed violently and the agents of destruction could easily have been the Israelites.

“Thus it seems that early Israel was mainly made up of various groups of hill country villagers originally indigenous to Canaan. However evidence also indicates that a small group of Hebrews joins these villagers after having been freed from slavery in Egypt and after having picked up Yahwism in the desert areas to the south-east of Canaan. They entered the land bringing Yahwistic faith with them, mainly in a peaceful manner, though at times they took part in military attacks.”\textsuperscript{46}

The names Pithom and Ramses have archaeological evidence related to the second millennium Egyptian situation. Exodus 1:11 remains an important historical datum for the Exodus tradition.\textsuperscript{47} Thus we can conclude that historically, the Exodus, did

\textsuperscript{42} FRENDO, “Back to Basics”, 58.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, 45.
\textsuperscript{46} FRENDO, “Back to Basics”, 61.
\textsuperscript{47} DAVIES, “Was there an Exodus?”, 29-30.
comprise part of the picture called “the origins of Israel”. The Exodus group consisted mostly of the house of Joseph, which, being nomadic, probably went down to Egypt to find food in a time of famine, and to find fodder for their herds.\textsuperscript{48}

Andre Lemaire concluded that the Exodus group made up of Hapira and Shasu elements left Egypt under the guidance of Moses, and later joined the tribes of Bnei-Israel of Canaan. They thus formed a confederation of tribes that had YHWH as its protector.\textsuperscript{49} Andrew Mayes offers an interesting argument as to how the Exodus event could have become an integral part of national history that was blown into mythical proportions.\textsuperscript{50} He asserts that “both the Egyptian background to the name Moses, and the data concerning the presence of Western Asiatic people in the thirteenth century Egypt argue in favour of the historicity of an Exodus of some kind”.\textsuperscript{51} Rainer Albertz seeks to present evidence that the Exodus presents Moses as a reflection of king Jeroboam, and that the Exodus account drew details from the experience of forced labour under Solomon. Exodus 1:11 in fact does contain a vocabulary that is similar to the work imposed by Solomon on the people in 1 Kings 9:15-19, especially in the words מִסִים and מִסְכְנ.\textsuperscript{52} Both Moses and Jeroboam are linked with a royal house, both identify with the oppressed, both rebel, both revolt, both fail and have to flee, both return after the death of the king and both negotiate with the king’s successor.\textsuperscript{53} In this light, Albertz argues that the cultural memory of Israel contained an account of the


\textsuperscript{51} MAYES, “Pharaoh Shishak’s Invasion of Palestine”, 137.

\textsuperscript{52} This has led scholars like Crüsemann to conclude that the Exodus narrative comes from the time of Solomon. See FRANK CRÜSEMANN, \textit{Der Widerstand gegen das Königum: Die antikoniglichen Texte des Alten Testamentes und der Kampf um den frühen israelitischen Staat}, (=WMZANT; 49), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978, 177.

liberation from Egypt, and the concrete experience from the time of Jeroboam then provided the best context for the Exodus narrative to be embellished the way it is. Mayes argues that Shishak’s invasion and the development of the northern kingdom spelt the best context for the communal memory of the Exodus to be consolidated. The Exodus was a historical reality on a much more reduced scale than narrated, then, it ultimately became an archetype, a symbol of Israelite identity, particularly in the northern kingdom where Shishak’s invasion and the subsequent withdrawal created the context for reminiscing the historical memory of Jeroboam escaping to Egypt and his subsequent return to assume kingship.54 Blum studies the summary recollection of Hosea 11:14 that reflects a narrative tradition of the Egyptian Exodus. Hosea attacked the cult of Jeroboam’s bull figures of 1 Kings 12:26-33 in Hosea 8:5; 10:5-6 and 13:2b. It is interesting to note that in 1 Kings 12:28 there is that proclamation of faith in the national god/s55 and of an Exodus from Egypt. With this as background, Mayes suggests that the Exodus tradition took root in the northern kingdom and became a founding Charter Myth. Blum suggests that the heavy work under Solomon and the political resistance against his rule could have led to an increase in value of the Exodus tradition.56 Nadav Na’aman argues that the beginning of the Exodus tradition grew through the proto-Israelites of Canaan of the Late Bronze age, when, under the 19th or 20th Dynasty, Egyptian supremacy in Canaan was increasingly oppressive over the non-urban population. Na’aman contends that the Egyptian withdrawal from the country could have been perceived as a great relief by all the inhabitants and seen as a liberation, giving rise to the Exodus tradition.57 However this does not explain how the Exodus event became so central. Moreover, why should an Exodus of Egyptians from Canaan be perceived and converted into an Exodus of Israelites from Egypt? In my opinion, Alt’s and Noth’s traditional hypothesis of a small Exodus is to be retained.

54 MAYES, “Pharaoh Shishak’s Invasion of Palestine”, 143.
55 The text is in the plural but commentators have seen this plural as referring to the two images, rather than belief in a plurality of gods. If we maintain that Israel was henotheistic, as scholars tend to agree, then the reference here is to an iconic cult of YHWH and the plural in גלעפֶּה is referring to the two golden images. Interestingly the plural in Exodus 32:4, 8, where only one image was made, appears to betray the fact that this text is secondary and dependent on the episode narrated in 1 Kings 12:26-33. For a more detailed study I refer the reader to HANS-CHRISTOPH SCHMITT, “Die Erzählung vom Goldenen Kalb Ex. 32* und das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk”, in Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible, Steven L. McKenzie (ed.), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000, 235-250.
and the difficulties of the Solomonic rule, or the memory of the Egyptian Canaanite oppression would have served as fuel for the originally small fire of the Exodus tradition.

2.1.2.1 The Extra-Biblical Sources

Römer gives extra-biblical data its due when considering the fact that many Hellenistic authors drew from sources that are theoretically contemporaneous with the formation of the Pentateuch in the Persian period.\(^{58}\) In chapter 1, I concluded that the final edition of the Pentateuch was “published” in the Persian period.\(^{59}\) Römer also considers that many of the old traditions of the Moses story were edited and finalised in this period, thus making it theoretically possible that other traditions that did not make it into the official publication of the Pentateuch, still circulated in the Hellenistic Era. Some of these traditions arrived to us thanks to Hellenistic authors. Maneton, Hecateus of Abdera, Artapanus, Lisimachus of Alexandria, and Eupolemus, offer Mosaic traditions parallel to those of the Bible.\(^{60}\) Michelangelo Priotto similarly argues that the definitive redaction of the Pentateuch occurred during the Hellenistic period, and so there is a temporal proximity in these traditions.\(^{61}\) Whilst we only possess fragmentary texts or indirect citations of these authors, the study of such authors leads us to Mosaic traditions that are different from the biblical ones but which most probably, the final editors chose consciously to ignore or censor. In fact, there are traces in the biblical texts that offer some parallels to these traditions, indicating that there was such a censorship.\(^{62}\) Obviously one must not exaggerate the importance of these sources. First of all these sources attest to a tradition and not to history itself. Secondly, these texts also idealised the person of Moses, much like the traditions in

---

\(^{58}\) THOMAS RÖMER, “The Construction of the Figure of Moses According to Biblical and Extrabiblical Sources”, \(A JB I\) 30 (2005) 103-106.

\(^{59}\) As I argue in chapter 1, during the Persian period there were two main redactions, which used previous sources, namely the D-composition and the P-Composition, and that the final redaction of the Pentateuch was actually a compromise between the two (see section 1.1 and references therein). Both were interested in offering Moses his due, altering the various traditions according to their theology and agenda.

\(^{60}\) RÖMER, “Figure of Moses”, 107-108.

\(^{61}\) PROTTO, \(Esodo\), 754-755.

\(^{62}\) PROTTO, \(Esodo\), 754-755; see also CATERINA MORO, \(I\) sandali di Mosè: \(Storia\ di una\ tradizione ebraica\), (=\(Studi\ Biblici\, 167\), Brescia: Paideia, 2011, 23-24.
the biblical text. However, these accounts could still offer valuable information that could also help us glean certain historical aspects of the person of Moses.63

2.1.3 The Life of Moses and his various Roles

Rolf Rendtorff notes that the Pentateuchal texts present a very complex image of Moses. He asks: “did the final redactor just collate the various traditions to form a coherent whole?”64 Indeed, as already stated, the vastness and the many layers of tradition that surround Moses, create a concrete problem for the historian. Yet it is possible, in my opinion, to arrive at least at a basic historical kernel. The texts can yield much more historical data than Noth allows when he states that Moses’ death and burial are the only sure criterion for the historical existence of Moses.65 Moreover, Noth himself concedes that we can conclude that Moses was an Israeliite leader, married to a Midianite, leading the people on a journey to the mountain of God.66

2.2 Moses the Prince

In Exodus 2 Moses is born of Hebrew slaves, the son of parents both coming from the tribe of Levi. The male child genocide of Exodus 1 sets the scene for the exposure saga of chapter 2. As the text narrates, as soon as Moses is born, he encounters a concrete danger. Being a “good/lovely child” (בָּנוֹט), his mother hides him, but can only do so for three months, after which she has to work out a complex plan to at least give the child a slim chance of survival. It is this attempt that leads the child into Pharaoh’s court, becoming the adoptive son of Pharaoh’s daughter. The irony is stark. The same Pharaoh who should have been his executioner, will turn out to be the one to provide Moses with nourishment, shelter, and good education. The narrative is

63 For a detailed study of the various parallelisms and themes in the traditions similar to Moses’, especially the birth, exposure and education, I refer the reader to: MORO, I sandali di Mosè, 2011.
66 Ibid, 163.
typical of wisdom literature, for whilst God appears to be absent from the scene, he is implicitly active through the providence that leads to the salvation of the deliverer, and through the deliverer, provides for the salvation of his people. As we shall see, in my opinion, this literary unit paves the way for explaining Moses’ link to the Egyptian court. The biblical author appears to have been conscious of Moses’ original Hebrew origins as well as his Egyptian education. The legend of Sargon would prove invaluable for the author to explain Moses’ Egyptian education. Historically, Moses was probably one of the appointed leaders from his people to supervise and negotiate the work imposed on the Hebrews. Such a position would have meant that he would receive an Egyptian education, as well as being viewed negatively by his own people. Indeed, Moses in his youthful years would have been a man torn between two identities.

2.2.1 The Birth of a Hero

The Greek heroes were considered as demi-gods. If there is a person in the Hebrew Scriptures who comes closest to such a status, it is Moses. He is the one who sees God face to face, speaks with Him as with a friend (Ex 33:11), and is constituted as a god to Aaron by YHWH himself in Exodus 4:16. The character of a hero emerges strongly in the literary masterpiece that is Moses’ birth account. It is introduced by the child genocide in Exodus 1, attributed to a panicking Pharaoh who wanted to control the ever-growing population of the Hebrews. This chapter appears to be the literary motif preparing the way for Exodus 2, and as such is dependent on it. The Midrash Exodus Rabba I 14, already notes that it would have been more effective in


68 Ibid. Childs notes how Exodus 1 was a literary construction to make possible the use of the exposure saga. In the Bible we do find parallels of such an exposure. Ezekiel 16 presents the allegory of Israel as an exposed child of an unwanted union between an Amorite father and a Hittite mother. In Genesis 21, Hagar exposes her child so as not to see it die a horrible death. Exodus 1:8-10 therefore, appears to be a secondary expansion to 2:1-10, providing the reasons for the exposure.

69 HUGO GRESSMANN, Mose und seine Zeit, Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen, (=FRLANT, 18) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913, 3. Yet this dependence is only literary. As Waterman notes, it would appear strange that to save the child, the mother would place it in the neighbourhood of Pharaoh’s residence. Even the princess appears to show no consciousness of Pharaoh’s edict. See LEROY WATERMAN, “Moses the Pseudo Levite”, JBL 59 (1940) 400.
controlling the population if the Egyptians were to kill firstborn females rather than males. Samuel Loewenstamm concludes that the Exodus event never included the horrific act of child genocide. It should be considered as literature not history, used to provide the background for the story of Moses’ birth. There is also the tendency in the author to link and integrate Moses’ fate into the framework of the national history of his own people. It is interesting to note that the father of Moses is only mentioned in verse 1 and then disappears, whilst the mother is portrayed as the protagonist who saves the child. Scholars have drawn parallels between the birth of Moses and that of Sargon of Akkad. Sargon was an illegitimate son of a high priestess who bore him in secret. She placed him in a basket of rushes, and after sealing its lid with bitumen, she let it afloat in the Euphrates River. Literary criticism shows that there are differences in detail that attest how the biblical author used this story and applied it in the narrative context. The father’s absence is similar to that of Sargon, however, here illegitimacy is being replaced by a quick reference to who the legitimate father was. It will only be in Exodus 6 that we are given Moses’ line of ancestors. It is also significant to note that the ark has a secondary function in this narrative. In the legend of Sargon, the ark fulfils its function since it was placed floating in the river. Strangely, the ark in this narrative appears to be a mere adjunct since Moses’ mother, after having taken the pains to cover it with tar and pitch to make it watertight, places it on the river bank. Loewenstamm argues that this actually betrays the author’s use of Sargon’s legend. It is thus evident that legendary material is being adopted, modified, and

71 LOEWENSTAMM “Moses’ Birth”, 214; Gosse also notes a theological parallelism. Moses’ mother for example, places him amongst the reeds (עוף) of the Nile. At the Nile, Moses turns the waters into blood, at the Sea of Reeds (יַם־עוף) the waters are parted and Israel is saved. In the plagues, the author uses various terms that allude to Genesis 1, such as the darkness, with the plagues evoking the chaos. Indeed the theology of the text points to a new creation, Israel. See BERNARD GOSSE, “La naissance de Moïse, les premiers nés et la sortie d’Égypte, les plaies d’Égypte et le retour de la création au chaos”, RB 54 (2006) 357-364.
72 This fact is corrected by later historians. The LXX for instance includes the father up to the fabrication of the ark, Philo includes both parents in the whole scene, whilst in Josephus the father becomes the principal character.
74 For a translation of the whole narrative, see ANET, 119.
75 LOEWENSTAMM, “The Story of Moses’ Birth”, 204.
76 Ibid, 205; it is interesting to note that whilst Philo (Vita Mosis 1:10) does not mention any vessel, Josephus actually restores the original function of the vessel, stating that the river carried it away (Ant II, 9,4). Childs offers a very interesting study where he also compares the biblical account with the
transformed. This is important for the dating of this literary unit. The legend of Sargon was written in the 8th century B.C.E., and therefore Moses’ birth story cannot be older. Exodus 2 appears to be a reaction to Neo-Assyrian ideology elaborated in Josiah’s court. As Römer points out, this does not mean that all the material was necessarily invented. Brevard Childs concludes that the birth story is the latest stage in the collection of the Exodus traditions which presents the reason as to why Moses was received in Pharaoh’s court and received a good education that would eventually equip him to become Israel’s leader and deliverer. Childs argues that the Gattung is not wisdom literature, but a historicised wisdom tale. As we have already seen, God is absent in the first two chapters, unlike in the rest of the book of Exodus. Just like in wisdom literature, God is implicitly present throughout the narrative in the providence of the actions of the humans involved.

I do not agree with Leroy Waterman who questions whether Moses was ever in Egypt but I do agree with him that the birth narrative shows that the biblical authors did not know anything of Moses’ origins, since they felt the need to use the legend of Sargon as a model for Moses’ birth account. Other scholars take it to the extreme in claiming that Moses was of Egyptian origins. Ed Meyer remarks that the daughter of the king was originally Moses’ real mother. As we have seen, the text is a literary masterpiece trying to harmonise Moses’ apparent double identity as a Hebrew and as an Egyptian. Reuel’s daughters in Exodus 2:19, do in fact identify him as Egyptian. Could it be that the text is presenting Moses’ double identity because he was in fact of Hebrew origin but received an Egyptian education? Having had such an Egyptian formation in Pharaoh’s court would explain his stark leadership skills and

Akkadian legal texts concerning the hiring of a wet nurse. See BREVARD S. CHILDS, “The Birth of Moses”, 112-114.
77 RÖMER, “Figure of Moses”, 102.
78 Ibid, 103.
80 WATERMAN, “Moses the Pseudo Levite”, 403-404.
81 Ibid, 401.
84 The name Reuel is here problematic. Scholars argue that probably it should have read Hobab, as it has been attributed to a misreading of the reference in Numbers 10:29 “Hobab the son of Reuel the Midianite, Moses’ father-in-law”. See R.F. JOHNSON, “Jethro”, IBD, 897.
his ability to legislate. A possible explanation for this scenario could be that Egypt had no caste system and so a person could rise from slavery to high positions of skilled labourers like royal sculptors and artists. We have to keep in mind the note in Exodus 11:3 that Moses was very great in the land of Egypt in the eyes of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people (הוּבְעֵינֵי הָעָם בְעֵינֵי עַבְדֵי פַרְעֹה).

We also have to distinguish between the two classes of overseers managing the Hebrew work force, namely, the “task masters” (גְשִים) and the “foremen” (טְרִים). The term “task master” is the active participle of the verb נָגָשׁ, which means “to force to work”; this was a position held by the Egyptians and was probably held by the Egyptian killed by Moses in Exodus 2. The noun שֶׁבֶר on the other hand means “officer”, “administrator”, or “civil servant”, and is a term that also occurs in Joshua 1:10. The text implies that the role of foremen (שֶׁבֶר) was a position held by the Hebrews, since in Exodus 5:19-21 they go to meet Moses in an effort to seek mediation. The fact that they seek Moses’ intercession before Pharaoh would allow for the speculation that Moses actually might have originally held a higher position than foreman, and presumably even higher than that of the task master. A datum that might corroborate this idea comes from Egyptology. In order to control the various ethnic groups working for Egypt, Pharaoh needed leaders who knew the culture of the ethnic groups, as well as that of Egypt. Indeed, as the Tel El-Amarna letters attest, the scribes of Egypt were well versed in all the languages of the surrounding peoples, especially the languages spoken in Canaan. The scribe was the one to keep external relations with other countries, and was therefore required to be proficient in the languages and in diplomatic relations. Some scribes were actually chosen from amongst the young men of the foreign ethnic groups living in Egypt, and Moses could

---

85 Gwyn Griffiths, “The Egyptian Derivation of the Name Moses”, JNES 12 (1953) 225-231. See also John Wilson, “The World of Moses”, in Everyday Life in Bible Times, Severy Merle (ed.), Washington: 1967, 118. This could also explain how Joseph managed to get such a prominent position in Egypt. Another interesting study is that of Görg, who studies parallel figures to Moses who were not of Egyptian origin and managed to become prominent figures. These persons in turn acted in the interests of various ethnic groups in Egypt. See Manfred Görg, “Mosè. Nome e detentore del nome”, in Mosè. Egitto e Antico Testamento, Eckart Otto (ed.), Enzo Nardi (trans.), (=Studi biblici, 152), Brescia: Paideia, 2006, 36-52.

86 HALOT, a.v. נָגָשׁ - 3 where the qal active participle is given the meaning “slave-driver”.

87 HALOT, a.v. שְׁבָר .

88 Giovanni Rizzi, Mosè: La storia di una vocazione, Pessano (Mi): Mimep-Docete, 1988, 32.

89 Henri Cazelles, Alla ricerca di Mosè, (=Leggere oggi la Bibbia, 3.2), Brescia: Queriniana, 1982, 16.
have very well been one of them.\textsuperscript{90} It could well have been that Moses was a skilled person of exceptional qualities, who was introduced into Pharaoh’s palace, even as a scribe. That Moses appears to be aware of his Hebrew roots is evident in Exodus 2:11. However, whilst the narrator speaks of his brethren, he could only intervene against the oppressing Egyptian because he was not identified with the slave labourers. The following two episodes of intervention also indicate that he identifies with the enslaved Hebrews, both ethnically as well as socially.\textsuperscript{91} This further strengthens the point that Moses could have been of Hebrew origins, a labourer, who through his exceptional skills would have been promoted to Pharaoh’s palace, most probably as a scribe, thus explaining his stark leadership skills and ability to legislate. This could also have been the source of so many attacks on his leadership, starting with Exodus 2:14 as well as Exodus 15:24; 16:2; 17:3; Num14:2; 16:3; 16:41, 42; 20:2; 21:5; even Miriam and Aaron speak against him in Numbers 12:1. Could this be an indication that Moses was originally perceived as a traitor by his own people, once having been admitted in Pharaoh’s court?

As we have seen, the biblical text might hint to a particular administrative practice in Egypt – that of placing leaders from amongst the very same working people.\textsuperscript{92} These persons were taught the Egyptian language, laws, customs, and so on, and were therefore very well educated, as Luke implies for Moses: και ἔπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων (Acts 7:22).

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid, 22. According to Cazelles, apart from Egyptian, Moses also had to learn cuneiform and the Hittite culture. Ibid, 25. This practice is also studied by James Hoffmeier, particularly within the historical setting of the royal court in the New Kingdom. See JAMES K. HOFFMEIER, \textit{Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition}, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, 142-143, and references therein.

\textsuperscript{91} KWOK KONG, “The Birth, Early Life, and Commission of Moses”, 146.

\textsuperscript{92} Hoffmeier gives examples from the policy introduced by Thutmose III which introduced the practice of bringing the princes of subject kings of Western Asia to the Egyptian court to be trained there and thus prepare them to replace their fathers upon death (see KURT SETHE, \textit{Urkunden der 18. Dynastie}, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961, 690). Foreigners such as Nubians and Semites were admitted into court to be “civilized”. Children of foreign rulers would return to their people to rule as vassals. Others continued to work on as court officials. See HOFFMEIER, \textit{Israel in Egypt}, 143. See also BETSY BRIAN, \textit{The Reign of Thutmose IV}, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991, 261.
2.2.2 The Name Moses

The name Moses appears to be of Egyptian origins.93 Exodus 2:10 tries to build its own etymology along the typical genre of biblical naming. This text implies that Pharaoh’s daughter named him Moses only after his weaning. The pun that she makes to arrive at the name Moses is very strange, for it implies that she knew Hebrew very well.94 This is a good indicator that this is the hand of a redactor wanting to harmonise the name of Moses with that of the patriarchs who were usually named through ingenious puns. If the name has a Hebrew etymology it would offer a problem, because it would thus be constructed from the active participle of the verb הָשָּׁה “to draw”. In reality Moses was drawn out of the water so the etymology should be passive.95 Some scholars have seen a reference to Moses’ function in relation to his leadership role in the Exodus in drawing the people out of Egypt.96 Apparently well aware of this, Philo derives the name from the Egyptian words mou “water” and eses “saved”.97 Josephus also supports this interpretation.98 Robert Duke argues that Moses was in fact given a name of Hebrew derivation by his parents, and that this was then used as his second name.99

93 GRIFFITHS, “The Name Moses”, 225.
97 PHILO, De Vita Mosis, 1:17: ἀνελέσθαι τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ μῶυ ὀνομάζουσιν Αἰγύπτιοι.
98 JOSEPHUS, Antiquities, 2: 228: τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ μῶυ μὴν Ἀιγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν ἐσῆς δὲ τοῖς [ξ ὄνομα] [συνήθετας].
99 Duke notes that the use of double names is common in the Bible. Daniel/Belteshazzar and Joseph/Zaphenathpaneah are just two examples. See ROBERT DUKE, “Moses’ Hebrew Name: the Evidence of the Vision of Amram”, DSD 14 (2007) 34-48, here 35. He argues that לְמָלָאכָיו line 9 of 4Q545 is actually the proper name given to Moses, and not the substantive “messengers”. 4Q545 9: לְמָלָאכָיו מֱעָר לְכֶר ל’ | לְרָו לָאָלָאֵי אָסֶרוּ | מְ בִּע | לְמָלָאכָיו | מֱעָר ל’ | לְרָו לָאָלָאֵי אָסֶרוּ | מְ בִּע | לְמָלָאכָיו | מֱעָר ל’ | לְרָו לָאָלָאֵי אָסֶרוּ | מְ בִּע | לְמָלָאכָיו | מֱעָר ל’ | לְרָו לָאָלָאֵי אָסֶרוּ | מְ בִּע | לְמָלָאכָיו | מֱעָר ל’ | L. Émile Puech translates: “et il lui dit: ‘Appelle-moi, mon fils, les messagers, vos frères, de la maison de [notre (?) père... à] son [servijce auprès d’elle et il l’appella. See DJD 31.335. Duke constructs the broken text differently and translates: “and he said to him: ‘call to me, my son, Mal’akyah(u), your brother, from the house of Pharaoh’ --- his strength to him, and he called him”. Apparently, Amram wants to speak to Moses since he is dying, and referring to him with the Hebrew name, asks Aaron to call him from the house of Pharaoh. It is interesting that the author of this text gave such a second name of pure Hebrew origins to Moses, much like the other biblical figures. This name מָלָאכָיו “messenger of YHWH” appears to be most fitting in Hebrew, for his mission is that of being a priest, prophet, heavenly messenger and king, appears to have been impressed on him by his parents when they gave him that name. The author of the vision of Amram was well aware of Moses’ prominent position and therefore supplied this name.
Today scholars tend to agree that the name is derived from the Egyptian verb *msiʿ* which means “to bear/give birth”. On similar etymological lines, Marks sees it as derived from Egyptian *mesu* meaning “child”. The name occurred in many common Egyptian theophoric names like: Ahmose, Amen-mose, Ptah-moseh and Thut-mose. Mosheh thus appears to have been the abbreviation of such theophoric names. So etymologically the name is of Egyptian origin relating to “birth and life”, and yet the editor plays on the pun of the Hebrew verb *nəṣaḥ* “to draw out”, for he was drawn out of the water, and ironically he will be the one to draw the people out of the water in the impeding saga between the forces of Pharaoh and God’s people at the Sea of Reeds. Paul Hughes identifies here the biblical equation where name equals vocation.

2.2.3 The Homicide: Moses the Liberator

The biblical text is silent as to how Moses came to know about his kinship with his brothers, the Hebrews. As Childs comments, “no words are wasted”, hence the reader infers things that are not explicitly told in the text. Moses’ identification with his kinsmen is left vague, for whilst the narrator speaks of Moses’ brethren, he could only behave as he did because he was not identified with the slave labourers. The literary irony surrounding young Moses is very strong: whilst the Egyptians see Moses as a Hebrew (Ex 2:2), both Hebrews (Ex 2:14) and Midianites (Ex 2:19) perceive him as an Egyptian. What Moses perceives as an act of deliverance, is perceived as an act of oppression by the Hebrews, especially in the way the Hebrew responds to Moses’ quest for justice in Exodus 2:14: “Who made you a prince and a judge over
us?” The pathos is indeed strong here. The author wants to convey that Moses the Hebrew was no longer considered to be such by his compatriots. He was perceived as coercive and dominating. Could this be an historical indication that after having been chosen to become a skilled person working in the court of the king, he was considered a traitor by his own people? In Exodus 2:11-15, Moses not only loses his original ethnic roots, he also loses his ethnic connection with the Egyptians. He becomes oppressed by Pharaoh, ironically, much like his brothers the Hebrews. In this episode Moses appears to be someone solicited by justice, and the reader cannot but sympathise with Moses’ quest for his brothers’ liberation. But his initiative remains a human one, and therefore, bound to fail. The true liberator will be God. It is interesting to note that this pathos is made clear by the text as it stands. In this episode Moses starts losing his identity both as an Egyptian and as a Hebrew. In the following narrative episode, Moses in Midian is recognised as an Egyptian, and yet here Moses appears to be devoid of any nationality (he names his son Gershom, “stranger there”) and apparently chooses to settle down definitively, as a shepherd. His identity as a Hebrew is only reaffirmed on his encounter with God, an identity that will only stand to count inasmuch as that identity is accompanied by YHWH (Ex 3:12). Moses can only be the liberator as long as YHWH, the true liberator, is with him. Rendtorff concludes that this episode of the slaying of the Egyptian was inserted to present the literary motif for Moses’ flight to Midian.\(^\text{108}\) Whilst I acknowledge the literary aspect of this text, we could affirm the historical possibility that Moses, born a Hebrew, raised up as an Egyptian, did in fact find a problem with his own identity. Gianni Barbiero argues that the spiritual journey of the young Moses depicted in Exodus 2-4, is really and truly a model for the whole experience of Israel in the Exodus event.\(^\text{109}\) In this episode, in fact, Moses emerges as a hero who is moved by this sense of justice. Coats notes how Moses defends the oppressed in this episode in Exodus 2:11-15a and in the following one of Exodus 2:15b-22 where he defends Reuel’s daughters. Moses is the hero seeking to save others, whether it is the Hebrews in Egypt or his family-to-be in Midian.\(^\text{110}\) According to Coats, such heroic narratives were not


\(^{109}\) BARBIERO, “Il cammino del giovane Mosè”, 3-23.

\(^{110}\) GEORGE COATS, The Moses Tradition, (=JSOTS, 161), Sheffield: JSOT, 1993, 108. Coats asserts that Moses hides the body of the Egyptian not out of cowardice, but because he did not want to lose his privileged position as an Egyptian, in order to be able to act like that again and defend his Hebrew brothers.
narrated for mere entertainment, but rather as a primary means of preserving the identity of the community, its moral fabric, as well as a means of encouragement, instilling hope for the future.\textsuperscript{111}

2.3 Moses the Shepherd

As the famous Italian proverb goes, “dalle stelle alle stalle” (from the stars to the stables), and this was indeed Moses’ experience after seeking to offer help to his “brethren”. The episode of the slaying of the Egyptian places Moses’ privileged position in jeopardy, so much so that he has to flee. Once again, his hunger for justice sets in, this time, landing him a positive reception from the Midianites. He intervenes in favour of Jethro’s daughters, and as a reward he gets to receive hospitality and, to some extent, an initiation into the tribe of the Midianites. Jethro gives him his daughter Zipporah in marriage, he becomes a shepherd, settles down with his family and begets two sons. This man, torn between two nations, now appears to gain a new identity, Moses the shepherd. But this shepherd, no matter how much he might have felt that he had settled down, still appears to have had an identity crisis. He names his son Gershom, “stranger there”. It could also be, however, that Moses was referring to Egypt, and that now he had settled down with a family with an itinerant home as a Midianite shepherd. Whatever psychological state Moses was in, Midian will always remain the essential place where he was introduced to the God of his fathers. YHWH appeared to him in the burning bush (Ex 3), but as we shall see, the importance of Moses’ sojourn in Midian is actually his intimate relationship with Jethro, “the priest of Midian”. Just as the text presents the revelation of the Divine Name in this narrative arch, so historically, in my opinion, Moses was introduced to Yahwism in Midian. It is here that the shepherd of sheep is wrought to become the shepherd of God’s people, Israel.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid, 111.
2.3.1 In Midian – Identity Lost

The tradition that Moses spent time in Midian, that there he married the daughter of a Midianite priest, and that it was there that subsequently the whole Exodus group met YHWH has been discredited by some as legend. Some scholars on the other hand contend that the Midianite layer is historical, especially in the light of the stark contrast we find in Numbers 25:6-18, which is very offensive to the Midianites. The intimate relationship with the Midianites is sealed by Moses with his marriage to Zipporah. Exodus presents Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, as a Midianite. In Judges 4:11, however, Moses’ father-in-law is called Hobab, descended from the Kenites, and Numbers 10:29 states clearly that Hobab was a Midianite. It seems that there are therefore two traditions. Geo Widengren asks whether this indicates that Moses had three wives, Zipporah, Jethro’s daughter, the daughter of Hobab, and the Kushite wife mentioned in Numbers 12:1. He concludes that it is unlikely that Moses had three foreign wives; rather Zipporah appears to represent the historical tradition that Moses had a foreign wife. This is not the place to enter into the complex discussion on this matter, but whatever the case may be, the Midianite tie with Moses and Israel is clear. Davies notes that the connection of Moses and the people with Midian can hardly be invented. Some scholars attribute the historical origins of Yahwism to this place. Apparently Moses came into contact with the worship of YHWH through Jethro his father-in-law, defined as the priest of Midian. Interestingly the name of his god is not given. Yet we can infer that YHWH was actually the name of Jethro’s god for in Exodus 18:12 Jethro offers, together with

112 Van Seters, for example, concluded that this tradition is based on the story of Hadad in 1 Kings 11. Van Seters, The Life of Moses, 29-33.
114 For the question of the sources I refer the reader to Childs, Exodus, 28-30. Other scholars try to give a different explanation. Hays, for instance, suggests that most probably חָתָן here means simply “in-law”; he therefore suggests that Reuel is Moses’ father-in-law, whilst Jethro would be his elder brother-in-law, whose flock Moses tended, and Hobab, a younger brother-in-law. See Daniel Hays, “Moses: The Private Man behind the Public Leader”, BR 16.4 (2000) 21.
Moses, Aaron, and all the elders of the people, a sacrifice to YHWH. Some argue that Jethro here converted to Yahwism, however that would be very unlikely since, after the sacrifice, he presides over the sacred meal that follows, much like the host.

The religious connection between the Mosaic religion and the Midianites appears here to be a historical fact. Archaeology corroborates this thanks to two Egyptian texts from the fourteenth and thirteenth century which indicate that YHWH was connected with the southern Transjordan. Both inscriptions mention “the land of the Shasu of Yhw”. YHWH’s homeland was in Edom amongst the Midianites and it is here that Moses came into contact with this divinity. Coats does not consider Midian to be the location of Moses’ call; the kernel of the Midianite tradition for him is not tied with the theophany and call, but rather with his marriage to Zipporah with the aim of explaining the intimate ties between Moses and his father-in-law, the Midianite priest. The tradition’s goal is to underline and explain the origins of that relationship. In the traditions surrounding Moses, the historical Moses appears to have a relationship with Midianite priesthood, and this relationship appears to have had the major influence on the introduction of the worship of YHWH in Israel. Moses is considered to be the introducer of Yahwism in Israel, thanks to his contact with the Midianites, particularly in his relationship with Jethro, priest of Midian and his father-in-law.

---

119 Rowley asks how it would have been possible for Jethro to officiate as priest if YHWH were not his God. It couldn’t be the case that Jethro was being initiated into Yahwism, for it would be most strange for someone to officiate during his initiation or conversion. See HAROLD ROWLEY, “Moses and Monotheism”, in From Moses to Qumran, Harold H. Rowley (ed.), London: Lutterworth Press, 1963, 52.
120 Ibid, 50.
121 COATS, Moses, 54.
123 One inscription is found in the Soleb Temple Cartouche of Amenhotep III, and the other is the Amarah West Inscription of Ramesses II.
125 This is not the place to deal with the complex history and evolution of Yahwism and monotheism. For that I refer the reader to the following works ROWLEY, “Moses and Monotheism”, 50-51. Indeed the rise of monotheism in ancient Israel is a much studied issue. Scholars today agree that monotheism in the strict sense of the word only emerged with Deutero-Isaiah, when Israel embraced a universalistic world view. They also agree that Yahwism in Israel was in fact henotheism and the texts of the Pentateuch, particularly the first commandment, call for a monolatric and un-iconic cult of YHWH. I cannot enter into further detail concerning this matter. For that I refer the reader to: HERBERT COHN, “From Monolatry to Monotheism”, JBQ 26 (1998) 124-126; RAÚL CASTILLO DUARTE, “El Henotismo o Monolatria israelita”, QOL 19 (1999), 61-71; MARK S. SMITH, The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts, London: Oxford University Press, 2001; MICHAEL HEISER, “Monotheism, Polytheism, Monolatry, or Henotheism?: Toward an Assessment of Divine Plurality in the Hebrew Bible”, BBR 18.1 (2008) 1-30; GEORG BRAULIK, “Das Deuteronomium und die Geburt des Monotheismus”, in Gott, der Einzige, Ernst Haag (ed.), Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1985, 115-159; THOMAS RÖMER, “L’exil à Babylone: creuset du monothéisme”, Le Monde de la Bible 110 (1998) 42-48; IBID, “Une seule maison pour le Dieu unique?: le centralisation du culte dans le
Interestingly, at his call and commission, Moses appears as estranged from both Hebrews and Egyptians. The identity of Moses is being diluted, first he is born a Hebrew who becomes an Egyptian, raised as a prince. Losing these two identities he becomes a shepherd but only faintly a Midianite, as is indicated by the pun he creates when naming his son Greshom “a sojourner/stranger there” in Exodus 2:22. Interestingly this places Moses as a man in the liminal stage of his life.

2.3.2 Moses at Horeb – Identity Found

The call and commission of Moses in Exodus 3:1-4:18 will be studied in detail in chapter 5. Whilst the call narrative presupposes the birth narrative, it is apparent, as many scholars argue, that Exodus 3:1-4:18 constitutes a late insertion. The name Horeb, used in this narrative, already hints that there is the hand of the Deuteronomist at work. The affinities and parallels between the language of Deuteronomy 18:15, Exodus 3:1-4:18, and Jeremiah 1:1-10, namely, Moses’ and Jeremiah’s call narratives, stand to show that this narrative is linked with Moses’ prophetic identity. I regard it

---

126 Interestingly, Seitz notes that the request for the revelation of the name tells us less about what the Israelites knew or did not know, and more about Moses’ distant relation to them. Seitz seems to imply that the Israelites did know the name of their God, whilst Moses was distant from them, so much so, that he was ignorant of the name of their God. See CHRISTOPHER SEITZ, “The Call of Moses and the ‘Revelation’ of the Divine Name: Source-Critical Logic and its Legacy”, in Theological Exegesis, Brevard S. Childs (ed.), Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999, 145-161.


as opportune therefore to study this relationship in detail in another chapter. Here I will only be dealing with the literary implication of Moses’ identity in his call and commission.

Thus, Moses in Midian appears to be in a liminal stage in his life with an identity crisis. As presented in the narrative it is only with the theophany that Moses’ identity is re-established as a full identification with the Hebrews in Exodus 3:6 כִּי אָנֹּב יִצָּחַק וֵֹלהֵי יַעֲקֹלֹּ הֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹאֵי אָבִי. It is very telling that whilst he acknowledges God’s identity by covering his face, he still doesn’t feel able to identify with his brothers as in 3:13 Moses considers the patriarchs “your fathers”, not “our fathers” (םֶלֶכֶת אלוהים אליך אלהים שִׁלְחוּנֵיך). God continually invites Moses to re-establish his Hebrew roots by identifying himself continually in ancestral terms in Exodus 3:6, 13, 15, 16, 18; 4:5. It is only after the commission in Exodus 4:18 that Moses finally fully identifies with the Hebrews and calls them “brothers”. There is also a noticeable shift at this point: Moses’ human quest for justice becomes a divine quest. The difference between the first and the second encounter with his brothers bears this marked difference. On his first encounter with his brothers in Exodus 2:14, Moses is met by two strong questions that apparently shake the very core of his identity: “Who made you a prince and a judge over us? Do you mean to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?” The answer to these strong questions will be Exodus 3:10 “Come, I will send you to Pharaoh that you may bring forth my people, the sons of Israel, out of Egypt”. It is thus no longer a human initiative, but a divine one! Danny Matthews identifies a very neat concentric structure around the centre of Moses’ identity:

113 ERICH ZENGER, Israel am Sinai: Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17-34, Altenberge, 1982, 34.
113 DANNY MATHEWS, Royal Motifs in the Pentateuchal Portrayal of Moses, (=OTS, 571), London – New York: T. & T. Clark 2012, 98. Since the question of 2:14 lies at the centre of this palistrophic framework, Mathews argues that Exodus 2:11-15a cannot be held as merely a transitional section. Moses is here neither designated as prophet nor a priest. Rather, that question as regards being a ruler and judge places emphasis on Moses as a royal figure as explicitly as possible without the specific designation “king”.

89
A: Born into a Levitical priestly family in Egypt (2:1-2)

B: Recognised as a Hebrew by Pharaoh’s daughter in Egypt after his rescue from the river (2:6)

C: Question of Moses’ identity: ruler or judge? (2:14)

B¹: Recognised as an Egyptian by Jethro’s seven daughters in Midian after the rescue at the well (2:19)

A¹: Marries into a Midianite priestly family (2:19-22)

Yet still, Moses appears to have a sense of inferiority and is hesitant. In the light of the Hebrew’s question “Who made you a prince and a judge over us?” Moses asks God “Who am I?” Again the issue of identity is underlined. Moses’ question is however out of place. Moses’ identity is no longer important. What is important is that it is YHWH who is sending him, as YHWH replies to Moses’ question: “I shall be with you”. Moses ultimately tries to find further excuses to avoid going back to Egypt. It is important to note that the response YHWH gives to each and every objection is a restatement of what “I shall be with you” means and implies.¹³⁴ YHWH’s reply is all based on his being “I am who I am” (היה אשם). The divine name is an intensification of YHWH’s answer “I shall be with you”.

2.3.2.1 Moses a Man with a Disability?

Moses reveals his speech defect in Exodus 4:10; 6:12 and in 6:30. It is very significant that two traditions appear to agree on this detail. Whilst I attribute Exodus 4:10 to the late deuteronomist, Exodus 6 is attributed to P, especially through the use of the technical term “uncircumcised lips” (עֲרַל שְפָתָיִם).¹³⁵ Scholars agree that as the text implies, Moses brings up this fact as an excuse to avoid the divine commission and confrontation with Pharaoh. It is also interesting to note how interpreters of this

¹³⁴ BARBIERO, “Il cammino del giovane Mose”, 16.
text took it as physical disability. Jeffrey Tigay suggests that the author of Exodus 4:10 (כְבַד־פָּה) uses a term that is typically used in Akkadian medical texts that discuss physical disabilities.\textsuperscript{136} Coats does not accept this interpretation, but rather states that these terms refer to someone who does not consider himself ready for a commission.\textsuperscript{137}

We have to keep in mind that lips (שְפָתָיִם) are an important feature in the literary genres of vocation narratives, as exemplified in Isaiah 6:5-7; 49:2; Jeremiah 1:9, and Ezekiel 3:3, each time requiring YHWH’s reassurance of the one who is commissioned. Some scholars attribute Moses’ defect to the fact of him having forgotten the Egyptian language, or else his being ineloquent or unskilled in debating. I don’t accept such interpretations for if Moses was truly formed in Pharaoh’s court, he would have certainly learned the language well, as well as the art of debating, especially if he were a scribe, as his legislative qualities seem to hint at. One might ask: “Who is the true Moses?” “Is it the timid and doubtful one of Exodus 4 or the authoritarian one of the account of the plagues?” As we have seen above, Moses, coming from Pharaoh’s court was an eloquent rhetorician and diplomat! I retain the view that Moses’ inability to speak is a harmonisation from the part of the deuteronomist who places a parallel between Moses’ לא אני שלג (Ex 4:10) and Jeremiah’s אני שלג in Jeremiah 1:6. This detail will be studied further on, but here it suffices to say that the deuteronomist wants to underline Moses’ prophecy by creating this parallel with Jeremiah. In both, the emphasis will be on YHWH who gives his word to his prophet. In fact, the reassurance for Moses (Ex 4:12), and for Jeremiah (Jer 1:9), is starkly underlined with regards to the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:18 where YHWH exclaims: אֲשֶׁר יֹתֵן דְּבָרִי בְּפִי.\textsuperscript{136 JEFFREY TIGAY, “Heavy of Mouth” and “Heavy of Tongue”, on Moses’ Speech Difficulty”, BASOR 231 (1978) 57-67.} \textsuperscript{137 COATS, Moses, 68-69, 78.}
2.3.2.2 Moses the “Bridegroom of Blood”

This is the title given to Moses by Sephora in Exodus 4:24-26, considered as one of the most obscure pages in the Hebrew Bible. The text is extremely ambiguous about who has done what to whom, except for the aggressor who is YHWH and the circumciser who is Zippora. Scholars have therefore tended to focus on what is the motivation for YHWH’s aggression, and what is the function of this pericope in the wider context. There is an apparent use of “conversion” terminology, where the verb בָּשׂ is used some five times in Exodus 4:18-21. This obscure episode also appears to be a parallel with the return of Jacob in Genesis 33. Both texts include a return that involves a mysterious encounter with YHWH, both include violence, both also include a subsequent meeting with their respective brother, where both brothers meet (פָּגַשׁ) and both kiss each other. On meeting YHWH, a mortal combat seems to ensue, and in both episodes, a body part of the hero has to be touched (נָגַע in Genesis 32:26, 33 and Exodus 4:25). As Barbiero notes, the parallels are too obvious to be coincidental. What is striking is the motivation for such episodes. Apparently before meeting a brother, one must first fight with God. In both cases, the hero emerges as changed. Some sought to explain this episode as a result of Moses’ blood guilt for killing the Egyptian. Others saw in it the ancient remnants of a pagan ritual preparing the male for marriage, but the text makes it clear that Moses had been married for quite a while, since his son is mentioned. Barbiero states that this encounter with the Lord requalifies Moses’ status as belonging to God first and only subsequently to his family, but it also marks a rite of initiation and passage.

138 There is general agreement among scholars that this is a very ancient text. We cannot enter into the various interpretations that this episode has been given; for such a summary see WERNER SCHMIDT, Exodus, (=BKAT, 2:1), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988, 118-122.
139 BARBIERO, “Il camino del giovane Mose”, 18.
141 BARBIERO, “Il camino del giovane Mose”, 19. Hays suggests that in this episode YHWH wanted to sever the bonds Moses’ family had with Midian, hence the circumcision. See DANIEL HAYS, “Moses: The Private Man behind the Public Leader”, BR 16 (2000) 25. I do not agree with such a view, especially since Exodus 18:12 explicitly states that Jethro offers a sacrifice to YHWH together with Moses, Aaron and the elders.
Whilst this tradition could have existed independently, in my opinion, to understand the redactor’s use of this tradition, we have to consider it in the larger literary context. Verses 22-23 are intimately linked to vv24-26. In vv22-23 YHWH calls Israel his first born and requests its freedom from Pharaoh. Should that freedom be denied, Pharaoh’s first born would face death. Apparently, in this episode it is the blood of Moses’ son that is shed, and it is that very blood that saves Moses’ life when touched with his leg. The blood of the paschal lamb touched with the door posts of the Hebrews will save the life of their firstborn. I see here an allusion which seeks to anticipate the tenth plague in Exodus 12.

As concerns the title “bridegroom of blood”, the most convincing argument has been offered by Bernard Robinson. He rightly notes that the Arabic cognate of the Hebrew חֲתַן is actually the verb “to circumcise”. Zipporah appears to take on the function of her father Jethro, the priest of Midian, by circumcising her son, and handling the blood of the circumcision. Robinson concludes that the obscure phrase מִיוּלָת חֲתַן דָּמִים לַ means: “You are my son-in-law (חֲתַן) by virtue of blood, the blood of the circumcision”. As Didier Luciani ironically notes, rivers of ink have been spilt on the few droplets of blood spilt in this act of circumcision! It is interesting to note at this point, as Römer does, that in certain heroic sagas, the deity returns to injure its own hero. The attack would serve as a test for the hero and would stand to point out, that as much as the hero is needed, he could never match his god, or do anything without his god. This obscure episode could have served the redactor of the Pentateuch very well in presenting Moses as the typical hero of ancient times. An interesting analysis is that of Susan Ackerman. As we have seen above, Moses is

142 All commentators are unanimous as regards this view; see BERNARD ROBINSON, “Zipporah to the Rescue: A Contextual Study of Exodus IV.24-6”, VT 36 (1986) 449.
143 Ibid.
145 ROBINSON, “Zippora to the Rescue”, 460.
148 SUSAN ACKERMAN, “Why is Miriam also among the Prophets? (And is Zipporah among the Priests?)”, JBL 121 (2002) 76.
presented as being a man in his liminal stage, having lost his identity as Egyptian and Hebrew. Ackerman considers his encounter with YHWH as a testing that is typical of liminality. Moses’ liminal stage will only come to an end at his encounter with his brother Aaron, who meets him and kisses him, thus reintegrating him into his family and his identity.

2.4 Moses the Leader

After God’s call and commission in Exodus 3-4 and Exodus 6:2-7:7, Moses becomes the leader of the people. Indeed, as such a leader, tradition will make out of Moses the paradigm of every Jewish institution, religious as well as political. Under this title of leader, Moses thus also becomes judge, mediator, priest, intercessor, prophet, king, teacher, and even scribe. All these titles will be condensed by the famous epitaph of Deuteronomy 34:10: רֹדֵּב יְהוָה פָּנִים אֲשֶׁר, אֶל מֹשֶׁה. Historically speaking Moses was truly the leader of Israel. In Egypt, most probably he was appointed a leader by the Egyptians over his brethren. In his return to Egypt, Moses is appointed “the leader” of the people by God. As this leader, Moses will be God’s instrument to work out wonders, lead the people out of Egypt, lead them to Sinai to encounter YHWH, there function as the covenant mediator, and from there lead them to the entry and the conquest of the land. As covenant mediator and intercessor of the people Moses is the great leader of the people. Indeed, Moses also emerges as the great spiritual, political, and military leader, the one who possessed all the charismas typical of later Israelite leadership roles. Indeed as Mathews notes: “this depiction of Moses transcends any attempt to limit him to a discrete office. The use of royal tropes is the most effective way to portray this exaltation”.

Historically speaking, the people of the Exodus generation needed a leader to organise their exit from Egypt. Moses is this leader in his commanding the people, in YHWH’s name, to start and stop marching, both in their exit from Egypt (Ex 14:15) and in the desert (Num 9:23). In Exodus 14:15, just like in his call narrative, Moses

149 COATS, Moses, 139.
150 MATHEWS, Royal Motifs, 99.
appears hesitant; YHWH in fact rebukes Moses (מַ־ּתִצְעַק אֵלָי), and orders him to command the people to start marching. I have already mentioned how Moses’ leadership was called into question more than once by the people, particularly in the wilderness “murmuring tradition”. It could very well be that as the Hebrew administrator for Egypt, Moses was originally eyed negatively by the people, especially as we observe in Exodus 2:14 where his identity is questioned by his Hebrew brothers. Ironically that question יָפֵט עָלֵינָּ, will continue to plague Moses his entire life, particularly every time his leadership is questioned by his brothers, the Israelites (Num 16; and his siblings in Num 12).

2.4.1 Moses the Covenant Mediator

In Exodus 20:18-20 the people elect Moses to represent them before God, as a consequence of the terrifying experience of the theophany on Mount Sinai. This is then picked up again by Moses in his narrative discourse in Deuteronomy 5:23-31, which appears to establish the prophet as an intermediary between God and the people. The Deuteronomic law of the prophets in Deuteronomy 18:16, in fact, quotes Exodus 20:18-20 and Deuteronomy 5:23-31 as being the reason why such a mediator was needed. God himself would give a prophet to the people whenever there is the need for a solution to a crisis. For Nicholson, Moses is presented in the book of Deuteronomy as the covenant mediator. He sees Moses as covenant mediator with the specific roles of speaking in the name of YHWH to the people (Ex 20:1-2a), as reciting the history of salvation (Ex 19:3-6; 20:2) and proclaiming divine laws (Ex 20:3ff). Moses is presented as the first in the line of prophets in Deuteronomy 18:15-18. It is in virtue of that which the people had asked in Exodus 20:19, that God instituted the office of the “prophet like Moses” in Deuteronomy 18:16. Nicholson argues that the “prophet like Moses” is to function as a covenant mediator in terms of Deuteronomy 18:16. In this sense, the Shechem covenant presided by Joshua, presents him as a covenant mediator, and consequently, as “prophet like Moses”. Joshua too speaks in the name of God (Josh 24:2), he reminds the people of their salvation history

152 Ibid.
(Josh 24:2-15) and gives YHWH’s laws binding on the covenant (Josh 14-15; 23). Apart from Joshua, Nicholson also considers Samuel as a candidate of covenant-mediator prophet. Samuel presides the Gilgal assembly (1 Sam 11:14-12:25) where he recites the history of salvation (1 Sam 12:6-13), he orders the people: “fear YHWH, and serve him faithfully with all your heart; for consider what great things he has done for you” (1 Sam 12:24). The people ask Samuel to intercede for them with YHWH in verse 19. “At Gilgal he (Samuel) performed the same functions as Moses did at Sinai (Ex 19ff) and on the Plains of Moab (Deuteronomy) and Joshua at Shechem (Josh 24). Samuel is therefore conceived of here as a second Moses, just as Joshua is represented also as Moses’ successor.”

Elijah too qualifies as a covenant mediator in his contest with the prophets of Baal. It is reminiscent of the covenant assembly in Joshua 24 and 1 Samuel 12. In all cases “all of Israel” gathered for the assembly. Elijah too exhorts the people to be faithful to the covenant God (1 Kings 18:21) and also to proclaim YHWH as their God (1 Kings 18:37). Elijah built a stone altar for the sacrifice just as Joshua did at Shechem. In all cases the people respond to the covenant mediator by acclaiming YHWH as their God.

Römer contends that the concept of Moses as mediator is older than that of Moses as prophet and it appears to reflect the deuteronomistic milieu of the 7th century. Moses will acquire the title of prophet only after the Exile. According to him, most probably Moses as mediator completed the original role of Moses the liberator, most probably in the reconstruction of the Exodus event in the deuteronomistic milieu of the 7th cent. Considering the “mosaic fiction” of Deuteronomy, and Nicholson’s line of thought mentioned above, I tend to conclude that the final redactor of Deuteronomy could very well have had this idea in mind of presenting Deuteronomy as Moses’ last act as covenant mediator. Deuteronomy is presented as Moses’ last speech. The outer framework of Deuteronomy, what Römer calls “deuteronomistic

154 NICHOLSON, Deuteronomy, 79.
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157 RÖMER, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 124.
Deuteronomy”, 158 is of particular importance for this understanding. Deuteronomy 1:1 presents this whole book as a speech of Moses (הַדְבָרִים אֵל) qualified as the words that “Moses spoke to the people of Israel according to all that YHWH had given him in commandment to them” (Deut 1:3). Moses therefore speaks in the name of YHWH. Deuteronomy 1-4 is a long narrative discourse, through which Moses recounts the Exodus event. In Deuteronomy 5-26 Moses pronounces the deuteronomic law code. Finally in Deuteronomy 29, Moses stipulates the covenant at Moab.

Priesthood also has a mediatory role between God and the people. It is important to note that after the covenant at Sinai, there is an emphasis on the priesthood and the cult. From Exodus 25 to Numbers 10, the priestly function becomes the central and most important office.159 The ordinary people are no longer permitted to approach the revelatory tent; only Aaron and his descendants are allowed to approach the divinity (Lev 8; Num 18:7). Yet the priesthood, unlike the other offices, is established as a hereditary function. Deuteronomy presents a different concept where the mediator between God and the people is the prophet. Prophecy is a call from God, it is not inherited, and this places more emphasis on intimacy with God. Prophets lead the people in religious and social matters as well, expressing themselves critically of social injustice, cultic misconduct, and other political failures. They continually preach for right action. The main role of the prophet is therefore to apply the Torah and direct the people to right conduct. The vicinity of God to Moses expressed in the incomparability of Moses in Numbers 12 and Deuteronomy 34, is not an end in itself. As much as it is a great gift and privilege to Moses, it is even more significantly important for the people. As their mediator, Moses is the one who helps the people meet and come to know YHWH.

2.4.2 Moses the Intermediary and the Intercessor

Moses, the one who receives everything that is intended by God for the people in Exodus 12-20 and Deuteronomy 1-5, is the intermediary par excellence. Moses is mentioned 770 times in the Bible, and of these, 210 times he is mentioned as the receiver of the oracle of YHWH through the formula: YHWH + verb of saying + Moses as receiver. Moses thus emerges as the divine interlocutor, and nowhere in the Bible does anyone equal Moses in this regard. As such, Moses is the absolute mediator of the law.

Arnold Rhodes contends that intercession is the characteristic role of the prophet. Indeed, Abraham in Genesis 20:1-28 is called a prophet not because he ever proclaimed the word of God, but rather in virtue of him interceding for Abimelech. Moses already appears as intercessor in Exodus 5:22-23, where he enters into a deep lament in favour of the people. Moses first appears before Pharaoh on behalf of the people and asks for them to be allowed to go on pilgrimage to YHWH. Pharaoh decides to oppress the people even more, since the people appear to be lazy. Apparently, this could have been prompted not only by the fact that the people appeared lazy (Ex 5:8), but even more so by fears of further rebellion as hinted by Exodus 5:2, 4, 5. Pharaoh thus decrees that the people would not be given any straw (v7) for their brick making, but they should rather fetch the straw themselves without any decrease in production. After the Hebrew foremen rebuke Moses and refuse his leadership, Moses laments before YHWH, accusing him of having caused evil to the people (תָהְלָם הֲרֵע). Indeed, Moses’ lament verges on the blasphemous here, accusing YHWH of having caused evil to the people, with direct reference to the futility and apparent deception in his “sending”. This lament, especially in his question הֶלְמָה צָלַלְתָּה, verges on the blasphemous here, accusing YHWH of having caused evil to the people, with direct reference to the futility and apparent deception in his “sending”.

---

163 RHODES, “Israel’s Prophets”, 108. Rhodes even calls them “the greatest intercessors in Israel”.
164 RHODES, “Israel’s Prophets”, 110.
165 Pharaoh could have feared rebellion here. As Cazelles notes, the verb הַרְשָׁב also means “to loosen the hair as a preparatory rite for battle”, CAZELLES, Alla ricerca di Mosè, 55. However, HALOT a.v. הַרְשָׁב, does not link the “loosening of hair” to battle, but rather the meaning “to let down the hair of a wife accused of infidelity (Num 5:18; Judg 5:2). This verb does have connotations of rebellion, “to make someone go out of control”, “allow to run wildly” and in the hiphil, as is our case, “to let waywardness develop”.
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appears to be in line with the theme of the "reluctant" prophet, which is already observable in the call narrative (Ex 3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13). Interestingly, some scholars have seen in this lament a parallel with Jeremiah’s laments. It is important to note at this point, that whilst some scholars consider this episode as the prehistory to Jeremiah’s laments, I agree with van Seters that this is not necessarily so. Indeed, if Moses’ call narrative is textually dependent on Jeremiah’s, something I shall study in chapter 5, then, the redactor is here harmonising the text to make Moses appear as a prophet like Jeremiah. Interestingly, Moses even intercedes for Pharaoh in the plagues in Exodus 8:8-9; 26-27; 9:28-33; 10:17-19. Even in these instances, Moses is in line with Samuel in 1 Samuel 7:5; 12:19-23, and with Jeremiah in Jeremiah 7:16; 14:11-12; 15:1. Van Seters argues that the role of the prophet as intercessor does not predate Jeremiah, and thus the prophetic shaping of Moses as intercessor in the plague narratives, especially in the prophetic commissioning formula המלך ישעיהו, must be viewed within the literary horizon of the Deuteronomistic literature. Vater and Schmid arrived at similar conclusions as regards the language of prophetic commissioning used in the plague narratives. Van Seters argues that the deuteronomistic history merely affirmed that YHWH brought Israel out of Egypt “with a strong hand and with signs and wonders”, but offered no details as to how this all happened. It was the Yahwist, according to him, who filled in the gaps through his imaginative reconstruction of the events. He sees the crossing of the Sea of Reeds as modelled on the crossing of the Jordan in Joshua 3, which in turn, according to him, is also very late and modelled after the accounts of the battles of the Assyrian Kings, where crossing the Tigris or the Euphrates without casualties was considered as an
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169 Mathews sees intercession as a royal motif rather than a prophetic one, since intercession is not a prerogative of the prophets. Kings who intercede are: David in 2 Samuel 24:17, Solomon in 1 Kings 8:22-53, and Hezekiah in 2 Chronicles 30:18. Mathews also gives examples from Near Eastern kings such as Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus. See MATHEWS, Royal Motifs, 75.
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omen of divine protection. He argues that the Yahwist took the theme of the signs and wonders and developed it into the plague narrative, and developed the tradition of the “mighty hand” into the narrative of the crossing of the Sea of Reeds.

In Exodus 32:32 Moses, as intercessor of the people, goes as far as contemplating his own death. Here Moses pleads for the very people who had rejected him and offers to become a replacement for the apostate people. In his intercession he appears to become the new Abraham. Indeed the rhetorical narrative here is full of irony. Moses does not accept God’s Abrahamic promise of Exodus 32:10 (ךָהֹותִּי נַעֲשֶׂה), but rather chooses to intercede for the people even at the cost of his life. According to Römer, the latest layer of tradition presents Moses as intercessor in the great prayers of Exodus 32:11-13; Numbers 14:13-19 and Deuteronomy 9:19, 27-29. Moses as intercessor is the latest layer of tradition concerning Moses’ roles.

There is scholarly consensus that the prayers of intercession in the Pentateuch found in Exodus 32:11-13; Numbers 14:13-19 and Deuteronomy 9:27-29, belong to the latest additions to the Pentateuch. Römer in fact contends that the prayers clearly presuppose the events of 597 and 587 B.C.E. and moreover, the prayers also evoke the possibility of divine forgiveness, thus correcting the strict Deuteronomistic theology of divine retribution. In fact, for intercession to be possible there must be the possibility of repentance not only on the part of the people but also on the part of God. This theology implies that divine plans are not immutable but may be revocable, as expressed at Jeremiah 18:7-10 and Ezekiel 3:17-21; 33:7-20. There are clear cases where at the repentance of the people, God changes his mind, the most classical being:

---


176 Römer, “Mose in Äthiopien”, 203; see also Hans-Christoph Schmitt, “Die Erzählung vom Goldenen Kalb”, 235.


Jonah 1:6; 3:9; Joel 2:14; Amos 5:15; Zephaniah 2:3. Yet even in the case of non-repentance, compassion may overcome wrath as attested in Hosea 11:8-9; Jeremiah 33:8; Micah 7:18-19. It is precisely this notion that led to the concept of the new covenant בְרִית חֲדָשָה in the prophets: “the frustration of waiting for the people’s response, and the realisation that by their own efforts they could not effect a total return to God, led to the development of an entirely new theological concept. If the nation would not initiate the process, God would.” The Sinaitic covenant had been broken and the people were still unrepentant, so God would graft in his people a new heart, the removal of the heart of stone and the grafting of a heart of flesh imbued with the “knowledge of God”. This is the theology of Isaiah 11:9; 54:13; 55:3; Jeremiah 24:7; 31:30-33; 32:38-41; Ezekiel 16:60; 34:25ff; 36:26ff; and Deuteronomy 30:6. We observe this theology in Exodus 32-34. Apparently the author here is using the deuteronomistic sources of Deuteronomy 9:8-10:11 and 1 Kings 12:25-33. There is the possibility of covenant renewal and the theme of divine presence among the people, echoes the book of Ezekiel. Exodus 32-34 in fact, appear to be a modification of the deuteronomists’ theological strictures to include the concept of the New Covenant. Therefore, Moses in Exodus 32:11-13, Numbers 14:13-19 and Deuteronomy 9:19, 27-29, emerges as the intercessor par excellence for his people. All these texts presuppose the events of 587 B.C.E. that could have been interpreted as the definitive judgement of YHWH on the people. The redactors responsible for the insertion of Moses’ supplications on behalf of the people evoke this possibility of divine pardon and appear to correct the deuteronomistic theology of retribution. As we have seen in chapter 1, the definitive redaction of the Pentateuch occurred during the Persian period and the above intercessory texts have been attributed to a post-sacerdotal redaction. It is this latest redactor that ultimately made of Moses the intercessor par excellence, and therefore Moses the intercessor appears to be a completion of deuteronomistic Moses, namely, the prophet. Whilst the early deuteronomistic redaction saw in Moses the covenant mediator, the prophet par
excellence, it was a later deuteronomistic redaction during the Persian period that made of Moses the intercessor par excellence.

Moses is also the intercessor in the so-called “Murmuring Traditions” of the wilderness. Childs identified two basic patterns in such traditions where Moses always emerges as the intercessor working for the benefit of the people, even when injured by the very people he defends. Pattern 1: initial need, complaint by the people, intercession by Moses, and miraculous intervention by God (a typical example would be the lack of drinkable water in Exodus 15:22-25 and lack of water in Exodus 17:1-7). Pattern 2: there is a complaint by the people for the lack of a commodity, divine anger and punishment, intercession by Moses and reprieve of the punishment. According to van Seters, the murmuring motif is secondary in these texts, which are aimed at underlining Moses’ intercessory role. Van Seters, concludes that in the Yahwist: “Moses is the prophet of salvation to his own people. Above all, Moses is intercessor, the one who suffers with them and for them, as in the case of Jeremiah and the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah.” According to Samuel Balentine, the role of the prophet as intercessor is only marked in Jeremiah especially in Jeremiah 7:16; 11:14; 29:7; 37:3; 42:2, 20. Van Seters notes that intercession in Jeremiah appears to be typical of the deuteronomistic redaction in Jeremiah particularly in Jeremiah 7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 15:1. In Moses’ intercessory role, I see the hand of the late deuteronomist. Intercession was a very important aspect of Jeremiah’s prophetic role, and subsequently, the deuteronomist sought to underline Moses’ intercessory role even more to depict him as the typical archetypal deuteronomistic prophet.

---
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187 VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 466.
188 SAMUEL BALENTINE, “The Prophet as Intercessor: A Reassessment”, JBL 103 (1984) 161-173; He also observes how the hithpael of the verb הפל occurs in no other prophet other than Jeremiah and is used for Moses in Numbers 21:7; Deuteronomy 9:20, and Samuel in 1 Samuel 7:15; 12:9, 23.
189 VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 172.
2.4.3 Moses the Legislator

Christoph Dohmen makes an important observation as regards Moses’ incomparability in Deuteronomy 34:10. Such incomparability is not linked with the person of Moses inasmuch as he was a prophet, but the emphasis rather lies on the intimate relationship YHWH had with Moses, and therefore the emphasis is on revelation. If Moses’ prophecy is declared unique (Deut 34:10 and Num 12:17), it is only so in virtue of the Torah. All prophecy following Moses, therefore, will serve as interpretation and keeping of the Torah. In my opinion, the theme of Moses’ shining face is related to revelation and the authority of that revelation. Exodus 34:29-35 tells how Moses acquired a shining face on the mountain after his personal revelation through which he received the law and mediated that law to the people. On completing his mediation, Moses veiled his face (Ex 34:33). This gives way to a continual ritual practice as evidenced in vv34-35. This episode has baffled many scholars. Childs searches for the prehistory of the episode but states that its origins are untraceable. Hugo Gressmann saw the function of the veil much like primitive masks. Other scholars have concluded that it is an insertion to conclude the preceding section, or that it has a minor role in the narrative. Thomas Dozeman built on Gressmann’s conclusion stating that the shining skin could also be interpreted as a mask which manifests a transformation, underlining the losing of one’s identity to God, and thus deriving authority to legislate. The text however seems to exclude the use of masks. Moses puts on the veil when leading his normal life and uncovers his face when speaking to God. In line with Exodus 3:6, it would have made more sense if Moses covered his face when speaking to God. In my opinion, the shining face of Moses is a

190 CHRISTOPH DOHMEN, “Mose schrieb diese Tora auf” (Dtn 31,9): auf der Suche nach dem biblischen Ursprung der Vorstellung von der mosaischen Verfasserschaft des Pentateuch”, in “Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben” (Gen 18,19), Reinhard Achenbach – Martin Arneth (eds.), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009, 256-257.
191 CHILDS, Exodus, 609-610.
192 GRESSMANN, Mose und seine Zeit, 249-251.
193 CROSS, Canaanite Myth, 314.
194 NOTH, Exodus, 260-267.
literary construction to underline the fact that the words spoken by Moses to the people are not his, but God’s.\(^{196}\)

It is interesting to note that in Nehemiah 10:1-40, Nehemiah issues a covenant\(^{197}\) containing eighteen laws, which he claims to have been “given through Moses the servant of God”. On a close study, however, it emerges that whilst these laws are dependent on the Torah, none of them appears to cite it.\(^{198}\) Each law is built on Mosaic foundations, namely the Pentateuch,\(^{199}\) and therefore Nehemiah feels authorised to attribute these laws to Moses.\(^{200}\) This can also be said of many of the laws of the Pentateuch. It is obvious that not all laws were promulgated by Moses, however, the legislators were certain that the laws they proposed were not their invention but were derivable from Mosaic principles and were thus traceable to Moses himself.\(^{201}\) Jacob Milgrom notices how JE sanctions multiple altars in Exodus 20:24, something that D would later contradict with YHWH authorising one single altar in Deuteronomy 12:4-7. Many saw this as a direct contradiction but it has to be stated that D would interpret Exodus 20:24 as a legitimate divine law revealed to Moses that was binding till the Israelites would enter the land. If Moses had lived in D’s time he would have interpreted Deuteronomy 12:4-7 as correct. Indeed Torah contains an evolution, where each tradition contributing to the Torah has a valid claim that its laws were traceable to Moses, in as much as they were promulgated in line with his thought being applied to the *Sitz im Leben*.\(^{202}\)


\(^{198}\) YOO, *Ezra and the Second Wilderness*, 68.

\(^{199}\) Yoo suggests: “In my opinion, any discrepancy between the pledges in Nehemiah 10 and Pentateuchal legislation result from the experiences of a post-exilic Yahvism that is temporally and culturally separated from an earlier period that sculpted the Pentateuchal laws. In other words, Neh. 10:31–40 reshapes the Pentateuchal materials and employs strategies to align legislation with particular -and contemporary- ideological concerns. Thus, Nehemiah 10 presupposes the final form of the Pentateuch”. See YOO, *Ezra and the Second Wilderness*, 68.


\(^{201}\) Ibid.

\(^{202}\) Ibid, 190.
Eduard Nielsen concluded that it was the Deuteronomic movement after the fall of the northern kingdom in 722 B.C.E. that made of Moses a “legislator”.\(^{203}\) According to him, the Deuteronomist made use of the title נָבִיא, attributed to him by Hosea when referring to the Exodus traditions, and built on the notions of Deuteronomy 13 and 18 to establish this prophet as lawgiver.\(^{204}\) Recent scholarship has tended to deny Mosaic authorship, even as regards the covenant code and the Decalogue.\(^{205}\) Otto claims that Moses did not create a political-theological programme, but rather the other way round.\(^{206}\) I do not concur with this view. Scholars agree that the Decalogue and the other laws have a lot in common with Mesopotamian and Babylonian laws. Many, therefore, argue that these Israelite laws have to be exilic at their earliest since it was during the Exile that such an influence was possible. However, such an influence could well have come from the pre-exilic period, indeed even from the time of the Egyptian captivity. Moses, as an Egyptian scribe in Pharaoh’s court, would have been well acquainted with such laws.\(^{207}\) We have to keep in mind that the various traditions behind the image of Moses sought to make a paradigm out of him so as to legitimise the various roles of leadership. The role of Moses as legislator is too central in the Exodus for it to be a constructed theme. The concentration of laws, from whatever era these might be, is too great for Moses not to, at least, have promulgated some basic laws, and as leader, have given some guidelines of conduct to the Exodus generation. If Moses did indeed lead the Exile, he must have given some basic ethical and social norms, however primitive these might have been! The image of Moses as legislator, therefore, in my opinion, is based on a minimal historical kernel.

\(^{203}\) Ibid, 96. Such is also Römer’s conclusion who contends that it was the deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch during the Exile that made of Moses a legislator. See RÖMER “La construction d’une “vie de Moïse”, 117.

\(^{204}\) Ibid, 98.

\(^{205}\) ECKART OTTO, “Mosè e la Legge”, in Mosè, Egitto e Antico Testamento, Eckart Otto, Enzo Nardi (trans.), (=Studi Biblici, 152), Brescia: Paideia, 2006, 53-104. Cazelles on the other hand takes the pains to show that the Ten Commandments actually had their origins in Egyptian and Babylonian Laws that were written in lists and are traceable back to Moses. See CAZELLES, Alla ricerca di Mosè, 84; Ibid, “Les origines du Décalogue”, Eretz-Israel 9 (1969) 14-19.

\(^{206}\) OTTO, “Mosè e la Legge”, 55.

\(^{207}\) If, as we have seen above, the scribes in Pharaoh’s court were well versed in the various languages of the petty princes in Canaan and the languages of Mesopotamia, to be able to ensure constant diplomatic relations, and if Moses was indeed such a scribe, he would have been surely influenced by their law codes. See HENRI CAZELLES, Alla ricerca di Mosè, (=Leggere oggi la Bibbia; 3.2), Brescia: Queriniana, 1982, 16.
2.4.4 Moses the King

Moses is never explicitly called king in the Hebrew Bible, however it is also true that the biblical texts implicitly present Moses with royal attributes. The exposure saga in Moses’ birth has various Near Eastern parallels with Sargon of Akkad and Cyrus of Persia. According to Mathews, the authors sought to present Moses in similar lines with these kings. As much as Moses is leader, he is also presented as possessing the people through the expression “his people”, used in the same way for royalty. The life and deeds of Moses are presented according to van Seters and others very much in line with the accounts of ancient Near Eastern historiography which usually focused on the life of the king and his deeds. Obviously this does not mean that Moses functioned as king; as Mathews concludes: “It must be noted here that this portrayal of Moses as a royal figure does not imply that Moses actually fills the office of king.”

The Bible frequently alludes to the leadership of Moses in royal terms. We have to keep in mind that Moses, as the ultimate receiver of divine revelation, is presented as the epitome of every Israelite institution, religious as well as civic. Moses is first presented as king in his birth and childhood narrative, but most of all, Deuteronomy presents Moses in the most powerful self-characterisation of any human speaker in the Bible, so much so that it proclaims his incomparability in Deuteronomy 34:10-12. Mathews presents an excellent survey of the royal motifs in the pentateuchal portrayal of Moses. In summary, Moses is presented as a royal figure in his birth narrative, through his exposure and being saved, his being beautiful and of good

---

208 MATHEWS, Royal Motifs, 48. Mathews studies the royal motifs in the pentateuchal portrayal of Moses through what scholars call “the floating motif”. Common elements appear in different texts, not only biblical, but also from surrounding cultures. These texts have a literary dependence, but obviously might have very different literary goals. Through a comparative analysis Mathews concludes that the Pentateuch is replete with royal motifs in Moses’ life.

209 VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 3.

210 MATHEWS, Royal Motifs, 3.


212 MATHEWS, Royal Motifs, 48.
health,\textsuperscript{213} in his flight to Midian,\textsuperscript{214} in his being a shepherd,\textsuperscript{215} in his being a military leader,\textsuperscript{216} in his building the tabernacle,\textsuperscript{217} in his giving of the law and the covenant,\textsuperscript{218} in his great humility (Num 12:13),\textsuperscript{219} in his being judge (Ex 18).\textsuperscript{220} Moses thus fulfils the roles of any national leader and as such, can be considered as model for Israel’s ideal king.\textsuperscript{221} Whilst the king is not above the law (Deut 17:18-20), as a legislator Moses emerges as a royal figure since he is the mediator receiving the law and passing it on to the people. The main role of the king was that of mediator between the people and God. In the Sinai episode, Moses became the leader and mediator between YHWH and his people acquiring the royal prerogative of transmitting and applying the law. Moses precedes the monarchy and therefore goes even further than the role of the king and precedes any royal prerogative. In fact, the kings in the Bible are not presented as promulgators of the Law but as judges who interpret and apply the law of Moses as depicted in 1 Kings 2:3 and 2 Kings 14:26.\textsuperscript{222} It is interesting to note that Josiah is the only king described as having walked according to the Torah of Moses (2 Kings 23:25). In this sense he is presented as the truest successor of Moses, as he is the only king to celebrate Passover as inaugurated by Moses, as is explicitly claimed at the end of his reform in 2 Kings 23:25. Römer asks: “Josias est-il un nouveau Moïse? Ou Moïse est-il un précurseur de Josias?”\textsuperscript{223} The destruction of the golden calf in Exodus 32:20 evokes the destruction of the cultic objects ordered by Josiah in 2 Kings 23. In both episodes, the verbs שָרַף and שָבַר are used. Moses appears to be presented as the first reformer of the cult in Israel, confirming his royal function.\textsuperscript{224} Indeed, if Moses

\textsuperscript{213} Ibid, 49.
\textsuperscript{214} Ibid, 51; in this he is similar to David, Hadad and Jeroboam. 1 Samuel 19:8–2 Samuel 2:4, and 1 Kings 11:14–40, being typical examples.
\textsuperscript{215} Ibid, 52-54. David is the shepherd who becomes king, not to mention that in many Near Eastern texts, kings are described as shepherds of the people, the most notable being Hammurabi, twice designated as shepherd in the epilogue to his law code.
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid, 67.
\textsuperscript{217} Ibid, 69, where sanctuary and temple building are typical actions carried out by the king. The biblical example is that of David and Solomon.
\textsuperscript{218} Ibid, 70; 122. Mathews states that Moses is not a mere covenant mediator, but he is the intermediary between God and Israel, and as such, this has typical royal overtones, with many parallels from the ancient Near East. An important way for a king to secure and maintain order, justice, and peace is through the establishment of covenant and treaties. In the covenant, Moses appears to be the vassal king who receives the covenant from God the suzerain.
\textsuperscript{219} Ibid, 72. Humility was an important royal prerequisite (1 Sam 9:21; 2 Sam 13:29).
\textsuperscript{220} Ibid, 122.
\textsuperscript{221} See also COATS, Moses, 198.
\textsuperscript{222} RÖMER, “Moïse a-t-il l’Étoffe d’un héros?”, 236.
\textsuperscript{223} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{224} Ibid; See also PHILIPPE ABADIE, “la figure de Moïse: un nom et un roi”, http://www.bible-service.net/site/605.html (22/03/2017). According to Abaide, the figure of Moses was constructed
is the incomparable prophet (Deut 34:10: יֵשָׁבֵב נֵבְיָה בְיִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּלָּה), Josiah is the incomparable king (2 Kings 23:25: כֹּלָּה נֵבְיָה יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר רָאָה בְיִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּלָּה). 225

Moses’ royal stature is heavily underlined in Hellenistic Judaism. The idea that Moses is king in Judaism is explicitly articulated for the first time in Philo’s philosophical commentary on the Greek Pentateuch. 226 Philo re-writes the biblical stories, addressing the situation of the Alexandrian Diaspora Jews. He presents the Jewish culture as equal to the Greek culture. 227 Philo’s first book “The Life of Moses” therefore deals with Moses as King and he takes the pains to present him in the lines of Plato’s ideal “Philosopher King”. 228 In fact, Philo presents Moses’ education in the Egyptian palace in terms of the Platonic theory of Forms and Ideas, 229 where he states that Moses “seemed to be reminiscing rather than learning”. 230 Philo also depicts the education that Moses received as that which was prescribed by Plato for the “Philosopher King”. 231 Philo presents Moses as the “most excellent king” and during the 6th and 5th cent. B.C.E. to give an identity to the people in Exile. However, his story was already being narrated in the 7th cent. B.C.E. by the scribes at the time of Josiah, presenting him as a reference model.

225 Indeed there is Hezekiah who is also qualified as incomparable by the deuteronomist in 2 Kings 18:5. Emphasis there is however on Hezekiah’s trust in the Lord. It is only Josiah who is mentioned in relation to Moses. For more details on the formula of incomparability in the deuteronomistic history see GARY KNAPPERS, “There was None Like Him”: Incomparability in the Books of Kings”, CBQ, 54 (1992) 411-431.


228 Philo re-writes this biblical narrative extensively in Platonic terms. It is interesting to note that whilst in the Bible, Moses dies outside the land as a divine punishment, Philo presents Moses’ death as ἀποικία, migration. Israel’s migration was a physical one from Egypt into Canaan (1:163), Moses’ ἀποικία will be a spiritual migration of his soul into heaven (2:288). Even the Exodus account turns out to be an allegory of the migration of the soul towards the virtue and the knowledge of God. See DAMGAARD, “Philo’s Life of Moses”, 240. Philo supports the diaspora, therefore he lays all the stress not on the importance of the land, but rather on the migration of the soul to attain knowledge of God.

229 PEARCE, “King Moses”, 50.

230 PHILE, De Vita Mosis, 1:21 “And immediately he had all kinds of masters, one after another, some coming of their own accord from the neighboring countries and the different districts of Egypt, and some being even procured from Greece by the temptation of large presents. But in a short time he surpassed all their knowledge, anticipating all their lessons by the excellent natural endowments of his own genius; so that everything in his case appeared to be a recollecting rather than a learning, while he himself also, without any teacher, comprehended by his instinctive genius many difficult subjects”.

231 Philo states that Moses was taught arithmetic, geometry, rhythm, harmony, metrical theory and music, all of which are prescribed as higher education for the philosopher king by Plato in the Republic 7:521c-531c. See LOUIS FELDMAN, “Philo’s View of Moses’s Birth and Upbringing”, CBQ 64.1 (2002) 273.
therefore as the champion of self-control, possessing the qualities of the ideal ruler, killing the oppressor in justice. As the shepherd in Midian he receives preparatory training for his kingship when eventually he would lead a human flock, and he is exceedingly noble in leaving his succession to Joshua, rather than his two sons. Feldman notes that even in Moses’ genealogy, Philo presents Moses as the ideal kingly character. Philo goes as far as stating that Moses “was named god and king (θεός και βασιλεὺς) of the whole nation”. In Josephus’ description of Moses, the latter bears all the qualities of a Hellenistic king: lawgiver, judge, general, and shepherd of his people. Josephus never calls him king, however, probably to avoid confrontations since he advocated a theocracy.

2.4.5 Moses the Warrior

Moses, in the Pentateuch, also emerges as a military strategist and leader. We have already seen how he commands the Israelites to start and stop marching in Exodus 14:15 and Numbers 9:23. He decides on the strategy to follow and prompts military action in Exodus 17:8-13; Numbers 13:1-16; 21:32, and 21:34-35. In Exodus 1:9-11 we already find warlike reminiscences where, fearing a revolt, Pharaoh wants to curb the proliferation of Hebrews. The text is full of military terms. Does this reflect a distant memory of military origin of Israel in Egypt as prisoners of war? In Exodus 6:26; 7:4; 12:17, 41, 47 the military term צָבָא is used in describing the group of the Hebrews. Interestingly Exodus 13:18 also gives a military overtone to the Exodus from Egypt describing the Israelites as armed (צָבָא בְּנֵי־יִשְרָאֵל מֵאָרֶץ מֵאָרֶץ). It is also important to note that Numbers 20:14-29; 21:1-3, 10-35 preserve the tradition

---

232 PHILO, *De Vita Mosis*, 1, 60.
233 PEARCE, “King Moses”, 51-60.
234 LOUIS FELDMAN, “Philo’s View of Moses’s Birth”, 259.
235 PHILO, *De Vita Mosis*, I, 158. See also MECKS WAYNE, “Moses as God and King”, in *Religions in Antiquity*, Jacob Neusner (ed.), Leiden: Brill, 1968, 355-357. Meeks notes that with this “puzzling” double title “god and king” Philo takes directly from Exodus 7:1 where God states that he made Moses as a god to Pharaoh, and also interprets his kingship in lines with his mystical ascent of Sinai, at the Sinai episode where he becomes God’s vice-regent.
of the conquest led by Moses in the south of Judea. In Numbers 31:2, Moses receives the divine command to exterminate the Midianites, which contradicts Judges 6-8, where it is Gideon who carries out the extermination. It is also apparent that the author of the book of Joshua knew of Moses’ conquest of Transjordan since he has to create a motif of Moses’ order for the Transjordan tribes to cross with the rest of Israel. Apparently the conquest of Transjordan functions as an excellent prologue for the true conquest narrative in Deuteronomistic terms. In these conquest narratives, Moses is a military leader, who will subsequently be followed by Joshua in this specific role.

As we have already seen in section 2.1.2, the Israelite occupation of Canaan was by no means straightforward, and even the biblical traditions are not unanimous. Joshua 13:2 mentions the remaining land (תנשארי וְהָאָר) and Judges 1:21, 27-36 presents a list of cities that the Israelites were not able to conquer. Apart from this, archaeological evidence has shown that many Israelite groups appear to have been indigenous to Canaan. Scholars therefore tend to conclude that overall the conquest theme is a literary product and not an actual reflection of history. Whilst this is very true for the conquest of Jericho in Joshua 6, to mention just one clear example, we cannot, as we have concluded above, overgeneralise and claim that there were no military activities at all. Moses, as the leader of the exodus generation, would have had the role of leading such activities. It is interesting to note that in the war against the Amalekites in Exodus 17:8-13, Moses is presented as holding up his hand, and whenever in this position Israel would win; whenever he let down his arms, Amalek would prevail. Traditional exegesis interpreted this in a spiritual manner. Scholars today contend that this action referred to the military use of the hand and staff so as to signal military tactical orders to the army.

The biblical literary portrait of the military Moses that emerges is the following: he was proficient in military logistics, leading Israel out of Egypt as if armed and ready for battle (Ex 6:26; 7:4; 12:17, 41, 51; 14:18). He is ordered by God to house the tribes into four mobile military groups of three, each flying its own standard and banner (Num 2:2). He was the one instructing the spies to scout the land.

242 Israel was to exit Egypt in an orderly manner according to the military term תָם עַל־צִבְא.
in Numbers 13:17-20. Moses appears as quartermaster, arranging the supplies of food and material taken from Goshen (Ex 12:34, 39) and rationing the divinely supplied manna and quail (Ex 16; Num 11). He also emerges as a military diplomat, arranging negotiations with Egypt in the chapters of the plagues, and the essentially diplomatic language in conciliatory terms with the kings of the Edomites and the Amorites (Num 20-21). In the end, whilst the Pentateuch does appear to contain fragments that suggest that Moses was indeed a military leader, it is apparent that the Deuteronomistic tradition works to “demilitarize” Moses. The military conquest of the land is thus attributed to Joshua.

### 2.4.5.1 Another Moses Tradition

Another hint at the deuteronomists’ work of the demilitarisation of Moses comes from the interesting note in 1 Samuel 12:8. Here we find what Gösta Ahlström calls “another Moses tradition”.243 Some scholars consider this tradition as pre-deuteronomistic.244 Römer on the other hand, sees in it a late text that tries to reassert the importance of Moses and Aaron.245 In 1 Samuel 12 we read Samuel’s farewell speech where he gives a historical resumé of YHWH’s deeds and the apostasy of the people. Interestingly, in v8 we read that Moses and Aaron led the people out of Egypt and “made them settle in this place” מִמִּצְרַיִם. According to Ahlström, this presents a summary of the Exodus which might reflect a different tradition where Moses is a military leader leading the conquest of the land. It is interesting to note that whilst the MT has Moses and Aaron as subjects of both actions, resulting from God’s sending, the LXX “corrects” this tradition by placing God as the subject of all the verbs: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν κύριος τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ααρων καὶ ἐξήγαγεν τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καὶ κατῴκισεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ. It is important to note that this tradition of Moses leading the people into the land is also attested in Hecateus of Abdera:

---

244 **NORBERT LOHFINK**, “Die Bundesurkunde des Königs Josias, (Eine Frage an die Deuteronomiumsforschung)”, *Biblica* (1963) 44, 464. Lohfink considers 1 Samuel 12 as pre-deuteronomistic, but retains that as a tradition, it is of little importance.
The colony was headed by a man called Moses, outstanding both for his wisdom and for his courage. On taking possession of the land he founded, besides other cities, one that is now the most renowned of all, called Jerusalem. In addition he established the temple that they hold in chief veneration, instituted their forms of worship and ritual, drew up their laws and ordered their political institutions. He also divided them into twelve tribes, since this is regarded as the most perfect number and corresponds to the number of months that make up a year. These two traditions contrast the mainstream traditions that have Moses die outside of the land! Römer notes that maybe there was the need to “pacify” Moses and close the Torah before the conquest of the land, in order to emphasise the fact that Israel’s identity and salvation did not depend on the Land but on the Torah. Łukasz Niesiołowski-Spanò argues that the tradition of 1 Samuel 12:8 is very old, and attests that Moses actually took part in the conquest of the Promised Land, and helped the people settle there. In this view, 1 Samuel 12:8 does not support the canonical version of Moses’ death in Moab. He argues that the version of the Exodus story where Moses was also the successful conqueror and hero who established the Jerusalem Temple, must have represented the older version of the account, and its replacement by the canonical version must have occurred relatively late. The theological motivation in having the hero die outside the land is that the ultimate victory is no merit of an individual nor is it a victory of the people, but is ultimately God’s prerogative. Apparently this tradition is attributable to the priestly ideology, when Moses was promoted to religious and political leader. It most probably served to legitimise and secure the power of the priesthood in replacing the monarchy. Ahlström notes that this tradition did not constitute any military activity, for if it did, then, Samuel would have sung the glorious deeds of YHWH. Rather, the conquest

247 RÖMER, “Figure of Moses”, 116; IBID, “Les guerres de Moïse”, 173.
248 ŁUKASZ NIESIOŁOWSKI-SPANÒ, “The Broken Structure of the Moses Story, or, Moses and the Jerusalem Temple”, SJOT 23.1 (2009) 23-37. He argues that this tradition is also preserved in Hecateus of Abdera, where Moses not only leads the Exodus but also founds the city of Jerusalem and establishes the temple. The Nehushtan that Moses had made, which was in the temple and destroyed by Hezekiah as we read in 2 Kings 18:4, might be a good indication of this tradition.
249 Ibid, 33.
250 Ibid, 36.
theme, according to him, was a literary historicisation from the time of deuter...Exodus.251

It is difficult to draw any sure conclusions as to the historicity of this tradition. To be sure, it is a very strange note that appears to be early and was later amended by the translators of the LXX. The strangeness of this tradition and the fact that it is also attested in Hecateus, shows that such a tradition did exist. This, together with the “demilitarization” of Moses, and the actual death of Moses outside the Promised Land, could hint that tradition wanted to keep Moses away from the bloodshed that the inevitable skirmishes of the conquest would have brought. In fact, in the war against Amalek, Moses only wields the staff, in an apparent gesture of prayer/signalling warfare (Ex 17:8-13). As the leader of the Exodus group, he never wields the sword! Since later tradition idealised Moses, it could very well be that it also seeks to keep him away from any shedding of blood.252

2.4.5.2 Moses the General – Extra-biblical Traditions

It is important to note that there are extra-biblical traditions that present Moses as a military leader. Artapanus,253 known in fragments thanks to Eusebius of Caesarea, has a tradition where Moses was present in Ethiopia. According to him, Moses who became highly respected by everyone in Egypt was sent to Ethiopia by a jealous Pharaoh, to lead Egypt’s war there. Apparently Moses becomes popular there as well, and even settles down. Interestingly, Artapanus explains the crossing of the Sea of Reeds in terms of an ebb tide, something scholars link with the D account in Exodus 14:21a and 26b; he also offers details that are typical of the P account in Exodus 14:14, 251 He also concludes that Joshua was one of the heroes of the hill country clans who had an important role and whose story was inflated to give him a reputation beyond the confines of his own clan, being ultimately associated with the figure of Moses.

252 David is in fact precluded from building the temple of YHWH precisely because he had shed too much blood. 1Ch 28:3: לא אירתה והיה להם בלבם את ימה שהם נשבעו לשהות מלחמה: לא יבנינה בלבם, and 1 Ch 22:8b: לא אירתה והיה להם בלבם את ימה שהם נשבעו לשהות מלחמה: לא יבנינה בלבם.

253 Many have discredited the Jewishness of Artapanus for the fact that he has Moses organising the Egyptian polytheistic religion. This goes against the very covenantal agreement he is credited with later. Ahearne-Kroll argues, however, that Artapanus aimed at a Jewish critique of the religious system of his time and sought to affirm Jewish identity in Ptolemaic Egypt. PATRICIA AHEARNE-KROLL, “Constructing Jewish identity in Ptolemaic Egypt: the Case of Artapanus”, in The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honour of John J. Collins, Daniel C. Harlow – Karina Martin Hogan – Matthew Goff et al. (eds.), Grand Rapids (Mich.) – Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2011, 444.
16a, 21b, 22, and 26a. This is striking indeed, as apparently this writer knew the biblical tradition very well and was also aware of other traditions surrounding Moses.

Josephus also retains the tradition that Moses was in Ethiopia, and remnants of Moses’ link with this place are reflected in the astonishing note of Numbers 12:1, according to which Moses was married to a Cushite woman. Josephus also presents Moses’ political and military career as fomenting Egyptian jealousy that would ultimately motivate his departure from Egypt. In Antiquities 2:252-253 we read that Moses married Tharbis, the princess of Ethiopia. Donna Runnalls states that Josephus used this Ethiopian tradition because he either wanted to correct the anti-Semitic idea that Moses was a renegade, or else, he wished to increase the curiosity of his readers with a story on strange and distant places. The former appears to be the case, as Josephus’ work is highly apologetic in nature. Most importantly, Josephus’ story is linked with Artapanus’ account especially in narrating about a military campaign. Runnalls argues that apparently they did not share a common source since there are marked differences in the accounts and the Greek vocabulary only corresponds in the most common words. Josephus presents Moses as an Egyptian general and also as general to the Israelites calling him στρατηγὸν καὶ ἡγεμόνα τῆς Ἑβραίων.

Runnalls’ reconstruction of the apparent tradition circling around and well known in Hellenistic times appears to have been the following: “Moses was the adopted son of an Egyptian princess and led an Egyptian army against the Ethiopians. Being a clever general he captured the city of Meroe. Moses there marries an Ethiopian princess.” Apart from Josephus, it is interesting to note that Targum Pseudo Jonathan, goes as far as to give an Aggadic interpretation of Moses’ Cushite marriage in Numbers 12:1 in terms of a marriage with the queen of Cush (מלכתא דכוש). This places such a tradition in the Palestinian context, and attests to a popular and
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widespread tradition.\textsuperscript{261} Scholars tended to conclude that both Artapanus and Josephus took from an aggadic reading of Numbers 12:1, however, today scholars contend that most likely Numbers 12:1 is a very late insertion that is informed by both Artapanus and Josephus.\textsuperscript{262} Some scholars actually suggest that this mosaic extra-biblical tradition is parallel to the story of Sesostris in Herodotus II, 102-111 and in Diodorus I, 53-58. Most probably, the Jews of the diaspora took from the legend of Sesostris and made out of him a Jewish Moses so as to legitimise mixed marriages which went against the orthodox Jerusalemite tradition typical of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.\textsuperscript{263}

Interestingly, as we have seen, the biblical texts give a glimpse of military overtones to the Exodus. In Exodus 13:8 the Hebrews leave Egypt armed. Josephus corrects this datum in Antiquities 2:321, where in 349, it is Moses who equips the people with the arms of the drowned soldiers.\textsuperscript{264} In view of the extensive biblical and extra-biblical traditions I conclude that Moses could well have been a military strategist. He could have easily acquired such skills in Pharaoh’s court as a scribe. The scribes who produced the great temple hieroglyphs appear to have been well aware of Egyptian military strategies. Whilst the historical Moses would have definitely led any battle in the wilderness, his military role on the literary level is much reduced when compared to other roles. Apparently, some details did escape the deuteronomistic redactor, who seems to have worked to “pacify” Moses.

\textbf{2.4.6 Moses the Priest}

Psalm 99:6 presents Moses and Aaron amongst the priests of God. There is a debate as to whether Moses was in fact a Levite or not. The birth narrative in Exodus 2 states that Moses’ parents were Levites. In Exodus 6:20 and Numbers 26:59, P gives us their names: Amram and Jochebed, both of Levite origins. The Chronicler too assigns Moses to the tribe of the Levites. This tradition is therefore well attested. Many
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argue that it is a literary construction. Much debate lies around his mother’s name Jochebed, for it has the theophoric element YHWH. Scholars argue that P could not have given such a theophoric element consciously to a woman who lived before Moses’ theophany at Horeb. Buchanan Gray had concluded that P’s generation would not have coined such a theophoric element in its tradition, so he took it to be earlier than P. However, it could also mean that such a name actually comes from a post-P tradition. The major indication that Moses was a Levite is that Deuteronomy 33:8 refers to Moses as “the man devoted to you” (יָֽאָשֶׁר יְהֹוָֽה אָמַרְתֻּמֻּ וּלְרֶ֔אךְ אֲשֶׁךָ וְלֶ֖אֵישׁ חֲסִידֶֽו בְּמַסָּהְּרִיבֵּו עַל־מֵי מְרִיבָּה). In this instance refers to Moses as the one “tested” at the waters of Massah and Meribah, in parallel to the Levites. Judges 18:30 too presents an interesting note in that the young Levite Jonathan son of Gershom, son of Moses, became priest to the Danites. Yet despite psalm 99:6, and Moses being ascribed to the tribe of Levi, nowhere is he explicitly called a priest.

Moses’ first contact with priesthood would probably have been with the Egyptian priesthood when he was in Pharaoh’s court. His next contact would have been with that of Jethro in Midian, and as we have seen, in the light of Exodus 18, that would have been an essential contact, for it is apparently through this contact that Moses becomes acquainted with Yahwism and mediates the encounter between YHWH and Israel. Gressmann would argue that in Midian, Moses becomes “der Priesterlehrling Jethros”. Diana Edelman, together with Wellhausen, argues that there was a Mosaic priestly line, most probably connected with a cult of the bronze serpent Nehushtan, till the time of Hezekiah in 2 Kings 18:4. It is interesting to note that in Judges 18:30, the line of priests in Dan appears connected to Moses. This text presents a textual problem where many manuscripts read נשא, some with a suspended nun, whilst a few read נשא. The LXX and the Vulgate read the name Moses, and
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scholars agree that the latter is the original reading. Since priesthood is hereditary, this text would attest that Moses must have been a priest.

In the end, we have to accept that even though Moses is never called a priest, he performs cultic actions that are typical of priests. Moses’ preoccupation with the pilgrimage to Sinai in Exodus 10:2-11, the building of the altar, and the manipulation of cultic blood, are all sacerdotal prerogatives. Most importantly, Moses is the mediator and intercessor of the people. What the people do in Exodus 33:7 in going to Moses for counsel at the tent of the meeting, they would later do with the priests in the shrines, as evidenced in Judges 18:5; 1 Samuel 22:10; 23:2; 2 Samuel 16:23. Psalm 99, therefore, respects the Pentateuchal narrative that could have reflected a historical reality, in associating Moses and Aaron with the priestly order.

2.4.7 Moses the Scribe

As we have seen in section 2.2.1, in Pharaoh’s court, Moses could have probably been instructed in scribal work. Apart from this, there are a few texts which communicate explicitly that Moses has the function of a scribe. The most notable of these is Exodus 24:3-8. In Exodus 17:14 Moses receives the order to write a record of the battle against Amalek (כָּלַב אֲזֹאֲר וְאֶבֶן שַׁבָּה). Exodus 24:3-8 presents a play on words around the root ספר, where Moses recounts (וַיְסַפֵּר) the words of YHWH to the people (v3), he writes (נָתַן) the words of YHWH he recounted (v4) in the book (ספר) which he takes (קִחָה) and reads (קְרָא) to the people (v7). In Deuteronomy 31:9, Moses writes the law and gives it to the priests and all the elders (הֲנִים לַכַּה אָדוֹנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). In Deuteronomy 31:15-25, God informs Moses of his imminent death, and after stating the future infidelity of the people, God orders him in v19 to write this information in a song to serve as a reminder and witness between God and the people (את שָׁם הַסִּירֶה הַזֹּם אֲדֹנָיו כָּלַב שָׁם וַתִּקְרָא). The imperative כִּתְבָּה is in the 2nd person plural “write for yourselves” which implies that the people are ordered to write the song, and
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subsequently Moses is then supposed to teach it and place it “on the mouth of the sons of Israel”. It is however evident in v22 that it is Moses who writes the song, thus appearing as the scribe and teacher par excellence (וּלְמַדֶּת הַשִּׁירָה הַזֵּה בַּתְּכֵנְיָהלֵיהּ אֶל בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Writing was very important for it assured a permanent place in tradition. Unlike the physical Moses who died, his writing would “remain forever”. Brian Britt notes that in Deuteronomy 31-32, Moses and writing are intimately intertwined in a legacy that places the Torah above Joshua, Moses’ successor, since the text communicated directly what YHWH communicated to Moses.274 The writing Moses becomes theologically more important than the Moses who leads the people. Moses was alive to the Exodus generation, but after his death he could only provide leadership through what he actually wrote.275 There is thus a mutual relationship: on one hand the Torah derives its authority from its connection to Moses as a central figure of the narrative, on the other, Moses derives his authority through the very writing of the text of the Torah which he received from YHWH as a unique prophet, teacher, scribe and miracle worker.276

Whilst the historical Moses might have written down some laws he promulgated in the name of YHWH, it is clear that tradition inflated the literary Moses, making of him the first and most important scribe. Historically this could have been the case, but there are clear indications that tradition worked to underline this role of Moses. We have already noted in chapter 1, that there is a relationship between 2 Kings 22-23 and Nehemiah 8. This is not the place to discuss all the details surrounding the relationship between these two texts; for that I refer the reader to Pakkala’s work.277 It suffices to say that 2 Kings 22-23 is a unified text from the post-exilic period.278 Both texts exhibit parallels in that the law is presented by a scribe. It is interesting that Exodus 24:3-8 also presents Moses as a scribe along these lines! Moses, Shaphan and Nehemiah all read the law out loud to the people, and on all occasions the people
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respond. The scribes of the post-exilic period made of Moses the founder of their institution; he received the law, wrote it down, read it and interpreted it.

In Qumran Moses is envisioned as a scribe in 11Q Psalms.²⁷⁹ It is interesting to note that the Targums give a lot of importance to the epithet of Moses the scribe (ספרא).²⁸⁰ This is especially so in Targum Onkelos Deuteronomy 33:21 “Moses the scribe of Israel” (משה ספרא רבי), and Targum Neofiti Numbers 21:18, where both Moses and Aaron are presented as “the scribes of Israel” (سفרתיהם לישראל ומשה אנר). According to Moshe Bernstein the Targumim either prefer to translate the term prophet with scribe, or else present the words ספרא and נביא as a word pair.²⁸¹ Eva Mroczek concludes that whilst there might never have been prophets like Moses with whom God spoke face to face, in the Second Temple period understanding of the scribal guild, there certainly were scribes like Moses whose encounter with revelation also happened through writing.²⁸²

2.4.8 Moses the Teacher

According to the exilic deuteronomists, Moses was Israel’s teacher and lawgiver.²⁸³ This is particularly underlined in Deuteronomy 1:1-5. The verb דִּבְדַּר in verse 3 is explained in verse 5 as רֵאִית לֵאמֹר הַזֹּאת לֵאמֹר בֵּאֵר אֶשְׁוָא וָלֵאמֹר. Indeed the verb בֵּאֵר here implies that at Mount Nebo, Moses interprets and explains the Law given at Sinai.²⁸⁴ In Deuteronomy 1:1-3 Moses is presented as the most authoritative figure, especially when considering that these verses constitute the overture to the whole book
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of Deuteronomy. Moses is the teacher. Indeed this is the relationship of how the Law given at Sinai is related to that of Moab. According to Jean-Louis Ska, it is evident that in Deuteronomy, the law is no longer proclaimed or promulgated, but interpreted and explained. Interestingly, the book of Deuteronomy appears to be the execution of the divine command given to Moses in Exodus 24:12b to ascend the mountain and receive the Law written by God so that he would “teach” (תָּהְם לְֹורָה הַזֶּא) it to the people. The object of בֵּאֵר in Deuteronomy 1:5 is את תּוֹרָה הַזֶּא. Otto suggests that this Torah refers to the one Moses received on Sinai in Exodus 24:12. Deuteronomy is therefore the first commentary of the Sinai Law, expounded by the first great teacher Moses. Moses is also presented as teacher in Deuteronomy 4:5 (ם חֻקִים יָהוָה בָעֵת הַהִוא לְלַמֵּד אֹתְךָ וּתִּי צִוָּהו). In Deuteronomy 4:14 Moses explains how YHWH ordered him to teach the people (וּתִּי צִוָּהו בָעֵת הַהִוא לְלַמֵּד אֹתְךָ). It is interesting to note that the reference here is to the theophany at Horeb, referring to Exodus 20:18-21. Indeed, Moses in Deuteronomy 4:14 is ordered by YHWH to teach the Torah to the people in virtue of the people asking that he mediates for them. Indeed, here Moses the prophet emerges as Moses the teacher. Parallel to this, whilst the people in Deuteronomy 5:27 ask Moses to intercede for them so that he would repeat word for word the commandments which YHWH would show him, YHWH replies in a different way by ordering Moses in v37 to teach them the commandments. The people ask that Moses repeats what he hears from YHWH, YHWH asks that Moses do something more than just repetition, namely, teach. The whole book of Deuteronomy is such an instance of teaching mediation where Moses “explains” the law. Considering the use of the verb, Moses emerges in Deuteronomy as a teacher par excellence and not a prophet. This will continue in rabbinic literature, where the epithet used most frequently and regularly for Moses is: “Moses our teacher”.
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2.5 The Death of Moses

The death of Moses offers various problems to the exegete as well as the biblical theologian. The vast plethora of apocryphal writings on the matter attest that these problems existed since antiquity.\(^{293}\) As already noted, Noth considers Moses’ death and burial outside the land as the only sure criterion for the historical existence of Moses.\(^{294}\) Propp observes that “perhaps the historical Moses simply expired before reaching the Promised Land and was buried in Transjordan in a now-forgotten grave (Deut 34:6).”\(^{295}\) He also observes that the biblical authors seek to justify Moses’ exclusion through the theological explanation of divine punishment.\(^{296}\) Numbers 20 and Deuteronomy 32 attribute the denial of Moses from entering the Promised Land to his sin of not believing and not sanctifying YHWH in the eyes of all Israel. Walter Vogels states that one cannot pin point a specific sin of Moses because there is the work of the hand of later redactors.\(^{297}\) Some go as far as claiming that Moses’ sin was so great that it was censored from the text to avoid embarrassment, and therefore, the truth will forever evade us.\(^{298}\) Indeed the traditional view is that the punishment was because he struck the rock twice with the staff when actually he was ordered by God to speak to it.\(^{299}\) Others claim that it is because in Numbers 20:10b Moses spoke to the people in words that God never commanded.\(^{300}\) Indeed Psalm 106:32 would strengthen this view since Moses is portrayed as speaking rash words on account of the people, and Deuteronomy 1:37 has Moses blame the people for God’s barring him from entering the land. Some scholars have suggested that Moses was the scapegoat for the people’s sin.\(^{301}\) Some even propose a direct connection with Isaiah’s Suffering
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Servant. In Deuteronomy 1:37, 3:26; and Psalms 106:6 his death does appear to take on some aspects of vicarious sacrifice. Indeed, Moses is presented as כפריא in Deuteronomy 34:5, a title that bears an overtone of unjust rejection and humiliation, an innocent suffering for the sake of the guilty.

Yet the punishment theme is as strange as it is inconsistent with the heroic level that Moses achieved. Indeed Moses many times interceded as mediator for the people, and actually confronted God. We need only mention Exodus 5:22 where Moses, with his question (למה חטא לאדם) accuses God of having caused evil to his people. Moses dared to confront God many times and got away with it, and yet here, for a mere technicality, he is barred from entering the Promised Land! It appears that whatever Moses did, lessened YHWH’s authority, something that was unacceptable and had to be a paradigm lesson for the people. Arden concludes that the problem here is not a procedural error, but blasphemy. Moshe Anisfeld, in fact, sees Moses’ fault as that of leading the people into blasphemy with his rhetorical question in Numbers 20:10 (משך damerוע נפשו כาะ אל לוך ברך).
In my opinion the view of vicarious suffering is problematic, because Moses here is presented as suffering “because of/on account of the people” and not “in the place of”. Moreover, whilst the suffering servant goes through voluntary suffering, in Deuteronomy we read that Moses asks God more than once to change his fate, so much so that he is ordered by God not to speak any more about the matter (Deut 3:26). Propp identifies two traditions for Moses’ death: the D tradition, which views Moses in a positive light, and the P tradition that views Moses in a dimmer light, and seeks to exalt Aaron over Moses, going as far as blaming Moses for Aaron’s exclusion from the land. In Deuteronomy Moses tells the people three times that God has punished him because of them (Deut 1:37; 3:26; 4:21). It is interesting to note that trouble brewed with the episode of the spies in Deuteronomy 1:19-46 and Numbers 13-14. The entire generation, including Moses, but excluding Joshua and Caleb, are condemned to die outside the land. Moses here appears as the innocent and true intercessor, paying this role’s ultimate price, which is that of sharing the lot of the guilty people he represents. In the P tradition, Moses appears firstly as uncircumcised of lips (Ex 6:12, 30). Unlike the note of Exodus 4:10, where Moses is described as having difficulty in speaking, P uses pejorative terminology of un-circumcision to note the speech defect. Aaron thus, becomes Moses’ mouth as his prophet. In P Moses is still Aaron’s superior (Ex 7:1) yet P depicts Moses as “a complex character, supremely great and yet imperfect”. In Numbers 20:8, Moses and Aaron are ordered by God to command the rock to give forth water but Moses actually strikes the rock twice with the rod. Apparently this is Moses’ transgression, as he was supposed to produce water by speech alone, not hitting it with his rod. He was supposed to show God’s creative power, rather than giving a less impressive miracle by deed. In P, Aaron appears as completely innocent (Num 20:23) and pays the price for his brother’s lack of holiness.
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wrought by Moses and Aaron. This is fully repeated in Numbers 20:5. Thus not only did Moses and Aaron not correct this slide into blasphemy, they actually reinforced it with the rhetorical question: וַהֲמִן־לָכֶם לַעַל הַזָּם מָיִם. The people were led astray to reduce the distinction between Moses and God. Their exclusion was thus designed to restore the people’s faith in YHWH’s exclusivity. 309 See also TENG KOK, The Sin of Moses, 254.
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of faith.\textsuperscript{313} The Priestly account is the fullest as regards Moses’ death.\textsuperscript{314} It appears that there is a post-exilic sensitivity as regards divine wrath on sin. Apparently the priestly leadership of the Persian period emphasised divine justice, and not leadership and succession, as was the case in the time of the deuteronomists, who sought to present Moses as an alternative to the king. The post-exilic priestly writers contemplated a Moses dying for his own sin and that of others, in a time when the sacrificial system was based on divine justice.\textsuperscript{315}

In my opinion there appears to be an evolution. Whilst P presents Moses’ denial as a resulting punishment for his own sin, D presents Moses as having corporate responsibility for the people, and therefore dies with them.\textsuperscript{316} Whilst P blames Moses, D puts the blame on the people. Psalm 106:6 apparently seeks to work out a synthesis between the two traditions.\textsuperscript{317} Deuteronomy 34 seals off the Pentateuch, offering no explanation for Moses’ death but rather stressing his intimacy with God. The legendary motifs are clear, Moses is cast as an incomparable figure and hero.\textsuperscript{318} Deuteronomy 34 is the only text that does not provide any specific reason for Moses’ death. As Coats notes: “the assumption of this unit here simply assumes that Moses now has reached the time of his death”.\textsuperscript{319} Deuteronomy 34:7 has Moses die at 120 years of age. For Römer this communicates an important theology which picks up on
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Genesis 6:3 where God limits human life to 120 years. As such, therefore, Moses dies at the conclusion of the Pentateuch as the exemplary man in whom God’s plans are fulfilled. Römer attributes this theology to the Pentateuchal redactor, as we saw in chapter 1. Knauf concludes that Moses died for a theological reason. According to him, being the central figure of the founding history, he could not have entered into the history itself, into the Promised Land.\textsuperscript{320}

Mroczek draws an interesting parallel between Moses who is denied the land and David who is denied the Temple. Ironically, both are the ones to do all the preparatory work for the fulfilment of the project.\textsuperscript{321} Whilst Mroczek does not elaborate on this parallel, I think she does bring out an important point. Römer concluded that Moses’ death was a redactional move to “pacify” Moses, closing the Torah before the actual conquest of the land. According to him, Moses’ death becomes paradigmatic, where dying in peace is not linked with dying in the land, but rather depends on observing the Torah, transmitted by him.\textsuperscript{322} This would have reflected the redaction aiming at the Pentateuch as opposed to the Hexateuch. The Pentateuchal redaction sought to give precedence to Torah, and was also addressing diaspora Jews who feared dying in a foreign land as a curse as found in Amos 7:17, and Jeremiah 20:6. Above we also saw how the redactions of the Pentateuch sought to pacify Moses from extended military campaigns and from his military role. We also saw how the biblical text appears to preserve a tradition in 1 Samuel 12:8, where Moses did enter the land, and how this also appears to have been censored, at least by the translators of the LXX. In my opinion this could also be an attempt to “purify” Moses of the blood that had to be inevitably spilt by the conquest. David was not allowed to build the Temple because he had spilt much blood (1 Chr 22:8; 1 Chr 28:3). Having Moses die outside the land could be a way of sparing him of the much blood that had to be shed in the conquest narratives. This could be a further reason, in my opinion, why the final redactors of the Torah had Moses die outside the Promised Land: Moses, the humble religious leader, prepared the people to enter the land, and ultimately died outside the land, in full intimate communion with YHWH. According to Dohmen, the incomparability of Moses and his death proclaimed in Deuteronomy 34:10 stand to

\textsuperscript{320} \textsc{Knauf}, “Wer war Mose?”, 584.
\textsuperscript{321} \textsc{Mroczek}, “Moses, David and Scribal Revelation”, 101.
\textsuperscript{322} \textsc{Thomas Römer}, “Moïse, héros de la diaspora: enquête sur les aspects de la figure de Moïse reflétant, à l’époque perse, les préoccupations de la diaspora égyptienne”, \textit{Transeuphratène} 36 (2008) 144.
underline the level of intimacy and communication that YHWH had with him. Emphasis in this phrase is on revelation and not the person.\textsuperscript{323} Moses dying outside the land contradicts Exodus 3:8-10 where he is explicitly commissioned to lead the people out of Egypt and into the land flowing with milk and honey. Deuteronomy 34 does not give an explicit reason for Moses’ death, but rather it is implicitly presented as a divine decision. Moses’ death shows that the land is not a condition \textit{sine qua non} for nascent Judaism. Yet the account of his death is full of pathos. He dies alone, because to an extent he lived a solitary leadership. Indeed as the true mediator, “He fought God in defence of the people and the people in defence of God”\textsuperscript{324}

In my opinion there is also an important kerygmatic message to the exiles in Deuteronomy’s account of Moses’ death. There is a very important parallel between Moses’ death and that of Josiah which has only been noted by Thomas Mann.\textsuperscript{325} Mann built upon Lohfink’s analysis of the Deuteronomistic view of the corporate responsibility of the people. Indeed, whilst the Exile was attributed to Manasseh’s sin by the Deuteronomistic Historian (2 Kings 23:26), the call for the people to recognise their co-responsibility in what happened remained essential. In the books of Kings the people are also responsible for they let themselves be beguiled by the kings’ idolatry. Indeed, Josiah will turn out to be the just king who worked for the reform, but in the end, he still had to suffer the consequences of his predecessors’ sins. Josiah is thus presented as the ideal exemplary king who, like Moses, has to share in the corporate responsibility of the people and, like Moses, die an untimely death. This therefore becomes an invitation to the exiles to take on corporate responsibility in view of their personal responsibility, and in this light, seek to accept, like Moses, God’s will. The Kerygma of Deuteronomy 1:37; 3:26; 4:21; and 32:51, is that whilst Moses did not make it into the land, the new generation did. If it will be God’s will, the exiled will eventually return to the land. The exiled just have to have faith and trust in the Lord.

\textsuperscript{323} DOHMEN, “Mose schrieb diese Tora auf”, 256.
\textsuperscript{324} ERICA BROWN, “In Death as in Life: What the Biblical Portraits of Moses, Aaron and Miriam Share”, \textit{BR} 15.3 (1999) 51.
\textsuperscript{325} THOMAS MANN, “Theological Reflections on the Denial of Moses”, \textit{JBL} 98 (1979) 481-494.
2.5.1 The Death of Moses and the Canon of the Pentateuch

As we have seen in section 1.1.2, Römer identifies a further canonical motif behind Moses’ death outside of the land. Many, following Wellhausen’s influence, have posited the existence of a Hexateuch. Indeed, the narrative logic would want Joshua to conclude the composition, for the conquest of the land constitutes the fulfilment of the divine promise of Genesis 12ff. Indeed, von Rad identified various historical creeds throughout the Hexateuch, confirming such a composition. Römer concludes that such narrative logic attests that the idea of a Hexateuch is not simply an invention of nineteenth century exegesis. Römer and Brettler identified a dialectic between two late redactions, namely, the “Hexateuchal Redaction” and the “Pentateuchal Redaction”. The former gave prominence to the land, and is attested by Joshua 24. The latter is attested by Deuteronomy 34, having Moses die outside the land, closing the Pentateuch as a body of legislative texts, thus giving prominence to the Torah. With the Exile, the land and the Temple had already been lost once. Only the Torah survived the turmoil of the Exile, and therefore the only sure criterion on which to build religious identity is neither the land nor the Temple but the Torah.

2.6 Conclusion

Indeed, the life of Moses is the most extensive biography in the Hebrew Bible. No other figure can boast of having such an extensive narrative dedicated to his personhood. The little historical data we find in the biblical text help us conclude that Moses, besides being a historical figure, is also a figure of religious historiography and tradition. We therefore distinguish between two types of Mosaic portraits, namely the Historical Moses and the Literary Moses. As we have seen, van Seters has

328 RÖMER, “La mort de Moïse”, 27.
330 FISCHER, “L’immagine di Mosè”, 145. Fischer sees Moses’ Midianite link, and the details of 2 Kings 18:4 and Judges 18:30 as the basic historical kernel from which the Mosaic traditions emerged and were inflated. Ibid, 142.
concluded that the Tetrateuch was the work of an exilic author, whom he calls the Yahwist, who wrote a prehistory to the deuteronomistic history. According to him, this prehistory was a literary construction and thus affirmed that the search for any sources or for historical elements in these texts is not only futile but a misguided “waste of time”.331 Yet, even if the Pentateuch were a late literary construction, it does not follow that such a literary construction is necessarily devoid of any historical kernel.

The historical Moses as such appears to have had a much more reduced role in the pre-exilic Israelite tradition.332 He appears to have been an Israelite man of exceptional qualities, chosen to be part of Pharaoh’s court. As such, he gained a prominent position in Egypt (Ex 11:3), which proved to be providential in leading the people. As such, Moses learned the Egyptian language and law, and if he was a scribe, he would also have been versed in the languages and laws of the ancient Near East. His flight to Midian has been deemed historical as well. This also proved to be spiritually providential. It is in Midian that Moses came to know YHWH intimately, probably through his interaction with Jethro (Ex 18). It is with this political and religious background that Moses became the leader of the Exodus generation. Moses here emerges as the charismatic religious and political leader.333 As such, he was the one to have introduced this generation to Yahwism and also to the first body of laws. If order was to be kept for this generation, Moses, being well educated in Pharaoh’s court, must have inevitably legislated some basic law for the people. It is as such that Moses becomes the great mediator and intermediary between YHWH and the people.

The literary Moses is the product of religious historiography, which took the historical Moses and expanded this figure extensively. As such, this construction underwent evolution according to the dominant tradition of the time. The *Sitz im Leben* 331 V.A. SETERS, “The Life of Moses”, 34. 332 MORO, I sandali di Mose, 33. 333 This humanistic reading of Moses in the Pentateuch has been highly criticized by Silver. For him the Torah presents Moses as an obedient servitor rather than a man of initiative. A holy man rather than a practical man of affairs. He was the faithful servant of God not a powerful leader, he is presented not in the heroism of the sagas but in the heroism of the charismatic. Indeed, according to Silver, the editors of the Torah were remarkably attentive to present a tight rein on the legendary embellishments of Moses’ biography. See DANIEL JEREMY SILVER, “By a Prophet the Lord Brought up Israel Out of Egypt”, in Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University 1909-1979, Katsh Abraham (ed.), Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979, 425.
of the Exile proves to be essential for the understanding of the literary Moses. We have to keep in mind that the Exile proved to be a very difficult time for Israel. The people had lost the land, the Temple, and all the institutions, together with their identity. It is at this point that traditions sought to make a paradigm out of Moses. The so-called Deuteronomistic History was compiled to give the reasons for the disaster. In and of itself, as we have seen in chapter 1, it did not offer much hope for the future. It was the later deuteronomistic redactors who sought to instil hope. Moses, who was historically very important as the initiator of Israelite religion, thus became the object of an extended literary construction. Indeed I agree with Georg Fischer who concludes that the literary construction of the image of Moses had the function of legitimising the various roles of leadership in Israel.\textsuperscript{334}

In the pre-exilic period, the earlier strata of the literary Moses appear to present Moses as legislator, who in the time of Josiah, became the epitome of legislation. Urdeuteronomium would ultimately be attributed to Moses, and the deuteronomistic Deuteronomy would make of Moses the ultimate interpreter of the Law as the one vested with authority since he was the one who received the law directly.

In the exilic period, the people in the Exile needed hope. It was at this point that the return would be viewed as the New Exodus. Moses thus became the “saved saviour”, in the sense of reflecting exilic hope.\textsuperscript{335} In the face of the failure of the Exile, Moses gets a new meaning. The monarchy had failed, and therefore “the ideal hero cannot be David but a New Moses”.\textsuperscript{336} The hero motif, extensively studied by Coats,\textsuperscript{337} is also a literary construction that instils hope.

In the late exilic and in the post-exilic period, the mistakes of the past had to be avoided. It is at this point that the later deuteronomistic redactors sought to make Moses a paradigm of every Israelite institution, religious as well as political. Moses thus is depicted in royal terms, as the ideal judge and king. As the sole direct recipient of the Law and the one interceding constantly for the people he was made the model

\textsuperscript{334} FISCHER, “L’Immagine di Mosè”, 147.
\textsuperscript{335} MEIK GERHARDS, Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose, (=WMZANT, 109), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2006, 250-256; 263-264.
\textsuperscript{336} MILLER, “The Roles of Moses”, 31.
\textsuperscript{337} COATS, Moses.
prophet. If there is to be any success whatsoever, any future judge, king, priest, and prophet, would have to be “like Moses”.

In the end, it is evident that the literary Moses is not a historic representation of a universal genius, but rather a concentration and optimisation of everything that is important for the governance of the Israelite community in every aspect of social life: the legal, the organising, the political and the religious. It is in this sense that Moses gains such prominence in the later Deuteronomistic tradition as the prototype prophet of Deuteronomy 34:10 and the first in line of a series in Deuteronomy 18:15. As such, therefore, historically Moses does not appear to be a prophet in the strict sense of the term. Moses the prophet is part of Literary Moses and this is the theme explored in the next chapter.
Chapter 3 – Moses the Prophet
3.0 Introduction

Deuteronomy 34:10, presents Moses as the unsurpassed prophet, making of him the paradigm of what it means to be a prophet. Moses will forever remain a prophet without any equal. God in Deuteronomy 18:15;18 promises his people a “prophet like Moses”. This makes of Moses an archetypal prophet,¹ and therefore the model for the prophets in the line following him. This tradition in Deuteronomy obviously implies, or assumes, that Moses was a prophet in some way or another, and that a future prophet, or prophets, would be “putting on his sandals” when exercising their own ministry. Von Rad states about Moses:

“He is the chief of the prophets (Deut 18:18), in that he is the archetype and norm of all prophets, through whose coming Yahweh guaranteed the constant connection between himself and his people… it is only rarely in Deuteronomy that we find Moses acting as the leader who gives strategic orders…. for his real office was to pass to Israel, in the form of a proclaimed word, the word of Yahweh which had been addressed to himself”.²

Arnold Rhodes concludes: “Whatever may be said about the overall portrait of Moses’ various functions as deliverer, ruler, judge, miracle worker, and priest (only so named in Psalms 99:6), the overarching portrait is that of the prophet par excellence, who announces Yahweh’s word to the people and intercedes for the people before Yahweh”.³

In this chapter, first of all, we shall have a look at what constitutes a prophet, and shall see in what ways this appellative can be applied to Moses. We shall inevitably be touching on the fact as to whether historically, Moses was a prophet or not. The question we shall seek to answer is “was Moses truly a prophet, or was it tradition, that made a prophet out of him?” Namely, in the light of the preceding chapter, is Moses the prophet part of the literary Moses or the historical Moses?

3.1 Prophecy – Attempting a Definition

The fundamental question that one has to answer when dealing with prophecy, and with which this thesis does deal extensively, is: “What constitutes a prophet?” If we put aside the various definitions put forward by dictionaries and focus exclusively on the biblical data, we find that prophecy can refer to “prediction, emotional preaching, social activism, the ability to enlighten and communicate insight, the founding of a new religion, and the leadership of a cult group”.

This extremely versatile picture shows that defining the prophetic role is no easy task. Whilst we distinguish between the former prophets and the latter prophets, with the latter being primarily the “writing” prophets, it is still difficult to define their role as such. We have to consider the fact that, as Hermann Gunkel and others note, the prophets were primarily speakers and not writers, and as such it was their circles that put into writing their oracles, extensively elaborating and enlarging their sayings. It is thus essential for the critic to identify the Gattungen and the Sitz im Leben of the oracles, as well as to strip off the layers added later, which in themselves, still communicate a theology. Keeping this in mind, it is essential to consider the final form of the book as well. In fact, the final redactors too had their own theological agendas. Obviously such an agenda was mostly in line with the prophet in question, and this has a lot to tell us.

The commonest Hebrew term for prophet is נביא, the origins of which is debated. Its closest cognate seems to be the Akkadian verb nabȗ(m), “to name”/“to call”, and could have the active sense of “speaker”/“herald”/“preacher”, or the passive

---

5 There appears to be a clear distinction between the writing and the non-writing prophets. Critical scholars saw that the writing prophets were the representatives of the purest form of monotheistic Judaism, whereas the former prophets reflect a cruder form of religion. See BERNHARD DÜHM, Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion, Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1874, 1-34. Modern scholarship, however, focuses more on the continuity and evolution between the two. See HAROLD ROWLEY, “The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study”, in The Servant of the Lord, Harold H. Rowley, London: Basil Blackwell, 1965, 128-134. According to Wilson, even the form critical analysis of the prophetic speeches show continuity between the two. See ROBERT WILSON, “Early Israelite Prophecy”, Interpretation 32 (1978) 7.
7 SWEENEY, “Formation and Form”, 114-115.
sense, “the one who has been called”. The Biblical term נביא, in my opinion, communicates both senses in that the prophet is called and sent by God as an active messenger speaking in the name of God. Some scholars define the role of the prophet by relying on Greek etymology, where προφήτης implies: “the one proclaiming a message on behalf of another”, in this case God. It is also interesting to note that although ecstatic prophecy was present in Israel, as attested in 1 Samuel 10, the translators of the LXX are careful to use the verb προφητεύειν and avoid the verb μαντεύομαι. This stands to show that the biblical understanding of prophecy went well beyond that of uncontrolled religious behaviour, much in line with the prohibitions found in Deuteronomy 18:9-14.

3.1.1 The Beginnings of Prophecy

Edward Robertson identified a long process of evolution in Hebrew prophecy, from its origins in the 8th century to its decline in the Second Temple period. It is a fact that the other religions surrounding Israel focused on divination and the reading of omens, something condemned by Deuteronomy 18:9-14. The only “divination” allowed in Israel, was the casting of lots in the judgments carried out by the priests with the בִּרְאוֹת and מִרְאוֹת (Ex 28:30). Israel’s election meant that the people always had a special relationship with YHWH, and this meant that YHWH would also communicate in special ways with his people. Such communication would require various mediums. Angels were often considered as God’s messengers, and yet there are various episodes where it is unclear as to whether it is actually YHWH or else his angel, that appears to, and speaks with, the patriarchs. Dreams were considered to be a medium of divine communication, yet dreams required interpretation, and whilst everyone could dream, very few could interpret them. Vision seems to have been a
more important medium of divine communication, the reason being that whilst everyone could dream, visions were more exclusive and more linked to God’s choosing the individual experiencing the vision. According to Robertson visions constitute prophecy in the truest sense.\(^\text{10}\) This is confirmed by the narrative comment of 1 Samuel 9:9 where it is stated that formerly “the prophet” was called “the seer” (יהוה). This verse appears to come from the hand of later deuteronomistic authors, who tended to use the term אִישׁ in a much less restricted sense. It appears that Samuel was originally a והוא and became a אִישׁ thanks to such editors who also authored the typical prophetic call narrative for Samuel in 1 Samuel 3.\(^\text{11}\) The deuteronomist does not simply explain what והוא means, when he equates this term with אִישׁ, but rather intends to convey the idea that Samuel was a prophet in the line of the “prophet like Moses”.\(^\text{12}\)

The terms והוא and והוא have been considered as synonymous to the word אִישׁ especially when visions were apparently the distinguishing mark of prophecy.\(^\text{13}\) Fenton argues that these different terms reflect merely individual or local preferences, and sees no point in attributing different prophetic functions on the basis of etymology.\(^\text{14}\) The majority of scholars however disagree. Vision appears to have been a kind of prophecy characterised by trance and ecstasy, when there is an infusion of the prophet’s mind with that of the divine. This is particularly marked in early prophecy such as that of the band of ecstatic prophets under the lead of Samuel in 1 Samuel 19:20, and the lead of Elijah and Elisha in 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 15; 6:1-5. According to Virgil Rabe, the best way to describe the phenomenon of vision is through the term “spirit-possession”, since through it, the subject does not lose his identity whilst being seized by the Spirit.\(^\text{15}\) The term והוא seems to be applied extensively to Samuel

---

\(^\text{10}\) ROBERTSON, “The Role of the Prophet”, 416.
\(^\text{11}\) STÖKL, Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 197.
\(^\text{12}\) Ibid, 198.
\(^\text{13}\) MORRIS JASTROW, “Rô’eh and Hôzeh in the Old Testament”, JBL 28 (1909) 42, and references there. Whilst there appears to be this synonymy, Jastrow does not accept that the functions of the והוא and the והוא were always identical. The והוא par excellence in the OT is Samuel, especially in connection with the role typical of the Near Eastern diviner. As such, therefore, Samuel can be classified as a prophet of the primitive type. In the episode of Saul’s first meeting with Samuel, the term והוא occurs some four times. Here Samuel appears to have the function of a diviner as a profession, who would receive compensation in return for his services. The term is also applied to the band of prophets of 1 Samuel 10. In 1 Samuel 3:20, Samuel is called והוא, a term which appears to be a projection of a later conception of prophecy.


inasmuch as he functions as a “diviner”. These diviners were those intermediaries who were sought by the people, especially by the king, when they required information from the deity. Jastrow argues that the term הָרָע is linked with the divination of priests using hepatoscopy, typical of the Babylonian diviners.

It appears that at a later period, the term הָרָע was used more frequently than הָרָע. Yet, the term הָרָע was used to refer to the earlier forms of prophecy as well. It is applied to the prophet Gad in conjunction with הנבּ in 2 Samuel 24:11 (זַזְּכֵבָא חָזָה). It also appears to be associated with priestly functions. Such is confirmed by the fact that Heman (1 Chr 25:5) and Jeduthun (2 Chr 35:15) are designated like Gad as “the king’s seer” (ךְֶּלֶּּּּּ), and both of them had functions typical of the Levites. Jonathan Stökl notes that whilst הָרָע appears to be linked with the royal court and הָרָע appears to have been independent of the official entourage (as was the case of the earlier Samuel), both are used interchangeably by the chronicler (1 Chr 23:29). Probably the chronicler either wanted to blur the distinction, or else he could no longer distinguish them. Some scholars suggest that the main difference between the terms הָרָע and הָרָע appears to be that הָרָע is a form of voluntary divination, and הָרָע an involuntary divination. Kotzé identifies two main classes of divination, 1) mediumistic divination which is non-rational, inspirational and natural, i.e. in a sense it is passive, and 2) inductive divination that is rational, systematic and artificial. He considers prophecy as a subtype of mediumistic divination where the divine word is received intuitively in a state of altered consciousness. See ZAK KOTZÉ, “Old Testament Prophecy as Divination: the Case of Isaiah 14,28-32”, JS 22 (2013) 91.

Many scholars argue that these practices were used by the biblical prophets. Jeffers argues that trees were commonly used in divination as they are rooted in the soil and reach high into the sky thus linking heaven, earth and the underworld. According to Jeffers, the הָרָע of Genesis 12:6, the מְֹונְנִים of Judges 9:37, hint at such a practice. Hosea 4:12 clearly refers to dendromancy and rhabdomancy with the term רָאָה בַכָבֵד.

17 JASTROW, “Rô’eh and Hôzeh”, 46-49. It is interesting that the practice of divining through looking at the animal’s liver was something known to the biblical world as attested in Ezekiel 21:26 through the term רָאָה בַכָבֵד.
18 Ibid.
20 Kotzé identifies two main classes of divination, 1) mediumistic divination which is non-rational, inspirational and natural, i.e. in a sense it is passive, and 2) inductive divination that is rational, systematic and artificial. He considers prophecy as a subtype of mediumistic divination where the divine word is received intuitively in a state of altered consciousness. See ZAK KOTZÉ, “Old Testament Prophecy as Divination: the Case of Isaiah 14,28-32”, JS 22 (2013) 91.
22 Many scholars argue that these practices were used by the biblical prophets. Jeffers argues that trees were commonly used in divination as they are rooted in the soil and reach high into the sky thus linking heaven, earth and the underworld. According to Jeffers, the הָרָע of Genesis 12:6, the מְֹונְנִים of Judges 9:37, hint at such a practice. Hosea 4:12 clearly refers to dendromancy and rhabdomancy with the terms רָאָה בַכָבֵד. See ANN JEFFERS, Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria, Leiden, Brill, 1996, 181.
Jerusalem…” (Isa 1:1). Visions, particularly about the future, are an important constituent of prophecy, but as Rabe notes, the classical prophets had more than just visions about the future. The prophet “proclaimed the word of God: the violation of the covenant by his contemporaries with a judgment of doom for the unrepentant, and a message of hope in God’s final victory”. It appears that both הֶּאֹר and הֶזֶח fell into disuse when the term נֶבֶי gained a wider semantic field, incorporating more roles in it, especially in terms of what constituted a prophet. It could also be the case that הֶאֹר and הֶזֶח gained increasingly negative connotations in view of them being similar in form to divination practices which Deuteronomy 18:9-14 deems as illegitimate. Whilst the other terms increasingly referred to divination, the term נֶבֶי seems to have been associated with being a direct mouthpiece of God. It thus became “the appropriate designation of the class of men that embodied the protest against all manner of divination”.

3.1.2 The Prophet – A Man of the “Word”

Being the mouthpiece of God, the prophet’s mission appears to be intimately linked with the proclamation of the word. This theology is particularly communicated in Exodus 4:16 where Aaron is designated as a prophet to Moses, who would function for him as a “mouth”. Indeed, the Hebrew Scriptures do not offer a uniform idea of who and what constitutes a prophet, and the title is used in different contexts and with different roles. Garrett Galvin gives an interesting idea of what constitutes a prophet: “A prophet can be a social critic, but not always; a diviner, but not always; a priest but not always, etc.” The biblical general understanding of the prophets is that they were intermediaries, proclaiming the divine will/word to their addressees.

---

23 See also Isaiah 22:1. 5; 2 Chronicles 32:32; Nah 1:1; and Ob 1:1.
25 The terms הֶאֹר and הֶזֶח in fact are seen negatively in Isaiah 30:10 and Ezekiel 13:23; 22:28, texts which seem to imply that these terms refer to false prophecy.
27 FENTON, “Deuteronomistic Advocacy of the Nâbî”, 34-35.
30 HELLER ROY L., Power, Politics, and Prophecy: The Character of Samuel and the Deuteronomistic Evaluation of Prophecy, (=JSOTS; 440), London: T & T Clark, 2006, 1. Heller argues that foundationally the main components of prophecy remain: 1) a deity who is the initiator of the message;
and Frank Moore Cross connected the rise of prophecy directly to the rise of the monarchy. Many scholars contend that prophecy did exist in ancient Israel before the rise of the monarchy, arguing that the letters of Mari indicate that prophecy appeared very early in the Near East and in Israel. Both Deborah (Judg 4:4) and Miriam (Num 15:20) are presented as prophetesses, Eldad and Medad are presented as “spirit-possessed” who prophesy (Num 11:24-30), and whilst Moses was considered the proto-prophet, the late tradition of Genesis considered Abraham a prophet as well. These early streams of prophetism can hardly be directly linked to the monarchy. It is legitimate to ask at this point: were these persons truly prophets in the strict sense of the word? Karel van der Toorn notes that Israelite prophecy is much more heterogeneous than the picture given by the classical prophets, and argues that “a careful reading of the biblical records, elucidated by Near Eastern parallels, reveals a remarkable continuity in the figure of the charismatic leader from the patriarchs to the prophets”. He in fact prefers to use the term “charismatic leaders” rather than prophets, and he concludes that Abraham and Moses were called prophets “unhistorically”. Stökl notes that the use of the title נביא in the Pentateuch is negligible, the reason being that the title נביא was applied to Abraham, Moses, Aaron and Miriam during the later period when its semantic field was widened and included leaders and important persons.

---

2) the message itself as a linguistic or meta-linguistic phenomenon; 3) the prophet who mediates the message; 4) the addressees as recipients of the message. See Ibid, 2.


33 KAREL VAN DER TOORN, “From Patriarchs to Prophets: A Reappraisal of Charismatic Leadership in Ancient Israel”, JNSL 13 (1987) 192. Interestingly, van der Toorn sees an evolution of charismatic leadership into prophecy. Indeed he concludes that the Israelites were aware that such charismatic leadership was the ancestry of prophecy. The first and epitome of all such leadership is Moses. The next level in the evolution is from Joshua to Samuel. The Judges derive their importance from their military exploits, but they also possess prophetic traits. Samuel constitutes the break between judges and prophets. From Samuel onwards spiritual and political leadership would go their separate ways.

34 Ibid, 197.

35 STÖKL, Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 33, 176.
Whilst prophecy had a long history, it cannot be denied that it was intimately linked to the monarchy. When the monarchy started, the prophets were there to keep it in check, a case in point being Samuel in 1 Samuel 8.\textsuperscript{36} When kingship became well established, the prophet became a mediator, serving as God’s spokesman to the king and to the people, offering advice or rebuke, as the situation called for. But the prophet also held a role of leadership. As Robertson puts it: “when Yahweh chose his prophets it was not to invite them to preach good sermons to backsliding Israelites, but rather for leadership in national emergencies”.\textsuperscript{37} He reaches this conclusion through an analysis of prophecy as depicted in the books of Samuel and Kings. The study of prophetic tradition led scholars to identify “a cumulative process of appropriation, assimilation and adaptation that shade off into increasingly frequent recycling and reinterpretation of older prophetic material”.\textsuperscript{38} The role of the prophet, properly understood, seems to have originated in the North, in Samaria, through prophetic and Levitical groups that opposed the monarchy.\textsuperscript{39} This was in turn taken up by Hosea and eventually migrated to the south through its uptake by Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic programme.\textsuperscript{40} Judaean prophecy sprouted through a different trajectory, namely with the work of Nathan and Gad at the time of David. Rather than opposing the monarchy, this tradition was at its support as court prophecy. This tradition was eventually taken up by Amos and Isaiah. Whilst the northern Ephramite tradition gave prominence of place to Moses as the “first paradigmatic prophetic mediator”, the Judaean tradition gave prominence to social justice.\textsuperscript{41}

3.1.3 The Prophet – Mediator and Intercessor

The prophet is also a mediator for he is caught in the current between his God and his people and speaks on behalf of both parties. The prophet intercedes for the people, sharing in their pain, but the prophet also speaks on behalf of God, sharing in

\textsuperscript{37} ROBERTSON, “The Role of the Early Prophet”, 426.
\textsuperscript{38} BLENKINSOOP, \textit{History of Prophecy}, 3.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, 4.
\textsuperscript{41} BLENKINSOOP, \textit{History of Prophecy}, 4. According to Blenkinsopp, Deuteronomy owes its social legislation to influence from Judean prophecy.
the “suffering” of God. This is what Abraham Heschel calls “pathos”. The symbolic acts of the prophets are not just ways of proclaiming a strong message to the people, but these also become situations lived by the prophet in his very flesh. The prophet shares both in the desolation of the people, and in God’s “pain” at the unfaithfulness of his people. It appears therefore that the prophet’s role in ancient Israel was twofold: on the one hand the prophet was God’s mouthpiece to the people, whereas on the other, the prophet also carried the people’s petitions to God. As such, therefore, the prophet emerges as a mediator and, when speaking on behalf of the people, an intercessor. This concept is very important for this thesis for as we have seen in the previous chapter, this mediation/intercession is very important in the life of Moses and also in the life of Jeremiah, as expressed in his confessions. It is in the roles of mediation and intercession that Moses fits mostly into the shoes of the prophet. As Michael Thompson and Stephen Bigger note, Deuteronomy 18:15 presents Moses as the proto-prophet who justifies the work of all the prophets following him. Just as Moses had been appointed to the role of mediator between the people and YHWH, responsible for bringing the Torah to the people, so YHWH will send a succession of faithful prophets who in the various situations cropping up in everyday life, would declare the will of YHWH.

Intercession and mediation are particularly important in some forms of prophecy especially in Covenant mediation. This is the case in Exodus 32-34 and 1 Kings 19 where the people break the covenant, and the mediator steps in to intercede for the people so as to re-establish that covenant. In these cases, Brian Britt identifies a typical Biblical type scene, composed of four elements, namely: 1) the prophet faces a crisis as the people broke the covenant; 2) there is a theophany; 3) the commissioning/re-commissioning of the prophet; 4) the divine plan is presented again

---

42 This is the original idea put forward by Abraham Joshua Heschel in his work The Prophets, New York: Harper Perennial, 2001, 30-31. As Callaway notes “the prophetic sympathy with God was matched by the prophet’s deep identification with his own people. On the one hand he stood outside the community and represented God’s view; on the other hand, he was a member of that community and was called on to represent its interests to God.” See MARY CALLAWAY, “A Hammer that Breaks Rock in Pieces: Prophetic Critique in the Hebrew Bible”, in Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity, Craig A. Evans (ed.), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993, 34.


and starts unfolding.\textsuperscript{47} Within this context, mediation and intercession become very important functions of every prophet. It is in this line that I believe that, to an extent, every prophet is a covenant mediator between God and the people. The prophet emerges particularly in his role as covenant mediator in texts that are typically called covenant lawsuit (e.g. Mic 6:1-14; Jer 2:5-9). The prophet acts like a lawyer speaking on behalf of his client, and brings YHWH’s claims before the people.\textsuperscript{48} This theme becomes particularly important as concerns the new covenant (בְּרִית חֲדָשָה) (see Jer 31:31). As we have already seen in the previous chapter section 2.4.2, for intercession to be possible, there must be the possibility of repentance on the part of the people but also on the part of God,\textsuperscript{49} namely, it implies that divine plans are not immutable but may be revocable, as expressed in Jeremiah 18:7-10 and Ezekiel 3:17-21; 33:7-20, to mention just a few examples. There are clear cases where at the repentance of the people, God “changes his mind” (Jon 1:6; 3:9; Joel 2:14; Amos 5:15; Zeph 2:3). The book of Jonah is a return to the prophetic legend, and turns out to be a parody of prophecy, emphasising not only the disobedience of the prophet, but also the prophet’s reluctance to accept God’s “repentance”.\textsuperscript{50} Indeed, the book of Jonah seeks to correct the apparent theological contradiction that lies between God’s immutable plan and his mercy and forgiveness. It sets the scene where ultimately divine anger, retribution, and even violence, spares everyone, including the reluctant prophet.\textsuperscript{51} Yet even in the case of stubbornness, compassion may overcome wrath, as attested in Hosea 11:8-9; Jeremiah 33:8; and Micah 7:18-19.\textsuperscript{52} This led to the development of the theology of

\textsuperscript{47} BRIAN BRITT, “Prophetic Concealment in a Biblical Type Scene”, \textit{CBQ} 64 (2002) 38.
\textsuperscript{48} CALLAWAY, “Prophetic Critique in the Hebrew Bible”, 25.
\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, the biblical understanding of God is very different from the notion of the God of philosophy, known in terms of “the Absolute”. The Bible does present God on the one hand as unchangeable, assuring that creation does not lie in the hands of caprice. Yet at the same time, the Bible presents God as changing his mind, sometimes even grieving over what He had done previously (Gen 6:6 to mention one example). This latter aspect reveals that God is in a vital intimate relationship with his people. See JOHN T. WILLIS, “The “Repentance” of God in the Books of Samuel, Jeremiah, and Jonah”, \textit{HBT} 16 (1994) 156-175.
\textsuperscript{52} It is precisely this notion that led to the concept of the new covenant (בְּרִית חֲדָשָה) in the prophets: “the frustration of waiting for the people’s response and the realisation that by their own efforts they could
the new covenant (בְּרִית חֲדָשָה). The renewal of the covenant could not follow the traditional deuteronomistic ritual of covenant renewal; the only way forward was if God himself changed the heart of the people (Jer 31:31-34), a theology that is also found in Deuteronomy 29:3; 30:6, and 31:21. The renewal of the heart appears to be a theme of the prophetic styling of texts in the latest phase of the redactional process.53

Since, as we have seen, intercession was extremely important for prophecy, many scholars concluded that the prophets of Israel were characteristically intercessors.54 However, not all scholars agree. Hans Herzberg recognises that intercession plays an important part in the activity of the prophets but he concludes that once the individual receives the prophetic call and becomes a prophet, that individual ceases to be an intercessor, and becomes a messenger of the word.55 Whilst the prophet is indeed a messenger of the word, it is very clear, especially in Jeremiah’s case, that the prophet remains an intercessor. One role does not exclude the other. Moreover, on a close analysis of the biblical texts it appears clear that intercession is not restricted to the biblical prophets. Other figures intercede for others, such as Isaac, not effect a total return to God, led to the development of an entirely new theological concept. If the nation would not initiate the process, God would.” See PAUL, “Prophets and Prophecy”, 397. The Sinaitic covenant had been broken and the people were still unrepentant, so God would graft in his people a new heart, the removal of the heart of stone and the grafting of a heart of flesh imbued with the “knowledge of God”. This is the theology of Isaiah 11:9; 54:13; 55:3; Jeremiah 24:7; 31:30-33; 32:38-41; Ezekiel 16:60; 34:25ff; 36:26ff; and Deuteronomy 30:6. This concept would lead to the Old Testament theology of the end times, where Israel would become the light to the nations (Isa 42:6; 49:6) and the eschatology of Isa 19:18-25; 45:22ff; Jer 3:17; 12:16; Ezek 17:24; Mic 7:16ff; Hab 2:14; Zeph 2:11; Zech 2:15; 8:20-23; 14:16-21, where all the nations would reject idolatry and accept and revere the God of Israel.


King Hezekiah, Job, Nehemiah, even non-Israelites such as Abraham’s slave in
Genesis 24:42-48, Pharaoh in Exodus 8:8; 28 and Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:34-
37. It appears that intercession is not a prerogative of the prophets, and in prophecy,
it is secondary to the proclamation of the word of YHWH. We must however keep
one thing in mind. The biblical tradition calls Abraham a prophet in Genesis 20:1-28
not in virtue of his proclaiming the word of God, but in virtue of his interceding for
Abimelech. It is therefore evident that at some point in time in the history of
traditions, we have to accept that intercession was seen as an important, if not an
essential aspect, of prophetic duty. Moses (Ex 15:22-25; 17:1-7; 32:11-13, 31-32;
34:9; Num 11:1-2; 12:13-16; 14;11-23; 16:22; 21:1-9; Deut 9:25-29), Samuel (1 Sam
7:5-11; 12:18, 23), Elijah and Elisha, serve as models for intercession. According to
van Seters: “Moses is the prophet of salvation to his own people. Above all, Moses is
intercessor, the one who suffers with them and for them, as in the case of Jeremiah
and the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah”. In Exodus 32:32 Moses as intercessor
of the people, goes as far as contemplating his own death to intercede for them.

Whilst the role of intercession is secondary to the prophet, it is still part of the
prophetic call. We also have to admit that intercession did eventually gain an essential
role in prophecy at a later period. Abraham is called a prophet in virtue of his
intercession and we have to keep in mind that the term “prophet” in the Pentateuch is
probably of late Deuteronomistic origins. The use of the term בִיא in the Pentateuch
appears to originate from a late deuteronomistic redaction most probably from the
Persian period. This is also evident in the parallels there are between Moses, Samuel
and Jeremiah, and especially in the way Jeremiah understands intercession to be one
of his responsibilities as a prophet, in view of his predecessors Moses and Samuel (Jer
15:1). The call narratives of Moses and Jeremiah appear to have been composed, or
at least edited, by the deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch, with clear efforts

56 O’KENNEDY, “Were the Prophets Really Intercessors?”, 333.
57 Ibid.
58 RHODES, “Israel’s Prophets”, 110.
59 VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 466.
60 FRANCOLINO GONÇALVES, “Les “prophêtes écrivains” ?” in The World of the
Aramaeans I, Dion Paul-Eugène (ed.), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, 180; STÖKL,
Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 178.
62 WILLIAM L. HOLLADAY, “The Background of Jeremiah’s Self-Understanding. Moses, Samuel, and
Psalm 22”, in A Prophet to the Nations, Leo G. Perdue (ed.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 1984, 313-
324.
to draw marked parallels between the two. Francolino Gonçalves concludes that the multiple classes of agents of revelation were placed under one overarching semantic field of נָבִי, a unity that was the conception of the Deuteronomistic School as expressed in Deuteronomy 18:9-22. In the Pentateuch, Moses emerges as an excellent mediator and intercessor. If intercession and mediation are what constitute prophecy, then, Moses, is indeed a prophet along these lines. But prophecy, as we have seen, is a much more complex reality than that. Apparently, the later overemphasis on intercession was the result of deuteronomistic tradition that sought to make Moses the archetype of prophecy.

3.1.4 Prophecy and Cult

Biblical scholarship has contended that priests and prophets were fundamentally opposed to each other. J.A. Brewer had concluded: “Religion was a matter of the cult. The earlier prophets had violently protested against such a conception of religion, and rejected the entire cultic apparatus as contrary to the will of God”. The prophets were seen as responsible for the de-ritualisation of Israelite religion. Albright contends that Samuel’s position towards ritual appears to be identical with that of Hosea, Isaiah, Micah and Jeremiah, as attested in 1 Samuel 15:22; all of them stress obedience rather than ritual. At the other extreme are scholars like

---

64 GONÇALVES, “Les “prophètes écrivains”, 180. Indeed Gonçalves believes that the writing prophets, originally, were not prophets, but rather men who criticised the official institution of prophecy. Micah 3:5-8, for example, presents the rift between someone who is not a prophet and the rest who are prophets. Jeremiah is only called a prophet four times in the LXX. Jeremiah is called a prophet in Jeremiah 1:5, but Gonçalves contends that this verse could not be prior to the Persian period. It is interesting to note that Josiah never consulted Jeremiah for his reform, and that Jeremiah does not appear to be a prophet in his contention with Hananiah. According to Gonçalves, the writing prophets ironically started being called “prophets” – the very institution they criticised – in the Persian period by the Deuteronomistic School.
67 Ibid.
Sigmund Mowinckel who proposed that all of the prophets in Israel were tied to the cult. Johnson too saw that they played an equal role with the priests where cult is concerned. Whilst it is true that some of the prophets were actually tied with the cult, for example Samuel, Elijah, Elisha and Jeremiah, it is also true that the biblical text is not clear as to whether all of the prophets were actually linked to the cult as Mowinckel contends. Gowan states that whilst it is undeniable that there was an institution of cult prophecy in ancient Israel, it is also very true that the prophets had a negative view of the cult. This was because the cult in Israel was completely syncretistic, something corroborated by both prophetic preaching as well as by archaeology. According to Gowan, the prophets were well acquainted with this cult, as indeed it was the only cult that existed, itself being the medium through which they themselves worshipped YHWH. Indeed, the prophets had never witnessed the cult as it is prescribed in the laws of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, for such laws post-dated the prophets. It is because of syncretism that the prophets repudiated this cult. From their experience they discovered that this blend of religions was completely inadequate in leading to the true knowledge of YHWH. Indeed, during the monarchy, one could not speak of a distinction between Canaanite and Yahwistic cult and this led to the strict criticism of the prophets, especially exhorting for the “knowledge of God” of Hosea 6:6. Both positions are still much debated. It appears that the prophetic criticism of cult introduced the principle that “the essence of God’s demand, is not to be found in cult, but in the moral spheres of ethical life”. Whilst this is true, it has to be noted that even the latter prophets were involved in cultic worship. Suffice it to say that Isaiah received his call while he was in the Temple, and the prophets Haggai and Zechariah advocated the rebuilding of the Temple and the restoration of the cult. With this brief presentation I conclude that whilst some of the prophets were directly linked with cult, they at times did criticise it. These prophets did not call for the abolishment

73 Ibid, 96.
74 Gowan cites as an example the way Jeroboam celebrated the Exodus with the two golden calves. Ibid, 99.
75 **PAUL**, *Prophets and Prophecy*, 394.
of cult, but rather advocated a cult that should corroborate a good ethical and moral conduct. As Mary Callaway concludes:

The prophets were not against religious institutions, nor did they see sacrifices and liturgies as empty formalities. Their invective was directed against those who believed that their prayers and sacrifices would cover for their crimes in the marketplace and that YHWH would protect them and their land unconditionally.\(^76\)

Jeremiah was from a priestly family, and whilst he condemns the Temple in Jeremiah 7, he does state that if there is repentance the Temple would be spared. Criticism of the cult lies rather in social injustice. Social injustice was particularly offensive to God because it contradicted the cultic worship the people offered. The people worshiped God through the cult yet “it was not the expression of the devotion of their hearts, but rather the proud expression of the defiance of their spirit”.\(^77\) The problem for the people was that cult was considered as the end in itself. Jeremiah, in fact, criticises both priests and prophets throughout his preaching.\(^78\) Both priests and prophets were important religious leaders and both sought to work for the enhancement of religious life. Priests focused on the cult, prophets focused on social justice. And whilst human competition could have set in at times, both aspects complemented each other in the sphere of religious life. I conclude this section making mine, Herbert Hahn’s words:

> With this altered perspective on the prophetic function, it was possible to see the priest and the prophet, each in his own sphere, working for the furtherance of religion without being continually at cross-purposes. The priest had the help of the cult-prophet in teaching the significance of ritual actions; the canonical prophet added yet more by infusing religious worship with an ethical conduct.\(^79\)

---

76 CALLAWAY, “Prophetic Critique in the Hebrew Bible”, 31. Belief in the view that Jerusalem was unconquerable became almost idolatrous. Israel’s own faith was denatured and based on religious traditions and institutions rather than faith in the living God. See Ibid, 32.


3.1.5 The Supposed “End” of Prophecy

There are hints in the first book of Maccabees that in the inter-testamental period, prophecy had ceased. Zechariah 13:2-6 seems to hint that whilst prophecy did not come to an end, its acceptance in normative circles did cease. Scholars are therefore divided as to whether prophecy had really ceased historically. Johnstone argues that prophecy entered into its decline owing to the high standards set by the Deuteronomists as regards prophecy. Lester Grabbe argues extensively that prophecy did not cease. He also argues that the view of prophecy ending and being replaced by apocalypticism is a tacit assumption. Hans Barstad does not accept the view that prophecy ever ended, not even after the destruction of the Second Temple, as the Targums attest. He argues that prophecy as a method survived through a particular evolution where prophetic speech changed from being visionary to becoming ever more interpretative, as is typical of the Qumran Pesharim. Whilst many scholars claim that prophecy did not cease, the biblical texts attest that classical prophecy as we know it at least did change drastically. This is evidenced in Jeremiah 36, where the prophet is being replaced by the scribe. It is interesting to note that whilst it was common practice for the consulted prophet to seek direct divine counsel, in 2 Kings 22-23 and Jeremiah 36 hint

80 1 Macc 4:46: “So they tore down the altar, and stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them”; 1 Macc 9:27 “Thus there was great distress in Israel, such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them”; 1 Macc 14:41 “And the Jews and their priests decided that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise”.
81 The deuteronomistic criterion for true prophecy became “conformity” with the role of Moses, the archetypal prophet. The criteria set by the deuteronomists were an unattainable standard and this meant, Johnstone argues, that prophecy became relativized in relation to the Torah. See JOHNSTONE, “The Portrayal of Moses”, 163.
85 Ibid, 105. See also JOHN BARTON, Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile, London: Longman & Todd, 1986, 106-112. He argues that the post-biblical era produced a different kind of prophecy than that of the period which produced the inspired sacred scriptures.
that during the Persian period there was an “end” of prophecy as it is classically understood, and this gave way to the rise of “the book”. As Benjamin Sommer concludes: “One may legitimately speak of a decline in prophecy or a transformation from prophecy to exegesis during the Second Temple period”. In this shift we find the birth of the understanding of prophecy and the prophets in Qumran. Even here, scholars are divided. Some argue that the Qumran Community perceived itself to be a continuation of what the prophets did, especially in its interpretation of the Torah and the Prophets. George Brooke is not so sure that the Qumran Community actually believed prophecy to be part of their activity. Gershon Brin argues that it appears obvious that in the Community, there was an expectation of the reappearance of prophecy after its disappearance during the Second Temple period. Burrows argues that prophecy had ceased in the inter-testamental period, so the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, was seen to have been put on hold. It is this that led to the formation of the coming of the eschatological prophet in 1QS 9:10-11. Burrows contends that the Community did not consider itself to be prophetic and so it reverted to apocalypticism. In any case, Qumran constitutes an interesting development in the understanding of prophecy, particularly as concerns the prophets of the past, and the future eschatological prophet, fulfilling the role of the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, as seems to be implied by 1QS 9:11: “until there shall come a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.”

86 THOMAS RÖMER, “The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah as a Supplement to the So-called Deuteronomistic History”, in The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud, Diana V. Edelman – Ehud Ben Zvi (eds.), London – Oakville: Equinox, 2009, 177-178; See also the Talmud B.Bat 12a “since the day when the temple was destroyed, prophecy has been taken from the prophets and given to the wise”.
91 Ibid, 224.
92 Ibid, 226.
3.2 The Prophets in Deuteronomy

The first reference to the prophets in Deuteronomy is in chapter 13:1-5. Here, however, the central issue is idolatry and not prophecy. Deuteronomy 13:1-5 speaks of the prophet, who by the deuteronomistic standards of Deuteronomy 18:22, emerges to be a true prophet. It speaks in fact of a prophet who manages to predict signs and wonders which come to pass. Indeed the fulfilment of the prophetic word is the criterion that is the test of the true prophet in Deuteronomy 18:20-22. If, however, such a “true” prophet entices anyone to serve other gods, or to apostasy in general, that prophet is to be put to death. This is also the case of the following verses 6-11 which speak of the family member enticing to idolatry/apostasy. It therefore makes no difference as to whether the prophecy of the prophet comes to pass or not, for if the prophet counsels idolatry, the law stipulates: “you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or to that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God is testing you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul” (Deut 13:3). The main theme in Deuteronomy 13 therefore centres on verse 4 which orders: “you shall walk after YHWH your God and fear him, and keep his commandments and obey his voice, and you shall serve him and cleave to him” (Deut 13:4). Thus the laws and commandments are here being awarded superiority to the prophets.93 This is a very important criterion, for if there emerges any disagreement between the Law and prophecy, the former is to be awarded superiority. The Torah is in fact the revealed will of YHWH, and the prophet can only mediate it, far from going against it! Prophecy is here being demoted “to the status of a sort of second-rate revelation, subordinate to the “Law of Moses”.94 For Barstad, this is a clear indication that the authors of Deuteronomy were suspicious of prophecy.95 In Deuteronomy 13, it is established that the prophet cannot entice the people to apostasy; this is reaffirmed in Deuteronomy 18 where it is established that the prophet cannot speak in the name of other gods, and not even speak of himself.96 Both offences carry the penalty of death. The prophet here is being understood solely in terms of being the mediator of the will

94 Ibid.
95 Ibid.
of God, like Moses, who is this mediator par excellence. There is agreement among scholars that Deuteronomy 18:15-19 serves as a document which legitimises prophecy tracing its origins back to Moses. Thus Moses is presented as the first among a series of prophets, all qualified as “prophets like Moses”. In any case, Deuteronomy presents the picture that the Torah is the supreme will of YHWH as revealed to Moses, the first, and indeed unequalled, amongst the prophets. The prophets, like Moses, are to function as mediators of this law and therefore cannot go against the dictates of the Torah; they can only explain it, expound it, and apply it.

3.3 Prophecy and the “Prophet like Moses” in Qumran

The texts found in Qumran present the prophets as mediators of divine law, a role similar to that which was traditionally assigned to Moses. Texts from Qumran depict Moses as a mediator between God and the people. Moses is the most referred-to figure in all the sectarian texts. It is important to note that these texts are not interested in offering any biographical data as regards Moses, but rather focus on him as the lawgiver, as the one who had spoken as an instrument of God. Indeed, the main focus on Moses surrounds the Sinai episode where he appears as God’s intermediary for the people. Moses was for the Community as one who has a pivotal focus as mediator of the Law and channel of the covenant. As such the sectarian texts have a particular interest in his prophetic status, mostly with its eschatological implications as to how the sectarians envisaged that God would ultimately provide leaders from the community in the end times. Indeed, according to Jewish theology,
the prophets do not introduce any new legislation independent of Mosaic Law, but are rather entrusted with facilitating the people in living the Torah by applying it to their concrete life situation. In this light, the scrolls present the prophets as receiving divine revelation for the proper understanding of the Torah of Moses. This revelation appears as progressive, starting with the revelation at Sinai, as it constituted the first step of this long process of revelation. Revelation at Sinai had to be supplemented with inspired interpretation to address future jurisprudential needs. This was the task of the prophets, who under the guidance of God’s revelation, would interpret the Torah and help the people to live it in their concrete Sitz im Leben. Moses received the one-time revelation of the Torah on Sinai and then the interpretation and application of such law to the various Sitze im Leben was disclosed to successive generations through a series of prophets. Moses himself is presented in the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy, as the prophetic lawgiver par excellence. The law was revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai, but in the Pentateuch he continually turns to divine revelation in order to legislate on unclear legal situations. The classical prophets functioned as such mediators of the law when reconfiguring or applying it. Whilst adding nothing to it, they help the people in interpreting and applying it, in concrete ever-evolving life situations. Deuteronomy 13 places the prophets as subordinate to the Torah, and fundamentally, this makes them legists and not legislators. The Qumran Community thus believed in progressive revelation of the prophets, and also saw itself as such a

105 JASSENN, “Ancient Prophets as Lawgivers”, 322; Mroczek argues that David and Moses serve as ‘scribal types’ who were models for scribes following them to continue in the long chain of transmission through their own inspired work of collecting, reworking and re-interpreting the text. Such was the work of the scribes at Qumran. See EVA MROCZEK, “Moses, David and Scribal Revelation: Preservation and Renewal in Second Temple Jewish Textual Traditions”, in The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity, George J. Brooke – Hindy Najman – Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008, 94.

106 This is what the Community at Qumran in the desert sought to do, as evidenced in 1QS 8:14-17, the Peshar on Isaiah 40:3: As it is written: In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God; this is the study of the Torah, which he commanded through the hand of Moses, to do according to everything which has been revealed from time to time, and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit”. See DEVORAH DIMANT, “Time, Torah, and Prophecy at Qumran”, in Religion und Philosophie und philosophische Religion der frühen Kaiserzeit: historisch-philosophische Perspektiven, Rainer Hirsch-Luipold – Herwig Görgemans – Michael von Albrecht (eds.), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 158, who argues that this text shows that the Torah has to be further interpreted through divine inspiration for its proper execution. The Pesharim constitute an activity taking place in the sequence of time in an ongoing process of inspired/revealed exegetical activity (כפל הנגלה_unit), until the arrival of the eschatological prophet of 1QS 9:10-11.

107 JASSENN, “Ancient Prophets as Lawgivers”, 312.
beneficiary of divine revelation. In the manuscripts, deposited in the eleven caves, it appears that the members of the community considered themselves as heirs of the earlier prophetic traditions. The Law is applied throughout the ages by the prophets thanks to divine revelation, coupled with their human intellectual work through exegesis. Through its own exegetical work, the Community appears to claim to have access to such progressive revelation. This is what the community does in the Pesharim, namely, offering an interpretation and application of the message of the prophets. “The Community viewed itself as the heir to the ancient prophetic lawgivers and saw its own legislative programme as the most recent stage in the prophetic revelation of divine law”. Pesher Habbakuk, in 1 QpHab 2:5-10 and 1 QpHab 7:1-5, mentions how the language of the prophets was at times cryptic and encoded and so their meaning had to be decoded. This meaning was decoded through revelation to the Teacher of Righteousness, who emerges to be the one to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets, including matters which the other prophets themselves did not understand. In the Damascus Document (CD 7: 14-21), the “interpreter of the Law” appears to be an inspired exegete and is understood as the second Moses. In 1 QpHab 11:5-11, the Teacher of Righteousness appears as the one offering the proper understanding of God’s  

113 1QpHab 7:4-5: פשח על מוהט הצדק אשורי ואמר אמינו כי ידך אברך תאני הצדק.  
114 DIMANT, “Time, Torah and Prophecy”, 150.  
servants, the prophets. Much like in the Targums, the prophet is understood as the person with the correct prophetic understanding of the Torah.\(^{116}\)

It is interesting to note that in 1 QS 9:10-11, the Community is presented as living the Community Rule in terms of the will of God, and also in terms of a continuation of biblical prophecy until the end, when the definite eschatological prophet would arrive and ultimately reveal the definite will of God.\(^{117}\) Prophecy, in fact, appears to be present in the life of the community as can be seen in 4 Q375 1 i 4-6. This text reworks the prophetical laws of Deuteronomy 13 and 18 which stipulate that if there is a false prophet, such prophet should be put to death. The text is particularly interesting, for it allows the tribe of the prophet to stand up and defend him\(^{118}\). If the tribe of the prophet stands up for him, then that prophet is to pass judgement through a ritual performed by the priest to establish the prophet’s trustworthiness. Apparently this ritual is similar to that of the Day of Atonement\(^{119}\) because the text hints that it is formulated in the terminology of that ritual in Leviticus 16.\(^{120}\) Unfortunately, column II is heavily damaged and therefore it is impossible to determine the true nature of that ritual. This text is important because it deals with a hypothetical situation, and therefore, it is a clear indication that prophecy was still considered alive in Qumran. Moreover, this is a perfect example of how biblical legal material was concretely being re-evaluated, re-interpreted, supplied and applied in a new *Sitz im Leben*.\(^{121}\) It was the role of the prophets of the future to decipher that

\(^{116}\) BARSTAD, “Prophecy at Qumran”, 119. 1QS 9:10-11 states: “They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in all the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.” Translation taken from GÉZA VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, New York: Penguin Press, 1997, 110.

\(^{117}\) BARSTAD, “Prophecy at Qumran”, 120.

\(^{118}\) והנביא אשר יקום ודבר בכה סרה להשיבכה מאחר אלוהיכו יומת וכיא יקום השבט אשר הווה מוה ומימר לא יומת כי תשדק יאה אסף את שבת ההוה להבשמה וששפתו לא המוקד אשך ידיע ההוה אלוהיכו והיה באתיה עם השבט ההוה וזקניכו ושפטיכו אל מקוםו אשר יבשær והנביא המושיח אשר יוצק על רואשו שמן המשיח. Translation by VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 577.


\(^{120}\) VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 577.

message, and ultimately, the eschatological prophet would be the one to replace the
old ones and bring the definite and final revelation of the will of God.\textsuperscript{122}

In short we conclude that in the Dead Sea scrolls, the prophets were considered
as the mediators of the Torah, and the community authorised its own interpretation of
the Torah and the development of post-biblical law, through its appeal to the
progressive revelation of the law. The prophets are intermediaries between the human
and divine worlds. The Qumran community saw in Moses both a lawgiver and a
prophet, and actually considered the very act of lawgiving as stemming from his
prophetic status as God’s intermediary. This was indeed the belief in Moses during the
Second Temple period.\textsuperscript{123} The Teacher of Righteousness seems to have been
understood in the lines of the “prophet like Moses”. The “prophet like Moses” of
Deuteronomy 18 was thus understood in eschatological terms, and whilst some
scholars identify him as Elijah \textit{redivivus},\textsuperscript{124} many others conclude that this prophet
would arise from the Community.\textsuperscript{125} It is interesting to note that the Qumran texts,
particularly 1QS 9:9-11 and CD 12:23-13:1, herald the coming of three end-time
redeeming-figures: a prophet, a priest and a king.\textsuperscript{126} These eschatological figures seem
to converge into the person of the prophet who is to come, who would be the “prophet
like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:18-20, the priest like Elijah of Malachi 3:23-24\textsuperscript{127} and
the Anointed one of the Lord of Isaiah 61:1-3.\textsuperscript{128} Moses and Elijah have long been
paired together as figures of special importance by tradition and by the canonical
redactors.\textsuperscript{129} “As the tradition about their pairing continued, Moses became the
paradigm for the eschatological prophet, and Elijah became the paradigm for the
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eschatologique, ont été analysés avec justesse comme faisant allusion à un prophète du futur, sans doute
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eschatological priest”.\footnote{Poirier, “The Endtime Return”, 233.} Whatever the case may be, Qumran stands to witness to a very important development in the tradition circling the “prophet like Moses”. Whilst initially, Deuteronomy 18:15-20 might have been seen to refer to a series or order of prophets, during the Second Temple Period this was developed into a promise of the coming of a future eschatological prophet.\footnote{Deuteronomy 18:18-19 became the proof text for the expectation of the eschatological prophet. See Ferdinand Dexinger, “Der “Prophet wie Mose” in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern”, in Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Mathias Delcor, André Caquot (ed.), Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1985, 97-111.} This is also the case of the Samaritan Pentateuch which interprets the figure of the “prophet like Moses” in Deuteronomy 18:18 as the figure of the eschatological Taheb.\footnote{Dexinger, “Der “Prophet wie Mose” in Qumran”, 97.} This is the typical development in the tradition of the post-exilic community. 1 Macc 4:44-46 and 1 Macc 14:41 attest to the hope of a coming prophet that did not arise out of the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18 but rather from a practical need. This need eventually led to the expectation of the eschatological prophet that soon found its biblical basis in Deuteronomy 18:18, which was no longer understood as distributive, namely, in referring to a line of prophets, but rather singularly, in terms of the promised eschatological prophet.\footnote{Ibid, 99.}

3.4 The Relationship between Prophecy and the so-called Deuteronomistic History

One major issue that has intrigued scholars is the fact that the so-called Deuteronomistic History does not mention the “classical prophets”, except for Isaiah. This is particularly strange for this history deals specifically with the time frame in which these prophets lived and carried out their prophetic activities. Barstad argues that this could not be the result of a hostility towards prophecy or the prophets, for this history does contain positive references to prophets such as Nathan, Elijah, and Elisha.\footnote{Barstad, “The Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 237.} He concludes: “in the time of the Deuteronomists there is no longer need for prophets because God has revealed his final will in Deuteronomy. Prophecy has been replaced by the Law”.\footnote{Hans Barstad, “Some Remarks on Prophets and Prophecy in the Deuteronomistic History”, in Houses Full of all Good Things, Juha Pakkala (ed.), Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008, 315.} Scholars tended to solve the problem by proposing a late
post-exilic formation for the prophetic books, at a time when the Deuteronomistic History had already been written. Freedman suggests that the Latter Prophets, as a collection, is to be dated towards the end of the 6th century B.C.E., collected and organised to form a supplement to the Primary History. Freedman contends that the existence of the prophetic corpus made it unnecessary for the authors of the Primary History to mention them in the way the earlier prophets are mentioned so extensively in the history. Blenkinsopp concluded that the Deuteronomistic Historian overemphasised the prophetically predetermined view of history. In fact, the deuteronomists make no mention of the Latter Prophets in their history because they apparently considered this collection as a supplement to their history. The deuteronomistic redaction in the book of Jeremiah, in fact, hints that in the series of successions of the prophets, Jeremiah was considered to be the last of “his servants, the prophets”. We have seen that the major role of the prophet was that of mediating between God and the people, preaching the observance of the Law, and on the consequent disaster of not obeying it. Within this framework, prophecy is proved authentic if its predictions are fulfilled in line with Deuteronomy 18:21-22. Blenkinsopp suggests that “the criterion of fulfilment or non-fulfilment (Deut 18:21-22) which dominates the History, could not account for the appeal of these other prophets to a certain self-authenticating quality which they possess.” Scholars observe that this criterion of fulfilment is hardly satisfactory, and is rather useless, especially when prophetic predictions in the future take years to fulfil. What if the prophecy is fulfilled years after the death of the prophet? Deuteronomy 18:21-22 therefore, appears to be a legitimisation of Jeremiah’s prophetic efforts. His prediction of the Exile did take place, and in his contention with Hananiah (Jer 28), the latter was proved to be the false prophet. Most probably, it is in this line of the prophetic strife
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There has also been a shift in the understanding of the way the biblical books were written. Whilst previously there was focus on the biblical author as a historian, as studies advanced it became more evident that the authors were interpreters and creators of tradition. During the writing of the books, there was also a process which came to be known as “inner-biblical exegesis”.\footnote{Barstad, “The Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 239.} Deuteronomy 13:2-4 places the law above the prophets, it being a litmus test for prophecy. Prophets in fact are discussed in Deuteronomy only in the negative sense in terms of the law, implying that it is a sort of second-rate revelation subordinate to the “Law of Moses”. In view of this, Deuteronomy 18:15-19 appears as propaganda, aimed at increasing the authority of prophecy by tracing its origins in Israel back to Moses. The prophets, arising periodically in succession, are therefore, in line with the Mosaic tradition, and it is only such “prophets like Moses” that the people should give heed to.\footnote{Carl Steuernagel, \textit{Übersetzung und Erklärung der Bücher Deuteronomium und Joshua und allgemeine Einleitung in den Hexateuch}, (=HAT; 1), Göttingen, 1900, 70; P. Buis – J. Leclercq – P.C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, Grand Rapids: Nicot, 1976, 262.}

Indeed the deuteronomistic law of the prophets in Deuteronomy 18:9-22 seeks to formulate a doctrine about the relationship between the Law, the authority of Moses, and that of the prophets, without opposing them. Like Moses, the prophet conveys the word of YHWH to the people. The authority of Moses will remain unequalled, for he is the direct receiver of the Law from YHWH, receiving it, “face to face”, indeed, “mouth to mouth”. This mediation is continued by the prophets, whom YHWH will appoint to reveal to them the application of the Torah in the concrete requirements of the various Sitze im Leben. There is therefore no contradiction between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Deuteronomy 34:10-12, as we shall see more closely in the next chapter.
3.5 Moses the Prophet

As Stackert notes, Moses does not act in a stereotypically prophetic way, and is clearly something more than a prophet.\footnote{JEFFREY STACKERT, A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 37.} In fact Moses is never explicitly called a prophet in the Pentateuch, and is only referred to as a prophet in just a few texts, namely, Numbers 12:6; Deuteronomy 18:15, 18; and Deuteronomy 34:10. Even in these texts, Moses is not explicitly called a prophet, but the reader has to infer it.\footnote{According to Sackert, who adheres to the Neo-Documentary Hypothesis, E, J, and P each portray Moses’ vocation as a typical prophetic vocation. Ibid, 55.} In Numbers 12, Moses’ authority is questioned by Miriam and Aaron quite awkwardly in terms of his Cushite marriage. In reality, on a close analysis of the text, it emerges that the whole issue was rather his prophetic status and authority. The text of Numbers 12, as it stands, presents Moses unequivocally as the ideal and supreme prophet par excellence.\footnote{ELAINE A. PHILLIPS, “The Singular Prophet and Ideals of Torah: Miriam, Aaron, and Moses in Early Rabbinic Texts”, in The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition, Craig A. Evans (ed.), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 78.} Indeed, Miriam is assigned a prophetic role in Exodus 15:20.\footnote{SUSAN ACKERMAN, “Why is Miriam also among the Prophets? (And is Zipporah among the Priests?)”, JBL 121 (2002) 71. Indeed, the great songs of victory are typically ascribed to women, such as is the case of the prophetess Deborah in Judges 5. Ackerman contends that women were only given a prophetic role in historically troubled times, such as is the case of Huldah, in the time of Josiah, and Noadiah, in the time of Nehemiah. Miriam too was a prophetess in troubled times, since Israel was in its liminal stage between Egypt and the Promised Land. See ibid, 71-72. Whilst Ackerman has a point, we have to keep in mind that the title נביא was used in the Pentateuch only at a much later time.} Moses appears as the unequaled prophet especially in Deuteronomy 34:6, where he receives the unparalleled honour of being buried by YHWH himself. The author of Deuteronomy 34 informs the reader that Moses was a unique prophet, both in the intimacy of his relationship with YHWH, as well as in the scope and power of the miracles he performed.\footnote{PAUL KISSLING, Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha, (=JSOTS; 224), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 32.} Indeed, Moses’ death is sealed \( עַל־פִי יְהוָה \) (Deut 34:5). This extreme obedience is the strongest accomplishment of prophetic existence.\footnote{JEAN-PIERRE SONNET, “La construction narrative de la figure de Moïse comme prophète dans le Deutéronome”, RTP 142 (2010) 13. Apparently it is this obedience that reverses his disobedience of Numbers 20. Ibid, 14.} The Epitaph “prophet” in Numbers 34:10 is used to address the uniqueness of the relationship of YHWH to Moses, stating the incomparability of that transmission,
which is the revelation of the Torah. Indeed the “face to face” tradition in Exodus 33:11; Numbers 12:6-8, and Deuteronomy 34:10-12, appears to lay stress on the canonization of the Law in relation to prophecy.

In Deuteronomy 5:23-28 we read how Moses was established as the sole mediator between YHWH and the people. In this pericope, Moses refers back to the episode at Sinai/Horeb, and in v27 quotes the words of the people who asked him that he be their mediator between them and YHWH. In v28 YHWH ratifies this request establishing Moses as the sole mediator between Him and the people. It is interesting to note that this episode is transformed in Deuteronomy 18. The same sequence of events is repeated, but this time Moses is no longer the sole mediator. Deuteronomy 18:16-17 establishes the people’s request at Sinai/Horeb, which we read about in Exodus 20:18-21 and Deuteronomy 5:23-28, as the aetiology for the birth of prophecy. In Deuteronomy 18:15-22 Moses presents himself as the first in a line of prophets, in view of mediation. In fact, his authority lies in the delegation of the people, when they asked him to intercede for them (also in line with Exodus 20:18-20 and Deuteronomy 5:23-27), but even more so, his authority lies in the fact that he was appointed such a mediator by YHWH. Whoever penned Deuteronomy 18:9-22, as Heinrich Gross notes, intended to present the theological foundation for the establishment of the prophetic ministry. The author considered such ministry as the institutionalised function of mediation. Moses is no longer the sole mediator, but rather is transformed into a model prophet, the unequalled first in a sequence of prophets. The author does not specify whether there will only be one or many prophets like Moses. This was the theology of the Deuteronomists, who late in the Exile dictated the role of the prophet in Deuteronomy 18:15-19, redefining prophecy as a way of continuing the work of Moses through history. This is very well summarised by the deuteronomistic historian in 2 Kings 17:13. It is apparent that the “prophet like Moses”
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is a deuteronomistic construction to refer to the series of prophets coming after Moses, whom the Deuteronomistic Historian calls: עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים. However, Rendtorff argues that it is not just the Deuteronomistic tradition that calls Moses a prophet. He retains that prophecy was an intrinsic element of the Moses tradition from its earliest beginnings.157 According to him, tradition started incorporating basic elements of the main figures of the Israelite traditions in the figure of Moses right from the very start.158 I disagree, because as we shall see in chapter 5, on a close analysis of the biblical call of Moses, there emerges a typical harmonisation with the other prophetic calls which, in my opinion, betrays the Deuteronomists’ attempts at portraying Moses as the model prophet.159 The deuteronomistic prophetic role of Moses is manifested in three particular aspects, namely: 1) Moses as mediator (Deut 5:22-31), 2) Moses as intercessor for the people in the episode of the golden calf (Deut 9:18-20,25-29), 3) Moses as the vicarious sufferer denied access to the Promised Land because of the sin of the people (Deut 1:37; 3:23-28; 4:21-22).160 Edelman sees the designation “prophet” applied to Moses as a secondary one, resulting from the deuteronomistic effort to eliminate illegitimate cultic practices in the Persian Period as condemned in Deuteronomy 18:9-14.161 In my opinion, this makes sense when we compare the list of magicians with that of chapter 2 of the book of Daniel.
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159 It is interesting to note that the earliest reference to Moses as prophet appears outside the Pentateuch in Hosea 12:14. There it is evident that Moses is not considered as a prototype/model prophet, for he is neither named so, nor does the substantive נָבִיא carry the article. It is just “by a prophet”, that YHWH brought Israel out of Egypt.
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3.5.1 The Call of Moses and the Call of the Prophets

The call and commission narratives of the prophets are placed at the beginning of the traditions and the works of the prophet, and serve as a vindication and legitimisation of the prophet and his office.\textsuperscript{162} Such narratives and their particular literary genre appear to be deuteronomistic in nature.\textsuperscript{163} Childs offers his own reflection on the history of traditions, underlining in particular the connection that there is between classical prophecy and the re-reading of the mosaic tradition. He concludes that this connection is underlined in the vocation narratives, considering that Moses’ vocation is penned in the style of the prophetic call.\textsuperscript{164} The majority of scholars in fact agree that Exodus 3-4 present Moses’ call in terms of the typical prophetic call. Schmidt argues that these passages are part of a redaction of the Enneateuch carried out in the spirit of prophecy and as such they post-date the earlier strata of the Mosaic tradition.\textsuperscript{165} Auld concludes that, as a concept, Moses the prophet, is reconstructed in the form of a post-exilic prophet of the prophetic canon. As such, therefore, the prophets predate but have no precedence over Moses as prophet.\textsuperscript{166} Mathews denies that the author of the Pentateuch attributed any prophetic traits to Moses. Contrary to the opinion of the majority, he concludes that Moses’ call is more paralleled to that of Gideon and Saul, rather than Jeremiah, who has a different nature and purpose for his commissioning.\textsuperscript{167} According to Mathews, “one role that challenges the standard portrayal of Moses as a prophet, priest, or covenant mediator, is that of military leader".\textsuperscript{168} I do not agree, for as we have seen in the previous chapter, the image of Moses is a multivalent one. If indeed literary Moses stands as the major paradigm for every office, then, this Moses will possess all the characteristic traits of such offices, without one necessarily excluding the other. Moses, the leader of the Exodus, must have also led the skirmishes and occasional battles that Israel met along
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the way. As Mathews notes, success as a military leader is a typical way of portraying kings in the ancient Near East, but this does not necessarily exclude the motif of prophecy. Indeed, the majority of scholars recognise that there is a strict relationship in the parallels that we observe in the call of Moses and that of Jeremiah. I shall study the matter in great detail in chapter 5. For now, it suffices to state that the Deuteronomistic tradition sought to create parallels between Moses and the prophets, particularly as regards their call narratives. Apparently, this tradition sought to underline the parallels between Moses and Jeremiah even more than the rest. On a close analysis of the texts it is clear that there is a reciprocal influence in the portrayal of Jeremiah and the prophetic image of Moses.

3.5.2 “Moses the Prophet” outside the Pentateuch

The earliest use of the substantive “prophet” (נביא) applied to Moses occurs in Hosea 12:14. Hosea was well aware that it was YHWH who brought Israel out of Egypt (especially Hos 11:1). In Hosea 12:14, Hosea places Moses as the subject and instrument of God’s action, without actually mentioning him by name. As Perlitt contends, Moses was made a prophet by a prophet of the eighth century, probably to legitimise his own position. Scholars disagree as to the dating of Hosea 12:14, some claiming that it is a late addition. In any case, as Miller states, whilst Hosea testifies to the early understanding of Moses as prophet, it is Deuteronomy that lifts this role to a much greater prominence, so much so that it becomes definitive for all subsequent
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history of prophecy.\textsuperscript{175} Obviously, as we have already seen, the parts of Deuteronomy treating the theme of prophecy are predominantly Deuteronomistic, and so it is the deuteronomistic tradition that elevates Moses as both model for any future prophet (Deut 18:15) as well as the greatest of all the prophets (Deut 34:10-12).

3.5.3 Moses the Reluctant Prophet

Moses’ lament in Exodus 5:22-23 constitutes Moses as the typical reluctant prophet. This is something already visible in the call narrative in Ex 3–4. However, here, Moses makes a direct reference to his commission and underlines the futility of his sending. Moses also goes as far as accusing YHWH of having deceived him and caused evil to the people, especially through the grave question: תָּהֵמָּה הֲרֵע. Van Seters concludes that Moses is here “made to resemble Jeremiah, who complains to God about all the trouble that he has experienced because of his speaking in the name of Yahweh (Jer 20:9).”\textsuperscript{176} Ferdinand Ahuis sees in Exodus 5:22-23 the pre-history to Jeremiah’s confessions.\textsuperscript{177} Van Seters on his part argues the other way round, namely, that Exodus 5:22-23 is actually dependent on Jeremiah’s confessions. In my opinion this is the hand of the exilic deuteronomist, working to portray Moses and Jeremiah on the same lines. This is a theme we shall be studying in greater detail further on, when analysing the parallels between Moses and Jeremiah.

3.5.4 The Extra-Biblical View of Moses as Prophet

Philo calls Moses “the most holy prophet” (ὁ ἱερώτατος προφήτης),\textsuperscript{178} “the proto-prophet” (ὁ πρωτοπροφήτης),\textsuperscript{179} and arch-prophet (ὁ ἀρχιπροφήτης).\textsuperscript{180} He
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describes Moses’ prophecy in two ways: 1) ecstatic, being mediated through possession, where the medium is passive and a conductor and 2) hermeneutical, being the prophet’s response to the divine voice in his rational soul, where the prophet is active.\textsuperscript{181} Philo invokes the former form of prophecy only as regards the prophet’s ability to predict the future, because this ability is a divine pre-requisite. For Philo, Moses’ promulgation of the laws were the result of noetic prophecy, where such laws were communicated to him by a divine voice, and his mind grasped the fundamental principles underlying them. Philo uses Moses’ noetic prophecy to underline that the Torah is not an invention of the human mind, but rather is of divine origin and requires that man contemplate it in accordance with the Divine Logos.\textsuperscript{182} In so doing, he presents the Judaism of his time as being in strict congruence with Platonic Philosophy.

Josephus in \textit{Ant} 4:329 claims that as a general, Moses had few to equal him, and as a prophet he had no rivals (προφήτης δὲ οἷος οὐκ ἀλλος).\textsuperscript{183} Feldman notes that Josephus appears to place more emphasis on Moses as a general rather than on his prophecy, since he mentions it first and extensively. According to Feldman, Josephus apparently contrasts the view of the Bible especially as depicted in Deuteronomy 34:7-12.\textsuperscript{184} It is a fact that Josephus focuses more on Moses’ military exploits. Probably he was seeking to legitimise his own position. However, he does consider Moses as “the prophet” with no equal. Like Philo, when Josephus speaks of Moses in terms of prophecy, he always uses the definite article indicating that, in terms of prophecy, Moses is unequalled.

The tradition of Moses as prophet appears to be well attested both in Philo of Alexandria as well as in Josephus. In these authors we do not observe any changes from the biblical tradition, other than that Philo seeks to explain Moses’ prophecy in Platonic and philosophical terms. Josephus, on his part, focuses more on the military role of Moses. He does however refer to Moses as a prophet with no equals, where in
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Ant 2:237 he refers to him in Hosea’s terms (Hos 12:14), using however, the definite article.

3.5.5 The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet

The term eschatological prophet refers to an expected coming of a singular prophet in the future, either as a forerunner to the Messiah or else, contemporary to him, as his assistant. We have already seen above that the Samaritan Pentateuch presents Deuteronomy 18:15-22, as a reference to the coming of a future prophet/Messiah called Taheb. The case for the Jewish understanding of such a future figure is however a much more complex one and this is not the place to discuss such issues at length. For that I refer to the excellent work of Howard Teeple. Here I offer only a brief overview of a very complex matter. What is of relevance to our study is the apparent transformation in the understanding of Deuteronomy 18:15ff. Originally the “prophet like Moses” was seen as referring to a line of prophets. However, as time went by, with the decline of classical prophecy, the need was felt for a particular figure. That reference therefore was seen to point at a future promise of just one particular individual. This prophet could play many roles. He might be a chief figure establishing a new era, he could be an assistant to the Messiah or his forerunner. During the Second Temple period, Judaism started evolving in ever increasing interpretative circles. Depending on the period and the particular tradition that the circle held, this figure was interpreted as either referring to Moses himself who would return as Moses redivivus, or else, to the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15. Elijah was seen to be a very good candidate, for according to the biblical tradition of 2 Kings 2:11, he did not die but ascended into heaven. This meant that he was still alive and thus could return. The added honour of ascension also meant that he was considered as superior to the rest of the prophets. This belief was obviously
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strengthened by the prophecy of Malachi 3:23-24 which presents the earliest belief in the return of Elijah as a forerunner to the day of YHWH. This belief was strengthened further in later Rabbinism, especially through the epic phrase “this must remain undecided until Elijah comes”. Despite the clear note of Deuteronomy 34:6 that Moses was buried by YHWH in the land of Moab, there arose in later Judaism the belief that Moses too ascended into heaven. Teeple states that both traditions must have existed side by side. This led to a further step in the idealisation of Moses, namely, the return of Moses as the eschatological prophet (Moses redivivus). Despite this tradition, Elijah seems to have been the best candidate. We can glean this from the Gospel according to Mark 8:28, where to Jesus’ question: “Who do the people say I am?” the disciples reply: “John the Baptist; and others say, Elijah; and others one of the prophets”. This is quite significant, for it attests that the people were expecting a prophet, and the only one being named from amongst them is Elijah. Moses is not mentioned at all. If there was an expectation of him returning, being such a prominent figure, he would have been mentioned.

All this expectation apparently developed in the post-exilic period, when the Israelites reflected on their past history, particularly on the event which stood above all the rest, namely, the Exodus, led by Moses. Tradition had long given Moses pride of place, and this gave rise to future Messianic ideas of a saviour of Israel. The beginnings of such an expectation can be gleaned from Second Isaiah, who speaks of the return from the Exile, in terms of the “New Exodus”. After the Exile, the priests regarded themselves as the only authorised interpreters of the Torah. At this point scribes took on a very important role, being scholars and jurists who adopted theological and social doctrines in line with past prophetic doctrine. It is a fact that Israel never recovered fully from the disaster of the Exile, suffice it to say that the Davidic monarchy was never reinstituted. There was thus a general longing for the good old days, and it is at this point that the expectation of a Davidic Messiah was

188 In Sir 48:10 the future coming of Elijah at the appointed time is seen in terms of the coming of the prophet-messiah who would restore the tribes of Jacob (καταστῆσαι φυλὰς Ιακωβ).  
190 This is also attested in Philo, De Sacrificiis Abeli et Caini, 1:8-10.  
191 TEEPLE, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, 42.  
192 Ibid 29.  
193 The covenanters at Qumran practised such an interpretation of the Torah and the Prophets and regarded themselves as heirs of this “continuing revelation”.
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conceived. This was coupled with a general longing for mosaic times, which in turn, also led to another belief that the eschatological “prophet like Moses” would come before or contemporaneously with this Messiah. The source for this belief must surely have been Deuteronomy 18:15ff. Scholars agree that this text referred to the permanent institution of YHWH’s prophetic line. Whilst during the Exile, the “prophet like Moses” was being interpreted as referring to a prophet from the past, the expectation of Second Temple Judaism led to the belief in the coming of a single prophet. Keeping in mind Mark 8:28, the best candidate for this prophet was Elijah, but as Teeple notes, “the idea of the eschatological prophet was not standardised and was very fluid.

3.6 Conclusion

Having given the general panorama of Israelite prophecy, as well as analysed the role of Moses as a prophet, we are in a better position to offer our conclusion and answer the question posed in the introduction: “Was Moses truly (historically) a prophet, or was it tradition, that made a prophet out of him?” The answer to this question depends very much on what one understands a prophet to be, and on the image we drew of the historical Moses in the previous chapter. If we apply strict criteria and apply the model of who the former and the classical prophets were, then we would easily conclude that Moses scarcely fits this role.

In this chapter we have seen that prophecy, as presented in the Bible, is a very complex phenomenon. We have also seen that as an institution it underwent various evolutions not only on the historical level, but on the literary level as well. What we can safely conclude is that the main characteristic feature of prophecy is the proclamation of the word of God that is received through revelation, in other words, the prophet is God’s mouthpiece. In being so, the prophet acts as mediator between

---

195 TEEPLE, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, 49.
196 Ibid, 121. In Qumran, the Teacher of Righteousness could very well be this Mosaic eschatological prophet of 1QS 9:11 “until there shall come a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.”
God and the people. As this mediator, the prophet is perceived by the people as being a man of God, and therefore, as such a man, the prophet could intercede for the people. It is in this light that Heschel portrayed the prophet as a man in the fray, a man full of pathos, caught up in between the two currents.197 On the one hand the prophet loves God and suffers for Him on account of the people’s infidelity, on the other, the prophet is one of the people, and therefore suffers with his people in the various punishments the people face. We have seen that mediation and intercession are not exclusive to prophecy, however our study has shown that they do constitute an important element of prophecy. The texts hint that there was an apparent development in tradition. Later on in tradition intercession became an essential role in prophecy as attested by the prophet Jeremiah. Probably it was the Deuteronomistic School which sought to make intercession an essential role in prophecy. As we have seen in chapter 2, van Seters concluded that the desert murmuring traditions were actually very late, and apparently the tradition behind them sought to present Moses as an intercessor on the lines of Jeremiah.198 Römer contends that the latest Deuteronomistic tradition sought to make Moses the intercessor par excellence, especially in Exodus 32.199 Most probably this is the same tradition that calls Abraham a prophet, solely in view of his intercession on behalf of Abimelech in Genesis 20:7.

One particular difficulty is that the biblical tradition calls certain prominent figures “prophets”. The problem is that historically these figures had apparently nothing to do with prophecy. Scholars seem to agree that prophecy, properly understood, seems to have had its beginning in Israel with Samuel, at least as an institution.200 If so, then why are Abraham, Moses, Miriam and Aaron, called prophets? The issue of Abraham has been explained. As for the rest, Stökl observes that the term נביא was applied to persons in the Pentateuch at a late stage, when the semantics of the word were widened, and included the notion of a person having a

197 HESCHEL, The Prophets, 30-31.
198 VAN SETERS, The Life of Moses, 466: “Moses is the prophet of salvation to his own people. Above all, Moses is intercessor, the one who suffers with them and for them, as in the case of Jeremiah and the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah”.
199 The prayers in Exodus 32:11-13; Numbers 14:13-19 and Deuteronomy 9:27-29, clearly presuppose the events of 597 and 587 B.C. and, moreover, also evoke the possibility of divine forgiveness, thus correcting the earlier strict deuteronomistic theology of divine retribution. See RÖMER, “Les guerres de Moïse”, 170.
special relationship with YHWH, not necessarily just being his messenger. Van der Toorn notes that the general biblical picture of prophecy is much more heterogeneous than what the classical prophets portray, because the role of prophecy includes the figure of the charismatic leader. Indeed since these charismatic leaders were extremely important for the religious, as well as the political spheres, these figures constituted the ancestry of prophecy. Perlitt comments: “Thus, early and late Israel had vested its greatest men with the prophet’s cloak, but it never fitted them fully” It was with Samuel that the religious and the political were to an extent divorced. Keeping in mind these views we can safely conclude with van der Toorn that Abraham, Moses, Miriam, and Aaron were called prophets “unhistorically”.

I therefore conclude that Moses, historically, was not a prophet in the classical sense of the word. As Smend contends: “One therefore should not call Moses a prophet, at least in the technical sense of the word, but only in a more general meaning”. He was, as we have concluded in chapter 2, the charismatic religious and political leader. As such, it has to be conceded that Moses constituted an important, if not essential, “ancestor” of prophecy, to use van der Toorn’s words. As this charismatic leader, he did mediate and did intercede for his people. Indeed, as the introducer of Yahwism to Israel, he did act as God’s mouthpiece par excellence, and it is in this sense that he is incomparable as Deuteronomy 34:10-12 claims.

In the post-exilic period we notice a very important development. If classical prophecy as we know it did not cease, it did change radically. There is already a hint of it changing with the rise of the importance of “the book”, particularly in Jeremiah 36 where the prophet is being replaced by Baruch, his scribe. The book of the Torah now moves to the forefront. This constitutes an important development. Second Temple prophets such as Haggai and Zechariah are still portrayed in the image of the classical prophets, however, as time went by it became evident, as shown in 1 Mac
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201 STÖKL, Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 178. As concerns the etymology of נָבִיא Gonçalves argues that the Deuteronomistic School widened the semantics of the term נָבִיא, where multiple classes of agents of revelation were placed under it. GONÇALVES, “Les prophètes écrivains”, 180.

202 VAN DER TOORN, “From Patriarchs to Prophets”, 192.

203 “So hat frühe und das späte Israel seine Größten in den Prophetenmantel gehüllt aber er vermochte sie nie ganz zu bedecken”. PERLITT, “Mose als Prophet”, 607.

204 VAN DER TOORN, “From Patriarchs to Prophets”, 197.

205 “Man dürfte danach den Mose mindestens nicht im technischen Sinne einen Propheten nennen, sondern nur in allgemeiner Bedeutung”. RUDOLF SMEND, Das Mosebild von Heinrich Ewald bis Martin Noth, (=BGBE, 3), Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959, 56.

4:46 and 1 Mac 9:27, that there was a practical need for a prophet to tell the people what to do. It is in this period that the scribes will come to the forefront and start interpreting the Torah. Interpretation of the Torah and the Prophets was considered as a continuation of prophecy in the Community of Qumran as well, where apparently, prophecy was now considered to be present in the production of the *Pesharim*, the product of inspired and revealed exegesis. Prophecy was thus intrinsically transformed, as is exemplified in the Rabbinic dictum of the Talmud B.Bat 12a “Since the day when the temple was destroyed, prophecy has been taken from the prophets and given to the wise”. The Torah was interpreted and applied by the classical prophets to the concrete situations of their *Sitz im Leben*. Once classical prophecy had ceased, this had to be continued by the scribes through revealed/inspired exegesis. It is at this point that we observe an important development in the interpretation of the “prophet like Moses” in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. What originally was interpreted as referring to a line of prophets, the “prophet like Moses” now started being seen as a singular eschatological prophet, better known as “the Mosaic eschatological prophet”.

In Chapter 2 I concluded that Moses, the charismatic politico-religious leader, introduced the people of the Exodus generation to Yahwism, thanks also to his links with Midian. As this leader he mediated the covenant at Sinai (Ex 18), and gave the people the first body of laws as a man vested with authority from God, as God’s mouthpiece. If we consider mediation as an inherent part of the prophetic role, then, we could consider Moses as a prophet. Indeed Moses was God’s mouthpiece when promulgating the laws and mediating the covenant. But maybe it would be pertinent to ask: “was Moses considered to be a prophet by his contemporaries?” I seriously doubt that. As such, the title prophet applied to the historical Moses appears to be an anachronism. Moses was indeed the first of Israel’s leaders. Tradition, then, picked up this important leader and made of him a paradigm of practically every Israelite religious and civil role. It was only later, when the meaning of the term prophet was widened to include leadership, that Moses was invested with the title prophet. As we have seen the biblical data have given us numerous aspects of the roles Moses took on during his career. Indeed, sifting through the traditions, it is possible to arrive at a glimpse of who the historical Moses was, and whilst such a study cannot give a biography of Moses, it can give a description, as we have seen in chapter 2, of Moses.

207 STÖKL, Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 178.
as a charismatic leader. Early Israelites were familiar with this type of leadership and regarded it as the ancestor of later prophecy.208 We can conclude therefore that whilst historically we cannot say that Moses was a prophet in the strict sense, we can say that his role did constitute what was later considered to be the ancestor of prophecy, and to an extent, later traditions took that to be prophecy itself.

In conclusion, “Moses the Prophet” is an epithet of the literary Moses, rather than the historical one. “The call narrative (of Moses) is not the beginning of the prophetic call tradition but the end of the process by which Moses becomes the greatest of all the prophets.”210 It was the deuteronomistic tradition then that brought about the literary creation of Moses as a prophet. Historically, Moses was not a prophet, but it was the authors/redactors of the exilic period who made of him a prophet “like the prophets”. That way Moses would become literally the “paradigm prophet” through the theme of the incomparable prophet. All subsequent prophets in Israel would then be compared to this exemplary “prophet”, who was the receiver of direct divine revelation.

Moses constitutes the supreme mediator between YHWH and Israel in that he received the direct revelation of the Torah from YHWH and presented it to the people. Moses in terms of revelation and teaching will remain unmatched in the Hebrew Bible. Keeping in mind Heschel’s “pathos” of the prophet, we see that Moses fits in very well. On the one hand, Moses is markedly distinguished from the people, especially in his degree of sanctity, epitomised in his immediate knowledge of YHWH, indeed, knowing Him face to face (Num 12:6; Deut 34:10). But Moses is also the representative of the people, with a huge sense of solidarity with the people as we read in Numbers 11:2, so much so that he even considers dying with them in Exodus 32:32. Even the categorical “no” from the part of YHWH as regards his entry into the Promised Land of Deuteronomy 3:23-26, is apparently intertwined with Moses’ sense of solidarity with the people in some way.211 The prophet interprets God’s requirements for the people and is also the one who, in solidarity with the people, leads

---

208 In this I fully agree with VAN DER TOORN “From Patriarchs to Prophets”, 202.
209 Ibid.
210 Ibid.
the people to God. This is precisely what Moses did. So whilst historically it is apparently awkward to call Moses a prophet, tradition reserves every right in calling him a prophet. Indeed, as the founder/introducer of Yahwism in Israel, he truly is “the prophet”.

\[212\] Ibid, 217.
Chapter 4 – Deut 18:9-22
4.0 Introduction

So far I have studied and arrived at conclusions on the “historical” and “literary” Moses and his roles in the Hebrew Bible, particularly and most importantly, as to how he was given the appellative “prophet”. Now I deem it necessary to give an exegetical study of the text of Deuteronomy 18:9-22. After studying the exegetical implications and what the author had in mind concerning the notion of the “prophet like Moses”, I will then be able to proceed with the next chapter, in identifying who this/these promised prophet/s is/are. Indeed, as Michael Fishbane notes, “inner biblical typologies constitute a literary-historical phenomenon which isolates perceived correlations between specific events, persons or places, clearly in tune with their later correspondents.”¹ Both the text itself and the way it is reread, creating a typology, exist within a “hermeneutical correspondence”. The aim of my work is precisely to identify that correspondence. Fishbane notes that Deuteronomy 18:18 evokes the promise of a prophet that has its origins in Moses, but which re-emerges in the commissioning accounts of Jeremiah (Jer 1:9), Isaiah (Isa 6:5-8) and Ezekiel (Ezek 2:8-3:3), thus creating what he calls “spiritual-historical continuities”.² The task of the previous chapter was to identify the background leading to the origins of this typology. The role of this chapter is to identify the meaning of this typology in Deuteronomy 18:18. The next chapter, will be to identify the implications of the spiritual-historical continuities that this typology created in the history of traditions of the Hebrew Bible.

4.1 Textual Delimitation

As already discussed in chapter 1, this pericope forms part of the section called the Deuteronomic Laws of Offices which are: The law of the Judges (Deut 16:18-20), judgement of the Levitical Priests and the Judge in “the place which YHWH will choose” (Deut 17:8-13); the law of the King (Deut 17:14-20); the law of Levitical Priests (Deut 18:1-8); and the law of the Prophets (Deut 18:9-22). Each group of laws is therefore clearly marked according to the office they treat. The upper delimitation

² Ibid, 373.
of our text is v9 as there is a clear change in subject. The initial כִּי of v9 is here interpreted as temporal.\(^3\) There is disagreement among scholars as to the exact upper delimitation of this pericope. Some argue that it should start in v15 rather than v9 as vv9-14 actually deal with divination, magical practices and idolatry.\(^4\) This is a valid argument, however, we have to admit that the role of the prophet in Israel is here being presented as the legitimate substitute for such proscribed offices, and therefore we can conclude that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is one law, divided into two sub-sections. The practices of magic, necromancy and the consultation of diviners are actually portrayed as the main reason as to why YHWH dispossessed the nations whose place Israel is supposed to take, with the causal כִּי of v14a indicating this. V14b actually hinges up with the next section introducing the “prophet like Moses”. In my opinion, the pericope could very well be split into two sub-sections. As we shall see in the syntactical analysis, v9 constitutes the opening of a particular construction in Deuteronomist which is divided into two parts, the first being prohibitive and the second affirmative.\(^5\) In our case the first part is vv9-14 which presents a list of prohibited activities linked with divination. The second affirmative part deals with the role of prophecy from vv15-22, prophecy being the only “divination” allowed in Israel. Vv13-15 present the hinge linking the two sub-sections.\(^6\) The key word, which functions as a hinge is שָמַע, where the idea of hearing is the focus and is a clear link between the two subsections.\(^7\) V13 states that every individual from amongst the people is “to be blameless with the Lord”. The nations whom Israel was about to dispossess where actually blameworthy for relying on such prohibited offices, described as “an abomination to YHWH”. To be blameless, therefore, every individual is to avoid having recourse to these offices and is to follow the only legitimate one established by YHWH, which is the “prophet like Moses”. Vv13-14 thus build on the previous sub-section and introduce the new sub-section starting with the asyndeton in

\(^3\) HALOT, a.v. כִּי, §10.

\(^4\) Barstad concludes that Deuteronomy 18:9-14 “deals in a peripheral fashion with the problem of illegitimate “prophecy” and concentrates on idolatry”. He argues that Deu18:15-19 is not logically connected with the preceding material. See HANS BARSTAD, “The Understanding of the Prophets in Deuteronomy”, JSOT 8 (1994), 244.


\(^6\) For Pukko v14 is the bridge between the two sections. See ANNTI F. PUKKO, Das Deuteronomium. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung, (=BWANT; I, 5), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1910, 254.

\(^7\) UDO RUTERSWÖRDEN, Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16,18-18,22, (=BBB; 65), Meisenheim: Peter Hanstein, 1987, 84.
v15a, namely what God has established for his people: Whilst these nations consulted diviners, Israel is to consult the “prophet like Moses”. We can therefore say that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is one pericope divided into two antithetic sections, one prohibitive and the other affirmative. Vv9-14 deal with the occult practices of the nations, vv15-22 deal with the new order established by YHWH, an order maintained by YHWH’s “prophet like Moses”. The essential verb for Deuteronomy, שָמַע is used as a hinge in vv14-15. The prophet is thus established as God’s only legitimate mouthpiece, and therefore Israel should only listen to such an appointed person.

4.2 Dating of Deut 18: 9-22

The dating of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is a much debated issue. Some scholars date it in the pre-exilic period, identifying its origins in the Northern Kingdom, where Ephraimitic prophets had a special office of covenant mediators, an office that was traceable back to Moses.\(^8\) This view has been widely criticised today especially by Robert Wilson and Félix García López.\(^9\) Nicholson is however of the idea that the mosaic north-Israelite prophets are presented as covenant mediators.\(^10\) He proposes that Deuteronomy owes its origin to the Northern Kingdom. There are affinities between the book of Hosea and Deuteronomy, and for Nicholson, the best solution would be to see them as both deriving from the same source.\(^11\) “For Hosea, Moses was the first of the Prophets”.\(^12\) Hosea 12:14 presents Moses as a prophet, and Deuteronomy 18:18 presents Moses as the proto-prophet. Nicholson proposes that the covenant mediatorship of Exodus 20:18-21 might be an aetiology for the office of the “prophet like Moses”, as depicted after all in Deuteronomy 18:16. Such a covenant mediator is supposed to speak in the name of YHWH, recite the history of salvation, and proclaim the laws. Nicholson concludes: “The function exercised by Moses in
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\(^8\) Such a view was bolstered by the work of HANS-JOACHIM KRAUS, *Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel*, (=TS: 51), Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957; see also BARSTAD, “Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 243.


\(^11\) Ibid, 76.

\(^12\) Ibid.
Deuteronomy is that of prophetic covenant mediator”. Nicholson also argues that such a role was fulfilled by Joshua, Samuel and Elijah in the assemblies each of them presided, ultimately confirming, according to him, that there is considerable evidence to support the view that the function of the covenant mediator was exercised by the prophets. The role of Moses in Deuteronomy is presented as that of the prophet, for in Deuteronomy 34 he is presented as the prophet par excellence. Nicholson concludes therefore that Deuteronomy owes its origin to prophetic circles in the Northern Kingdom. However he dissociates the idea that the author of Deuteronomy 18 employed the title prophet for Moses as an allusion to Hosea 12:14. Rather, he argues, the title in Deuteronomy 18, arises from the circumstances at Horeb, as outlined in Deuteronomy 5. He in fact sees this text as deuteronomistic, where the exilic background is a terminus a quo.

Whilst parts of Urdeuteronomium might have been very well penned in the Northern kingdom as Nicholson holds, the majority of scholars today agree that Deuteronomy 18:15-20 belongs to the exilic edition of the book of Deuteronomy and introduces the deuteronomistic idea that YHWH constantly sent his messengers to Israel starting with Moses. Reinhard Achenbach dates Deuteronomy 17 and 18:15-22 even later, as part of the Hexateuchal redaction that includes the deuteronomistic idea of the prophetic character of Moses in the Persian Period. Dietrich identifies Deuteronomy 18:15-22 as being of the DtrN, dated during the Persian Empire. According to him, the so-called “other gods” reflect the strict monotheism typical of DtrN, which sought to protect Israel from the lure of other religions. Indeed, as we have seen above, Deuteronomy 18:9-22 presupposes and re-interprets the theophany.

13 Ibid, 77.
14 Ibid, 75-79.
15 Ibid, 79.
16 ERNEST NICHOLSON, “Deuteronomy 18.9-22, the Prophets and Scripture”, in Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel, John Day (ed.), (=OTS; 531), London: T & T Clark, 2010, 158.
17 Ibid, 163.
at Horeb of Deuteronomy 5, aetiologically establishing prophecy on Mosaic lines. It is widely agreed that Deuteronomy 5 is post-exilic and probably is to be dated within the context of the first return. If this is so, it logically follows that since Deuteronomy 18:9-22 reinterprets Deuteronomy 5, it is to be dated within this context as well.\footnote{Christophe Nihan, “Moses and the Prophets”: Deuteronomy 18 and the Emergence of the Pentateuch as Torah”, \textit{SEA} 75 (2010) 29-30.} Lohfink concludes that this section of the law of offices in Deuteronomy 16–18 is actually post-exilic, constituting a programme of re-establishment of political and religious life:

The Babylonian return movement must have been supported very strongly in its different centres by jurists. Far from the concrete realities of their own country, these people had to restore morale by developing juridical utopias. This is the only way to imagine the emergence of texts as varied as Leviticus 25 in the Holiness Code (sabbatical year and jubilee year), the prescriptions about officials in Deuteronomy 16-18, and different features of the assistance measures of the Deuteronomistic Code as well as the project of a political constitution in the book of Ezekiel.\footnote{Norbert Lohfink, “Was there a Deuteronomistic Movement?”, in \textit{Those Elusive Deuteronomists}, Linda S. Scharing (ed.), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 63.}

As already argued above, Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is a pericope that forms part of a larger unit of laws, called the laws of offices extending from Deuteronomy 16–18. I agree with Lohfink that these laws are post-exilic.\footnote{As already seen in chapter 1, Lohfink argues that these laws were a response of exilic deuteronomistic theologians who sought to control the monarchy that had previously abused of its power. See Norbert Lohfink, “Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Torah und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt 16,18-18,22)”, in \textit{Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I}, Norbert Lohfink (ed.), Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990, 305-323.} At most, the earliest we can date the laws is late in the Exile. From a close analysis of the Law of the King in Deuteronomy 17:14-20, we can conclude that the authors had read the prophets well before actually composing this law. The king is presented with a law that erodes all his power, he is reduced to a mere titular figurehead. Indeed, the law presents a series of prohibitions for the king,\footnote{It is interesting to note that the king is forbidden from multiplying horses and from multiplying wives. Indeed this appears to be a subtle criticism of King Solomon, who indeed multiplied horses (1 Kings 4:26) and wives (1 Kings 11:3).} with only one single positive law, which reduces the king to a student of the Torah. According to Deuteronomy 17:17, the only thing that the king is ordered to do is to commission a copy of the Torah from the Levitical Priests, and to read from it “all the days of his life”. In my opinion, this law is clearly post-monarchic and is somewhat utopian in nature.\footnote{Otto notes that the legislation of the public offices in Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 is a law that defines concrete statutes for living inside the land under foreign rule after the disappearance of kingship. See Otto, “Deut 16:18-22: a law that defines concrete statutes for living inside the land under foreign rule after the disappearance of kingship.”} Mark O’Brien interprets
Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22 as a move by the deuteronomistic reformers to distribute power in Israel across various offices, thus curbing the power of the monarchy. The most plausible dating for these laws therefore appears to be the late-exilic to the early post-exilic period, a legislation aimed at addressing the religious and political institutions when these will eventually be reinstated upon the return to the land. Obviously it could well be the case that, as we shall see, the deuteronomistic author used some material from Urdeuteronomium to form his text.

4.3 Source Criticism of Deut 18:9-22

As already hinted above, the first part of this text, especially vv10-12, were most probably part of Urdeuteronomium or a pre-exilic core, most probably part of a primitive collection of “to’ebah Laws”. The second part of our text which focuses on the figure of the “prophet like Moses”, appears to be of deuteronomistic origins. What was the source for the tradition of Moses as a prophet? First of all, we have to state that it is very strange that Moses is rarely mentioned in the prophets. If there was a strong tradition of Moses as a prophet in the North, as Nicholson claims, why is Moses ignored so much by his colleagues? The Major Prophets mention the Exodus a lot, and yet, they very rarely mention Moses. Ezekiel knows many traditions about the Exodus, and yet, the book does not mention Moses by name. The prophetic texts that do mention Moses appear to be late additions, probably by scribes editing the

---


29 L’HOUR, “Les interdits tô’eba dans le Deutéronome”, 492-492. L’Hour identifies three phases of the development of this particular tô’eba law. It was first developed early on within the Northern Kingdom. At a second stage it was incorporated within the deuteronomistic corpus, possibly during the reign of Hezekiah, and later, during the reign of Josiah, the section on child sacrifice was included. See also GARCía LÓPEZ, “Un profeta como Moisés”, 303.

30 Isaiah 63:11-14; Jeremiah 15:1; Micah 6:4 and Malachi 3:22.
prophetic scrolls during the Second Temple period. The LXX version of Isaiah 63:11 for example, lacks the mention of Moses; most probably, the mention of Moses was a gloss added to the proto-Masoretic text.30

Despite all this, many scholars still retain that the tradition of Moses as a prophet originated in the North, probably somewhere in the 8th century B.C. with the preaching of Hosea. Indeed, many see that Deuteronomy 18:15-18 is dependent upon Hosea 12:14.31 But Hosea 12:14 presents a problem: The verse is interpreted as clearly referring to Moses, but why is Moses not mentioned by name? Why is the leader of the Exodus considered a prophet? J.D. Atkins argues that Deuteronomy and Hosea were both dependent on a pre-existent tradition that considered Moses as a prophet,32 and assumes that Hosea does not mention Moses by name because the author took it for granted that Moses as a prophet was common knowledge.33 But was it? The lack of mention of Moses outside the Pentateuch contradicts this assumption. Moreover, the dating of Hosea 12:14 is very much debated, with some scholars claiming that it is a late insertion.34 Atkins argues that the author of Hosea 12:14 understood Moses as a paradigmatic prophet.35 I do not agree, for the substantive “prophet” (בְנָבִיא) lacks the definite article in both instances of its use in this verse. Indeed, if the author understood Moses as a paradigmatic prophet, he/she would not have written “a prophet”, but “the prophet”! If we accept that Hosea 12:14 are ipsissima verba of Hosea, it becomes evident, in my opinion, that Hosea is trying to legitimise his position, his prophecy, and his prophetic critique of Israel, by attributing prophecy to the leader of the Exodus event.

Indeed Hosea 12:14 appears to be the start of a tradition according to which a prophet is at the origins of the history of Israel. Yet it is very strange that this prophet

---

is not being identified.\textsuperscript{36} Christophe Nihan states that it is erroneous to see Hosea 12:14 as a simple precursor to Deuteronomy 18:15, 18.\textsuperscript{37} Apparently, the tradition that is a source for Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is built upon Amos 2:11\textsuperscript{38}

Evidently the deuteronomistic tradition reinterprets Amos 2:11 in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18.\textsuperscript{39}

Atkins suggests that the incident of Eldad and Medad in Numbers 11:26-29 anticipates the main idea behind Deuteronomy 18:15-18. The text is presenting Moses as a prophet, but also emphasising Moses’ desire that there be more prophets among the people of God.\textsuperscript{40} Numbers 12:6-8 then, seems to present Moses as a paradigm prophet, and is a clear anticipation of Deuteronomy 34:10-12. Atkins asserts that Deuteronomy 18 inherited rather than invented the ideas about Moses and his prophetic office.\textsuperscript{41} On similar lines, Stackert argues that the Torah sources, particularly E, presume Moses’ prophetic vocation and describe him as a prophet.\textsuperscript{42}

In my opinion, the fact that Moses is not mentioned extensively outside of the Pentateuch, if not in late texts, is very significant. It seems that the emphasis during the time of the prophets and the early formation of the Deuteronomistic History was the Exodus event, rather than the person of Moses. The Exodus event became an extremely important paradigm during the Exile, and the person of Moses appears to have gained importance during the exilic period. It was at this point that the prophecies of Hosea 12:14, and even more so Amos 2:11, were taken up by the Deuteronomists. When redacting the second part of the Law of the prophets, the Deuteronomists most probably took on from Hosea 12:14 and Amos 2:11 as well as the famous recurring formula of the Deuteronomistic History: כְּבָר יָהִי אָשֶׁר בָּרוּ בֵּי יְהוָה מַעַבֵּדָם.\textsuperscript{43} Indeed

\textsuperscript{36} Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 55.  
\textsuperscript{38} Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 55.  
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, 57.  
\textsuperscript{40} Atkins, “Origins of Deuteronomic Prophecy”, 329.  
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, 332.  
\textsuperscript{42} Jeffrey Stackert, A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 55. Stackert argues that E works at consolidating Moses as the first and last prophet of Israel, eyeing all the rest of prophecy negatively.  
\textsuperscript{43} This formula is recurrent in 2 Kings 17:23; 21:10; and 24:2.
this formula always appears as a divine judgement, against Israel and Judah. 2 Kings 24:2 appears to be the sealing of the fulfilment of what the prophet had predicted, namely, what YHWH had warned his people would happen, through (םב) his prophets. Jeremiah 25:4 and 35:15 present the exact same theme of YHWH accusing the people of not lending their ears to listen to his servants the prophets. Apparently this is a very strong theme that the Deuteronomists developed and elaborated within the text of Deuteronomy 18:15-22.

4.4 Deut 18:9-23: A Syntactical Analysis

In this section I shall make some important syntactical observations which bear upon the interpretation of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, especially with reference to the question of this thesis, namely, of the identity of the “prophet like Moses”. There is widespread agreement that this pericope is a complex and multi-layered text. A complex text, however, is not necessarily multi-layered. Repetitions within a text do not necessarily point at multiple sources, or at an extensive redactional activity either. As Niccacci points out, every exegetical study of a text should include an analysis of the macro-syntactical level of the text, namely, identifying the “linguistic attitude” of the author, using a textual linguistic approach. This text, in fact, does present a complex textual linguistic analysis: this pericope starts in Deuteronomy 18:9 with a direct discourse, which is typical of the law being communicated by Moses to the people. Moses, is obviously acting as mediator, being God’s mouthpiece to the people. This direct discourse continues till v14. V15 actually marks a new beginning indicated by the asyndeton and starts with the lexeme נביא, laying emphasis upon it. Indeed, this

---

44 Jeremiah 25:4 and Jeremiah 35:15
47 RÜTERSWORDEN, Gemeinschaft, 85.
is going to be the theme of the following verses. It is very important to understand the function of v16, because it presents here a narrative discourse, inserted within the direct speech of Moses, having an explicative function as to the reason why YHWH will raise such a נביא. Indeed, this narrative discourse functions as an aetiology for the rise of prophecy in Israel. Within such a narrative discourse, extending from v16 to v17, we observe two direct quoted speeches which Moses does within this aetiology. The first one is in v16, where Moses quotes the people in the 1 pers. sing. V17 then continues the narrative discourse followed immediately in v17b by the quoted direct discourse of YHWH. This direct speech quoted here refers back to what YHWH originally told Moses on the day of the congregation at Sinai. V19 continues with the direct discourse of the law of the prophet. This direct speech is interrupted by the hypothetical direct question which YHWH quotes the people as possibly asking in v21b. This question, is answered directly by YHWH with the continuation of the law in v22. In the following section, I shall offer a syntactical as well as an exegetical analysis of each verse, identifying the function of each phrase within this complex legal discourse.

4.4.1 Introductory Verse

Our text begins in v19 with a protasis temporal clause. As Joüon and Muraoka note, the temporal and the conditional clauses are closely related. See Paul Joüon – Tamitsu Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, (=Subsidia Biblica; 27), Roma, 2006, §166a.

The use of this כִּי is very common in deuteronomic law, with the temporal reference being to the time when the conquest would be fulfilled in the future. This is the typical construction for the deuteronomic law of offices: “the law of the king” in Deuteronomy 17:14, “the law of the prophet” in Deuteronomy 18:9, and the law concerning the cities of refuge in Deuteronomy 19:1. Lohfink calls this construction “the lesser frame of the law” (die kleine Gebotsumrahung); it is an eventual temporal clause that points to the entry and the possession of the land, a clause which is then followed by the principal clauses containing the legal

49 As Joüon and Muraoka note, the temporal and the conditional clauses are closely related. See Paul Joüon – Tamitsu Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, (=Subsidia Biblica; 27), Roma, 2006, §166a.
50 See HALOT a.v. כִּי, §10.
prescriptions. Udo Rüterswörden calls this clause a “historicising introduction to the law” (historisierende Gebotseinleitung). This conditional temporal clause governs the whole legislation. This has an important exegetical import, namely, that YHWH will raise the “prophet like Moses” (Deut 18:15) when the people would have entered the land. The syntax of this legislative pericope, therefore, seems to exclude, to a certain extent, Joshua from being a “prophet like Moses”. Joshua’s mission will be accomplished once he leads the people into the land and finishes the conquest. The “prophet like Moses” will be appointed by YHWH once the people have entered, conquered and settled in the land.

The apodosis of this temporal and conditional clause is the continuation of Moses’ direct speech, and marks a strong future indicative that is a prohibition. The substantive  הֹּּלֶכֶבּ , here used in the plural, is very significant and it is used in the typical way of referring to the abominable practices of the Canaanites. García López argues that this substantive attests to the older part of this text, comprising a to’eba law, which was part of Urdeuteronomium, prohibiting any form of divination in Israel. It is significant to note that this substantive is used three times in this pericope, here, and twice in v12.

4.4.2 The Prohibited Offices in vv10-11

This asyndeton comprises the second prohibition in the apodosis. This clause introduces a list of prohibited practices which were common amongst Israel’s surrounding peoples. Rabast notes that vv10-11 are metrically formulated with the participial phrase, something typical of apodictic laws. It is interesting to note that part of this list is used in the judgement pronounced on King Manasseh in 2 Kings 21,

53 BDB a.v. א. BDB distinguishes between  אָל imperfect, expressing a deprecation and  אָל imperfect expressing a strict prohibition.
54 FÉLIX GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “Un profeta como Moisés: estudio crítico de Dt 18,9-22”, in Simposio Bíblico Español (Salamanca, 1982), Fernández Marcos Natalio (ed.), Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1984, 305. According to him, this primitive to’ebah law of primitive Deuteronomy is made up of v10a; 10b; 11; 12. Subsequently, two other later redactors would have added respectively v9b.10ab.12b and vv15b-20.22aa. 22b.
55 KARLHEINZ RABAST, Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitsgesetz, Berlin: Heimatdienstverlag, 1948, 11.
where in v6 we are given a similar list to Deuteronomy 18:10-11. Scholars have debated a lot the meaning of the terms enlisted within these verses. Heller presents the following list of eight prohibited divinations:

1) Divination by causing a son/daughter to pass through fire.
2) Divination by manipulation of arrows or sticks.
3) Divination by clouds or causing spirits to appear.
4) Divination by observing the surface of oil or water in a cup.
5) Divination by the practice of magic.
6) Divination by pronouncing magic spells.
7) Divination by the questioning of spirits or of familiars.
8) Divination by inquiring of the dead (necromancy).

This list of abominable practices lies at the heart of the reason as to why YHWH dispossessed the Canaanites from their land as explained in v12b. The seeking of such

---

56 2 Kings 21:6
58 As Heller notes, this pericope is dealing with divination rather than sacrifice, so the issue at hand here is not strictly child sacrifice. Apparently the passing of children through fire was also a means of divination and 2 Kings 17:17 and 21:6 seem to hint at this, since the practice is there listed together with divinatory practices. Scholars have suggested that the survival or death of a child’s “passing through” fire could mean a yes/no answer, or that the spirit of the dead child would be invoked at a second stage, involving necromancy, where the parent would still have authority over the child, and claim an honest answer. See HELLER, Power, Politics, and Prophecy, 25. Rüterswörden too sees that the moloch practice here appears to be linked with some oracular activity. See RÜTERSWÖRDEN, Gemeinschaft, 79.
59 The phrase נִיָּאָ֖ו בֵּר חָבַ֣ר is defined in HALOT as “obtaining oracle by arrows” in the context of wanting to reach a decision, and is used in Ezekiel 21:26-27 and in Deuteronomy 18:10. See HALOT a.v. נִיָּאָו 2, and references therein.
60 Heller interprets this participle masculine plural in terms of the meaning of the verb in piel, נחָש which means in fact “to cause to become visible”. The verb in the poel conveys the meaning “to interpret signs” and the poel participle means “soothsayer”. See HALOT, a.v. נחָש.
61 The piel participle of נָחַש here means “to seek and give omens”. Apparently it was a kind of divination with a cup or goblet (Gen 44:5, 15). See HALOT, a.v. נחָש, and references therein.
62 The syntagm רֶבֶר חָבַּר is piel participle singular of חָבַר meaning “to practise sorcery”, as in 2 Chronicles 33:6. In the participle it means “sorcerer” as used in Exodus 7:11; Deuteronomy 18:10; Malachi 3:5 and Dan 2:2. See HALOT a.v. חָבַר.
63 The syntagm לַֽמַּטְמִים רָצִּיעֵי is comprised of the qal participle of חָבַר and the substantive רָצִּיעֵי, meaning “charm” or “spell”, as occurs in Isaiah 47:9, 12. See HALOT a.v. חָבַר 2.
64 נִיָּאָו is qal participle masculine singular of the verb לְשֹׁאַל meaning “to ask”/”to seek”. The substantive לְשֹׁאֵל means “spirit of the dead” and frequently occurs as a word pair with נִיָּאָו. This word pair occurs in Leviticus 20:27; 2 Kings 21:6, and 2 Chronicles 33:6. See HALOT a.v. לְשֹׁאֵל II.
65 The syntagm נְדָר אֲלָמָּה is constructed from the qal participle masculine singular of לְשֹׁאֵל meaning “to seek” and the lexeme נְדָר meaning the dead. With נְדָר the verb לְשֹׁאֵל takes on the overtone of “to question”, as in “to question the dead” as a source of divination. This practice is mentioned also in 1 Kings 22:7; 2 Chronicles 18:6, and Isaiah 8:19. See HALOT a.v. לְשֹׁאֵל 8.
divination is therefore a very grievous offence. This pericope however does not offer a mere prohibition. It also offers an alternative. The sole alternative to inquire the will of YHWH is through prophecy, as explained in vv15-22. Prophecy is thus established as the sole medium through which God’s will is to become known to the people.

V12 begins with a nominal causal/explicative clause. This causality is “explanatory causality”, stating the reason for the prohibited offices. Again the use of the substantive אשباح is here more grievous, for it is described as אשבח יְהוָה. Again, this indicates that this verse was part of the to’eba law from Urdeuteronomium. Indeed, the second part of this verse states the very reason as to why God is driving the people out of the very land which Israel is going to take possession of. It is also significant to note that the Hiphil participle ראשים in this clause implies that YHWH’s action is already occurring in the present.

4.4.3 The Hinge of the Diptych: Israel’s Call to Perfection in vv13-15

The asyndeton of v13 marks a break in the text, laying emphasis on the fact that Israel is to be blameless before God. This proposition forms a hinge between what precedes and what follows. To be perfect with YHWH, Israel is to shun such proscribed offices and refer to the single mediating office which is that of the “prophet like Moses”, introduced in v15. V14 starts with what Niccacci calls casus pendens, laying emphasis on the 2nd person singular personal pronoun, with an adversative י°9.

---

67 The list of to’eba laws in Deuteronomy includes the following: Deuteronomy 7:25-26 – the images of gods and the gold and silver attached to them; Deuteronomy 12:31 – the deeds that the people of Canaan did for their gods, especially child sacrifice; Deuteronomy 14:3 – the eating of meat derived from unclean animals; Deuteronomy 17:1 – sacrificing imperfect animals; Deuteronomy 22:5 – wearing clothes of the opposite sex; Deuteronomy 23:18 – giving the earnings of a prostitute or the wages of a male cult prostitute; Deuteronomy 24:4 – remarrying the same previously divorced woman; Deuteronomy 25:16 – using a dishonest weight; Deuteronomy 27:15 – making images of other deities. For a more detailed study on the to’eba laws in Deuteronomy see JEAN L’HOUR, “Les interdits to’eba dans le Deutéronome”, RB, 71 (1964) 481-503. He considers these laws as being pre-deuteronomic, which were most probably a list of covenant laws originating in the Northern Kingdom that served as a source for Deuteronomy, probably in the time of Josiah.
68 Niccacci defines the casus pendens as “a noun or noun equivalent freed from the position it would occupy within a normal clause and placed at the head of the sentence. It does not really occupy the first position of the clause but is placed outside it (‘extra-position’) and reference to it is usually made by an anaphoric or resumptive pronoun. See NICCACCI, Syntax, §123. Whilst traditional grammars state that the casus pendens is used to create “emphasis”, Niccacci states more accurately that it is used to express the topic of the new text segment. See NICCACCI, Syntax, 123.
translated: “but as for you…” This double clause is coordinated adversatively with the previous causal clause, laying emphasis on what YHWH has allowed for his people, in contrast to the nations being dispossessed. V14c continues with the apodosis of the *casus pendens* which is connected with הָיָה through the preposition ל + the 2nd person masculine singular pronominal suffix. This double clause is very important for this text. As we have seen, we can divide this text into two, the first part running from vv9-14a marking the proscribed practices of divination and sorcery that Israel is to shun and avoid at all costs. This verse, together with v13, serves as a hinge linking on to the next section of the law, which legislates about the sole institution that is legitimately established for Israel to inquire the will of God, namely, the law and the promise of the “prophet like Moses” running from vv15-22.

4.4.4 The “Prophet like Moses”: vv15-20

The promise of the “prophet like Moses” begins with the asyndeton of v15. This verse marks the start of the second part of this pericope, introducing the “prophet like Moses” in contrast with the previous prohibited offices. It picks up from v14c by stating what, in contrast YHWH has established for his people. V15 starts with an *x-yiqtol* phrase with a very particular construction, namely the “affected object” is placed at the beginning for emphasis, with the construction following the pattern of Object-Verb-Subject. The *yiqtol* in this phrase is usually considered to have an iterative value, which implies that YHWH will continue raising prophets in the future. The “affected object” נָבִיא therefore, as we shall see later on in the comment, does not refer to a single prophet, but should be rather considered as a singular noun of category. Moreover, very important for our consideration, is the comparative preposition כ, here in its poetic variant כָּמ. This comparative כ can express “a relation of either perfect (equality) or imperfect (resemblance) similitude. The meaning may therefore be “exactly like”, or “more or less like”, but in many cases without precise nuance”. What is this particular nuance here evoked? If this text is not to enter into any
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contradiction with Deuteronomy 34:10, then, this כ here, must be doubtlessly interpreted as implying imperfect similitude. One syntactical problem is whether כ modifies “prophet” or Moses. Is the prophet going to be like Moses “as a prophet”? or like Moses as “a fellow Israelite”? According to Mathews, who denies the stress placed on Moses’ prophethood, the latter is the case. According to him, this fits well the context of Deuteronomy 18:9-14, where Israel is commanded not to give heed to any soothsayers or diviners, but is rather to obey the prophet from within the community.74 David Petersen offers a similar argument to deny that Deuteronomy 18:15-22 establishes Moses as a paradigm of prophecy.75 He argues that whilst the majority of scholars considers the comparative phrase “like me” as modifying the object “prophet”, he considers it to be modifying the phrase “from among your own people”.76 According to Petersen the emphasis lies on the prophet, who, like the king, is to come from within the community. The comparative clause thus emphasises the fact that just as Moses was raised up from among the people, so too would the “prophet like Moses” be raised up from among the people. He in fact suggests that this verse be translated: “The Lord will set for you a prophet from among your own people, from among your brothers, as I am from among your brothers”.77 This would mean that the author of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 did not consider Moses a prophet. I do not agree with Mathews or Petersen. In my opinion, the emphasis that the prophet has to be strictly from within the community is emphatically hinted through the syntax with the repetition of the preposition מ in the phrase מִקִרְבְךָ. In my opinion, it is quite logical that Moses is from amongst the people, and to underline it explicitly would be redundant. Moreover, if we are to keep Mathews’ and Petersen’s interpretation, it could also be the case that the preposition כ is here functioning as a double duty modifier, in which case, both interpretations would be correct. This pericope deals strictly with the institution of the prophet, and v16 directly links the institution of the “prophet like Moses” with the Sinai/Horeb covenant. Back then, Moses was instituted as the sole mediator between Israel and God, something that will now continue in the figure of the prophet whom YHWH will appoint from amongst the people. The

76 Ibid, 312.
77 Ibid, 313.
preposition כ, therefore, qualifies Moses’ prophethood and implies that the prophet should be like Moses in the manner described in Deuteronomy 18:16-22, functioning as God’s mouthpiece in conveying God’s message to the people. The one speaking here is Moses, and commentators have asked as to whether Moses here is actually putting his very own words on YHWH’s mouth. With this asyndeton, there is a hint that this is Moses’ own promise that YHWH would raise a prophet from the midst of Israel, and goes on to justify this promise referring back to the people’s fear at Horeb as expressed in Exodus 20, where Moses was asked to serve as their mediator. But even if this were the case, in Deuteronomy 18:18 YHWH affirms what Moses said here. Synchronically and syntactically, this text is telling us what Moses told the people, after YHWH had spoken in the manner of v18, where Moses quotes him verbatim.

V16 marks an important aetiological explanation for the origins of prophecy in Israel. This explicative clause lays stress on the fact that YHWH will establish a “prophet like Moses”, not just as a legitimate counterpart to the prohibited offices, but also as a consequence of what the people had asked of YHWH on Mount Horeb in Exodus 20:19 and Deuteronomy 5:5. This section running from vv16a-20b is a parenthetical section that explains the origins of this “prophet like Moses”. This section is constructed with a series of quoted speeches. In fact, v16 (לא אcorp לך השם אד) appears to be a rephrasing of what the people had asked on that day at Sinai/Horeb, when they specifically asked Moses: (Ex 20:19). V17 marks the next reported speech that Moses quotes YHWH as having told him, namely, that what the people had asked, YHWH deemed as “good”. This reported speech of YHWH starts here and continues until v20b.

V18 starts with an x-yiqtol that some commentators consider as a repetition of v15, a Wiederaufnahme, with a slight syntactical harmonisation, reading ס"כנה אכרה יאכלה

---

78 **PAUL KISSLING**, *Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha*, (=JSOTS; 224), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 64.
79 Ibid.
instead of כָּךָ. Those commentators who consider this text to be multilayered, interpreted this syntactical harmonisation as a later addition. However, it does not necessarily follow that the fact that v18 offers what these commentators retain as “better syntax”, is a later addition! In my opinion, the author in v15 is shrewdly creating an emphasis through the repetition of the preposition מִן, as already noted above, that the prophet whom the Lord will appoint, will be strictly an Israelite. This implies that a non-Israelite would constitute a false prophet, anticipating the theme of false prophecy, dealt with in vv21-22. Moreover, with this emphasis, v15 creates a stark contrast with the diviners of the nations. In v18, such contrast is no longer needed as the context is different, and moreover, we cannot ignore the fact that this verse is Moses’ verbatim quote of what YHWH had said/promised at Horeb. As Nihan notes: “it is possible to perceive a tension between vv14-15 and 16-18 only if one fails to take into account the discursive context of Deuteronomy 18:9-22”. As he notes, v18 is not a simple Wiederaufnahme (revival) of v15, since v18 comes from the mouth of YHWH, not Moses. Vv15-17a are part of Moses’ speech and vv17b-20 constitute Moses’ quoting YHWH verbatim. Vv15-20, therefore, constitute a literary unit.

The use of נָתַן in v18 is quite peculiar. Usually the normal way of expressing YHWH’s placing of his word in the mouth of the prophet is through the use of the verb שִים as is used in Numbers 22:38; 23:5; Isaiah 51:16 and 59:21. It is significant to note that the same expression occurs within the book of Jeremiah where YHWH reassures his prophet: יָדַרְךָ דְבָרַי יְהֹוָה (Jer 1:9). It is interesting to note that whoever authored Jeremiah 1:9 seems to be presenting the fulfilment of Deuteronomy 18:18b, which is worded in the future tense as a promise. Indeed, whilst the author could have used the verb נָתַן as a verb synonymous with to שִים, the fact that this use of נָתַן, as reference to the “putting of the word into the prophet’s mouth”, is used only in Deuteronomy 18:18 and Jeremiah 1:9, is very significant, and is a clue, in my opinion, hinting at textual dependence. There also seems to be this thematic parallel linked with

82 Indeed, this would ipso facto exclude Balaam of Numbers 22 from being considered “a true prophet”.
83 NIHAN, “Moses and the Prophets”, 28; see also GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “Un profeta como Moisés”, 289.
the speech of this prophet in Moses’ call narrative in Exodus 4:12, where YHWH himself states that He will be present with Moses’ mouth, after Moses had expressed his ineloquence. Here the verb used is “to cause to see”, namely, YHWH will “show” Moses what to say. V18c too offers another strong parallel with Jeremiah 1:7d: רּתְדַבֵר וְֹורֵיתִָך אֲשֶׁר אֲנָ. Indeed this phrase is YHWH’s command to Jeremiah which corroborates the future indicative of Deuteronomy 18:18. Again, the person who authored this verse seems to want to present Jeremiah as the fulfilment of Deuteronomy 18:18. There is also another parallel with Exodus 7:2 where YHWH orders Moses to speak to Aaron that which YHWH will command him: רִיָּה תְדַבֵּר אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר תּאַ. It is interesting to note that in each of these cases, the verb רָה is constructed with the energetic נ. We shall study these parallels in greater detail in the next chapter.

V19 starts by laying stress on the individual who would choose not to listen to the “prophet like Moses”. The construction is very particular; it starts with the macro-syntactical marker והָיָה that introduces the circumstance of the text. The stress is then created through the use of a casus pendens, which emphasizes and presents the theme of the person that would be held accountable by YHWH as explained in the apodosis. The relative clause here presents the very important theme of listening that was so important in vv14-15. This casus pendens refers to the man who would directly disobey the precept of Deuteronomy 18:15b: אֵלָיוּתִּשָּׁם. The apodosis of the casus pendens is constructed through the reference to the substantive איש through the preposition עם + the 3rd person masculine singular pronominal suffix. Keeping in mind the possibility of the lateness of this text, as discussed in chapter 1 and in section 4.3, this two-member phrase underlines the accountability of the people. Indeed, the people did not give heed to the prophets, and therefore, they are to be held fully responsible for the Exile. The Exile in fact turned out to be this “calling into account” of the people by YHWH from the people, precisely because they refused to listen to the prophets’ call to repentance. It is also important to note the gravity of not listening.

84 Niccacci, Syntax, §156: “Like wayehi the function of והָיָה is not in the individual sentence but in the unit of discourse or narrative to which it belongs. This function consists in placing the circumstance, or rather the paragraph which follows it (the two-member syntactic pattern) within the main thrust of the message and of connecting this with the preceding context”.
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to the “prophet like Moses”. The emphatic כִּי here is very strong. YHWH himself would be the one to punish such insubordination.

In v20, YHWH introduces another theme, again through the use of a casus pendens to create emphasis. This verse presents the theme of the prophet speaking presumptuously, or who would speak in the name of other gods. YHWH will not only seek account of him, but will seek his very life. Many translate כִּי as antithetic. Whilst I agree, I also retain the emphasizing function of כִּי, translating “but surely”. This emphasis would underline the connection with the man who would not give heed to YHWH’s words, but the antithetic relation would also lay stress on the harsher judgment of the would-be prophet. This verse is important for it presents a new subsection within the law of the prophets, namely the possibility of there being false prophets. This law seems to expound on Deuteronomy 13, where it could be the case that the prophet induces the people into idolatry. It is interesting to note that the prophet who speaks presumptuously in the name of YHWH is placed in the same situation as a prophet who speaks in the name of other gods. Both are punishable by death, apparently sharing the same grievousness, for the actions of both would be leading the people astray and away from YHWH. The apodosis of the casus pendens presents the penalty for the prophet who speaks presumptuously or speaks in the name of other gods. Indeed, here scholars have identified links with Jeremiah 28, where Jeremiah enters into a conflict with Hananiah, there a false prophet, for he preaches peace, in contrast to what Jeremiah preaches. Indeed, there the prophet Hananiah dies an untimely death as foretold by Jeremiah, confirming this legislation. It is important at this point to note that in this legislation the subject of the execution is YHWH. In a sense, the people need not worry too much, as YHWH himself would take care of it. Both Jeremiah 28:16-17 and especially Deuteronomy 18:19c make it clear that the one doing the execution of the prophet is YHWH himself. The death sentence will in fact be nothing but YHWH’s calling into account of the false prophet. V20 ends YHWH’s speech to Moses on Mount Horeb on the day of the assembly. What was spoken then by YHWH, Moses is now presenting to the people as a parenthesis, to explain better the origins and the role of the “prophet like him”.
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4.4.5 True and False Prophecy

The theme of false prophecy is introduced in v21 with a conditional protasis built with כִּי. The syntax from this point onwards is very complex. The text here is elliptical of the apodosis. This conditional protasis introduces the guidelines that are to be used for distinguishing the true prophet from the one who speaks presumptuously. It is now no longer possible to state with certainty who it is that is speaking here. Is it YHWH continuing the speech from the previous verse? Or is it Moses, continuing the legislation from v15b? I prefer the latter case, as the בִּשְׁמִי of v19b, becomes בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה in v22a. YHWH’s speech ended in the previous clause and now Moses is continuing with the legislation. Moses then quotes the hypothetical question that the people might ask in the future in the face of a prophetic utterance. How would the people go about distinguishing a true from a false prophet? The answer comes in the long casus pendens that follows which starts with the relative יִשְׂרָאֵל clause that presents the theme of the false word of the prophet. Apparently the relative clause is elliptical of the subject, most probably דָּבָר, as can be implied from the verb in this clause as well as the substantive הַדָּבָר as used in v22b. All the stress is being laid syntactically upon what is spoken in the name of YHWH. The casus pendens is continued with two we-lo-yiqtol clauses, emphasising the non-occurrence of the prophesied word. The apodosis of the casus pendens is constructed with the personal pronoun 3rd person masculine singular וּ which obviously builds upon the theme of the false word presented with the יִשְׂרָאֵל above. As we have seen, the relative clause there is most probably elliptical of the subject יִשְׂרָאֵל. The grammatical subject of this clause is in fact וּ. Full emphasis is being laid upon the “word” and is the final part of the complex answer given to the question of v21b.

The last verse constitutes a direct order by YHWH to the people not to fear the prophet who spoke presumptuously. At this point it is important to notice the verb used here, כִּי, which means “to be afraid”. This is significant for the exegesis of this pericope because, as noted above, many scholars have drawn parallels with Jeremiah 28. There is however a major difference! Jeremiah 28:9 states that the burden of proof for a prophecy lies with a prophecy announcing future peace. The verb כִּי here seems to exclude this scenario, for it would make no sense to fear a prophet announcing
peace! Jeremiah 28:9 implies that a prophecy of doom should be taken ipso facto as authentic, however, since it would make no sense to fear a prophet preaching שָׁום, Deuteronomy 18:22 seems to imply that any prophecy should be placed under scrutiny. We shall discuss this issue later on.

4.5 Deut 18:9-22: a Close Reading

Having delimited the text, dated it, and given a detailed syntactical analysis to aid our interpretation, I now proceed to comment on the text, seeking to identify the intentions of the author/s especially in the portrayal of Moses as a prophet, and in presenting the figure of the “prophet like Moses”.

4.5.1 Prohibited Divination in Deut 18:9-14

Deuteronomy 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 18:15-22 appear to place parallels between prophecy and witchcraft/divination. This is a polarisation that appears to be reflected in 1 Samuel 9-10. In the exilic period, the deuteronomist “clearly placed prophecy in opposition to witchcraft/divination by putting these institutions of ancient guidance in ideological tension.”\(^{85}\) Deuteronomy 18:12 places the responsibility of the loss of the land on the people who do in fact revert to witchcraft and divination. According to Matthew, “from this perspective, DtrH seeks to exonerate YHWH from the charge of powerlessness in the face of the Assyrian and Babylonian defeats and the subsequent exiles.”\(^{86}\) From 2 Kings 17:7-23 it is evident that the deuteronomist blames the Israelites for the Exile of the north for they had practised divination and sorcery. There is corporate responsibility of the whole people, underscored with that of particular individuals who contributed to the fall of the nation. Saul, as the first

\(^{85}\) MATTHEW MICHAEL, “The Prophet, the Witch and the Ghost: Understanding the Parody of Saul as a “Prophet” and the Purpose of Endor in the Deuteronomistic History”, JJSOT 38.3 (2014) 335.

\(^{86}\) Ibid, 336.
king, is a case in point, for he became the national villain and the cultic embarrassment of kingship.  

4.5.2 The Promised Prophet

The Torah presents Moses as being both the origin (Deut 18:9-22) and the insuperable model (Deut 34:10-12) of all future prophets. Yet it is very telling that outside Deuteronomy, Moses is not explicitly called a prophet, (though it is apparently implied in Numbers 11 and 12). What is even stranger is that the latter prophets ignore Mosaic prophecy completely. Indeed, scholars have hesitated in affixing the title prophet to Moses, because Moses is not labelled regularly as a prophet in the Bible. Many scholars note that the way in which Deuteronomy 18:15-18 presents Moses as prophet lacks parallels in the legal code of Deuteronomy. Nihan states clearly that the latter prophets ignore Mosaic prophecy simply because Moses was not a prophet. Within this study, it has become increasingly apparent that the representation of Moses as the origin and model of all prophecy is the creation of late deuteronomistic editors/authors.

As we have seen, Deuteronomy 18:15 presents prophecy as the most important office in Israel since it is presented as a purely charismatic office, the only office that is directly set up by God. Moreover, only the prophet is portrayed in Deuteronomy 18:18 as the direct successor of Moses. Neither the priest, nor the judge or the king are presented as such. The majority of scholars see in this text the institutionalisation of...
the office of prophecy, especially in its etiological presentation, being traced back to
the covenant at Sinai (Ex 20:19//Deut 5:25//Deut 18:16-19). Indeed, Moses does not
act in a stereotypically prophetic way; he was much more than a prophet. Stackert in
fact states: “the label ‘prophet’ may thus be a necessary descriptor of Moses, but it is
hardly a sufficient one”.92 We have already seen in chapter 3, that prophets are
generally mediators between God and his people, and also intercessors on behalf of
the people. Moses fulfils these functions very well, especially as the covenant
mediator, as well as in his great intercession in Exodus 33. As we have seen,
Deuteronomy 18:19 presupposes Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, where the author of
Deuteronomy 18:19 rewrites these texts to root prophecy in the Horeb revelation.93
Apparently the author is aware that Moses at Horeb was the true mediator, and then
transposes this identity to the person of the prophet, in the sense that what the people
asked from Moses in terms of religious guidance, the people would continue asking
from the prophets.  

As we have concluded in chapters 2 and 3, Moses is much more than a prophet.
The question arises: Is the “prophet like Moses” supposed to be comparable to Moses
in a literal or in a figurative way? In other words, if Moses was not strictly a prophet
himself, is the prophet like him to emulate him in being a leader to Israel? Or is the
“prophet like Moses” simply to emulate Moses’ prophetic role?94 What is the specific
role of the “prophet like Moses”? Von Rad asks if the prophet is to be an announcer
of the law or a mediator of the covenant.95 For Kraus and Nicholson, the office here
depicted is clearly that of the covenant mediator.96 James Muilenburg too considers
Deuteronomy 18:15ff as the aetiology of the “prophet like Moses” as covenant
mediator.97 Bernard Levinson contends that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 presents the
prophet as constrained by the limitations of the Torah. The aim of this text, especially

92 Ibid, 38.
93 THOMAS RÖMER, “Moses, Israel’s First Prophet, and the Formation of the Deuteronomistic and
Prophetic Libraries”, in Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the
Formation of a History, Mignon R. Jacobs – Raymond F. Person Jr. (eds.), Atlanta (Ga.): Society of
Biblical Literature, 2013, 131.
94 STACKERT, A Prophet like Moses, 37.
95 VON RAD, Deuteronomy, 124. In this case Joshua was both.
96 HANS-JOACHIM KRAUS, Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel, (=TS; 51), Zollikon-
Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957; NICHOLSON, Deuteronomy and Tradition, 76. This position is held
by many scholars, all of whom retain that the origins of the traditions behind Deuteronomy originated
from the North. For a complete list of studies I refer to GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “Un profeta como Moisés”, 293
n.24.
in 9-14, is to reduce the ecstatic and visionary character of prophecy, and ensure that the prophetic word is aligned with the Torah. The future prophets are to be like Moses in four ways: 1) like Moses with respect to legitimacy; 2) like Moses, the prophet will only speak words that YHWH will place in his mouth: Deuteronomy 18:18//Exodus 4:15//Jeremiah 1:9; 3) just as Moses is directly appointed by YHWH in Exodus 3–4 so too are the prophets whom YHWH will raise up; 4) the future prophets are to be like Moses in that they do not challenge in any way what Moses proclaimed, namely, the Torah.

Deuteronomy 18:15-18 contains the permanent promise of the prophetic charisma, manifesting itself amongst the people of God. These verses thus elect Moses as the model for all of the prophets of Israel, as Deuteronomy 34:10 does when stating the incomparability of Moses, placing him as the prototype of all prophecy. This makes the exegete of the Bible search for elements of biblical theology on prophetism in terms of the image that the Pentateuch gives to the person and the activity of Moses. Yet, as this study has shown so far, it appears that tradition along the ages attributed the prophetic title to Moses when the role of the prophet was very much extended. As Stökl concludes: “The historical value of the narratives in the Pentateuch which describe some of the actions of Moses, Aaron, Abraham and Miriam as prophetic is most likely negligible”. I identify in such texts the hand of the Deuteronomist, most probably seeking to impose the prophetic role on Moses. The line of influence is therefore in the opposite direction. It is evident that in Exodus 3–4 Moses’ mission is transformed from a hero into a prophetic one, where in terms of this role Moses becomes the mouthpiece of YHWH. Moses arises as the God-sent liberator and as such he has a threefold mission: 1) to remind the people of the divine promises to the fathers; 2) to tell them that YHWH will be with them as much as He

99 STACKERT, A Prophet like Moses, 139.
102 STÖKL, Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 176.
103 Auld rejects the idea of a deuteronomistic history, or rather, the idea of a history that was composed with deuteronomistic overtones. He calls the historical narrative running from Josh-2 Kings: “the Book of the Two Houses”, and concludes that “Deuteronomy learned from the story of kingship and prophecy, rather than the other way round”. See GRAEME AULD, “What Was a Biblical Prophet? Why Does it Matter?”, in Reading from Right to Left, Cheryl J. Exum - Hugh G. M. Williamson (eds.), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003, 1-12.
was with him (Ex 3:11); 3) to lead them out of Egypt to the Promised Land. As such Moses is primarily a leader, but he is also the intermediary between the people and God. In this sense Moses has a prophetic function fulfilled.  

Summing up: the law of the prophets offers an aetiology where the origin of prophecy lies at Mount Horeb. The prophets are designated as the true successors of Moses for they are the only institution which knows its origin at Horeb, where Moses received the Torah. Moses as the leader and mediator of the people is presented as the prototype prophet. The role of the “prophet like Moses”, therefore, is to act as mediator between God and the people. The role of this prophet is first set in contrast to the prohibited divinatory offices. The Canaanites referred to their magicians, sorcerers and all kinds of soothsayers to discover the will of their gods. In Israel, this role is solely fulfilled by the “prophet like Moses”. Such a prophet will have the Torah as the static and ultimate principle with which to guide and lead the people. Just as the people constantly referred to Moses for guidance and to inquire of God (Ex 18:15 ִים לֹה ש אֱָּלִדְר), so will they need to consult the “prophet like Moses” for similar guidance, as the need arises. Indeed, the Torah does not change, but times and situations do change, and so, just as the people referred to Moses as new situations arose, so God sends his prophets to explain to the new generations what that Torah means in that particular new situation. Indeed, as we have seen above, the promise in Deuteronomy 18:15 is expressed by the imperfect יָקִים, and refers to more than one prophet.

4.5.2.1 One Prophet or a Series of Prophets?

This question has been one major issue concerning this text. Moses is here presented as a prototype prophet, and a “prophet like him” is promised. The question is: does this promise allude to a single prophet like him whom God will call or raise up in the future? Or does it refer to a line of prophets? As we have seen, grammatically we can interpret the imperfect of v15 (יָקִים) as iterative, and consequently, the noun

105 LOHFINK, “Distribution of the Functions of Power”, 349.
106 GESENIUS, Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar, 107i.
107 Ibid.
(נָבִיא) as having a collective overtone. If we consider the wider context, namely, this law as being part of the laws of institutions in Deuteronomy, with the law of the judges, the kings, and the priests, then it is clear that this text is referring to the prophets in general, and therefore to a line of prophets, where practically each prophet would constitute a “prophet like Moses”, as long as that prophet proves to be authentic. The warning of the danger of false prophets in Deuteronomy 18:21-22 confirms the interpretation that the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 is distributive, for it could hardly refer to such a risk with a single occurrence. Driver had already concluded in 1902:

“The argument of the passage shows that the “prophet” contemplated is not a single individual, belonging to a distant future, but Moses’ representative for the time being, whose office it would be to supply Israel, whenever in its history occasion should arise, with needful guidance and advice: in other words, that the reference is not to an individual prophet, but to a prophetical order”.

The debate continued. Von Rad considered it essential to ascertain whether the promise of the “prophet like Moses” in Deuteronomy 18:15 is to be understood widely into the future, referring to the succession of prophets to come, or else whether it referred to one single fulfilment, in the sense of the coming of the “eschatological mediator”. To this we have to add the view whether the traditions presenting the “prophet like Moses” actually had one single historical figure in mind. Barstad for example concluded that Joshua is the “prophet like Moses”. Von Rad concludes that the identity of the prophet is not important, rather it’s the presentation of the “one outstanding office by means of which Israel comes into quite direct contact with God”. Von Rad in fact sees this office not so much in the light of the great prophets of judgment, but rather in terms of the way Moses is represented in Deuteronomy,

---

109 This interpretation is strengthened by the tradition that YHWH will not cease from sending to his people, his servants the prophets, a tradition clearly attested in 2 Kings 17:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2; Jeremiah 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19.
112 VON RAD, Deuteronomy, 123.
113 BARSTAD, “Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 237-251.
114 VON RAD, Deuteronomy, 124.
interceding for the people, suffering as their representative, and actually dying outside
of the Promised Land, much in line with Deutero-Isaiah’s suffering servant.115

According to the majority of scholars, the text clearly implies that Moses was
the first in a line of prophets.116 It appears that this text is seeking to legitimise the
authority of the prophetic office and thus points to a series of successors. Deuteronomy
34:10-12 however seems to present a problem for this interpretation.117 Deuteronomy
34:10 claims: “And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom
the LORD knew face to face”. The issue here is not the incomparability of Moses, but
the syntax of the sentence. Is תב qualifying the arising of a prophet? Or is it qualifying
the status of the “prophet like Moses”? Many commentators saw it as referring to signs
and wonders or the incomparability of Moses. Miller however argues that since the
majority of scholars agree that Deuteronomy 34:10 is later than Deuteronomy 18:18,
there was an apparent shift in understanding, namely, from a line of prophets to a
singular prophet.118 He thus translates: “until now there has not arisen a “prophet like
Moses”. According to him there was a shift from the reference to the prophets to a
future expectation of a singular prophet with high eschatological overtones.119 I do not
agree that the particle תע here is referring to the temporal aspect. In my opinion, the
text is referring to the incomparability of Moses. The text is quite clear: there has never
arisen a “prophet like Moses” and indeed, there never will! Stress is here being made
on incomparability. So I do not agree with Miller that Deuteronomy 34:10 alludes to
the future eschatological “prophet like Moses”. I do agree, however, that there was a
shift in Jewish theology, especially in the late post-exilic period when messianism
started entering into the foreground. It was then that Deuteronomy 18:18 and
Deuteronomy 34:10 started being interpreted as referring to the future eschatological
“prophet like Moses”.120

115 Ibid, 124.
116 JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP, The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible,
117 PATRICK MILLER, “Moses my Servant”: The Deuteronomic Portrait of Moses”, Interpretation 41
118 Ibid.
119 Ibid.
120 Ultimately this is confirmed in the New Testament, where it becomes clear that Jesus is the
eschatological “prophet like Moses”. There are various New Testament texts that allude to this
theology. The most notable allusion would be the famous “Sermon on the Mount”, where Matthew
presents Jesus as the New Moses. Maybe the best example of a New Testament text that implies that
Jesus is the prophet like Moses is Acts 7:37.
4.5.2.2 The Promised Eschatological Prophet

In the previous section we concluded that the promised prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, refers to a series of prophets, rather than a singular prophet. Later Jewish tradition, however, started interpreting the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, as referring to the eschatological prophet who should come. This interpretation started somewhere in the late 2nd century B.C.E. It is a fact that Israel never fully recovered from the disaster of the Exile. The Davidic kingdom was never reinstated, the Second Temple did not reach the original splendour of the first one, and the various institutions continued to suffer. At this stage, there was a general longing for the good old days, and it is within this context that Messianism arose during the Second Temple period.

It is interesting to note that in Malachi 3:22-24 Moses appears together with the prophet Elijah. In this text, Elijah represents the prophets, as the prophet who has to come, whilst Moses represents the Torah. The final redactors of the Pentateuch, after the disaster of the Exile, started expecting an eschatological restoration that, according to the prophetic tradition of Malachi 3:24, was to be brought about by Elijah. It is not unthinkable that in Malachi 3:23-24 there is an allusion to Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Most probably the reference to Elijah is due to the fact that in 2 Kings 2:11, Elijah did not die but was taken into heaven. There are in fact various parallels between Moses and Elijah: Elijah marches forty days and forty nights to Horeb, for example, where like Moses, he is the beneficiary of a theophany. It is probable that the author of Malachi 3:22-24 makes of Elijah the “prophet like Moses” promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Here Moses and Elijah are juxtaposed to form a complex symbol of the Torah and the Prophets, both forming a continuum. Jewish tradition then built upon this typological re-reading of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, starting with Malachi 3:22-24, seeing Elijah as the promised eschatological prophet, as promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. This development occurred during the time when the *Nebi’im*, the second section of the Jewish canon, was being closed. During this time
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122 Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 43.
123 Ibid, 68.
124 Ibid, 69.
125 Ibid, 70.
there was a general longing for the days of the Davidic kingdom, and even more so for the times of Moses. Apparently Malachi 3:22-24 reflects the belief that the eschatological “prophet like Moses” would come before or contemporaneously with this Messiah. As we have seen, the source for this belief must have been Deuteronomy 18:15-22. Whilst during the Exile, the “prophet like Moses” was being interpreted as referring to prophets from the past, the expectation of Second Temple Judaism led to the belief in the coming of a single eschatological prophet. Keeping in mind Mark 8:28, the best candidate for this prophet was Elijah, but as Teeple notes, “the idea of the eschatological prophet was not standardised and was very fluid.

4.5.3 The Criterion of Prophetic Verification in Deut 18:21-22

As it is evident in the Former Prophets, prophecy can be an ambiguous phenomenon that is open to potential abuses. Lamentations 4:12-13 attests that prophecy was part of the problem contributing to the Exile. As Fabian Dapila notes, the prophet was expected to be faithful to YHWH and as such, the prophet could be used as YHWH pleased, even if that meant that the prophet undergo humiliation and rejection. “A prophet was expected to deliver the message given by Yahweh as accurately as possible. It is not in the power of the prophet as a divine messenger to determine or verify the purpose of the message”. It is a fact that Zedekiah and his band of prophets in 1 Kings 22:19-23 received a message of victory from YHWH and delivered it faithfully. The prophets were faithful to YHWH, for it was YHWH who sent his deceiving spirit to lead Ahab astray. It is evident that YHWH’s plan is sovereign.

---

127 Ibid, 121. In Qumran, the Teacher of Righteousness could very well be this Mosaic eschatological prophet of 1QS 9:11 “until there shall come a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.”
130 In fact, Zedekiah and his band of prophets mislead Ahab who went for war and died. This was the divine plan, and in this sense, even if Micaiah’s prophecy ultimately contradicted their prophecy, and Micaiah’s prophecy was vindicated, Zedekiah and his followers were still true and authentic messengers of YHWH. See DAPILA, “Prophetic Fulfillment”, 24.
know whom to believe?” YHWH’s message was to be delivered even if it meant that the prophet be humiliated, as has been the case of Jeremiah. Jonah refused his prophetic ministry precisely because he knew of the possibility that YHWH allows for the humiliation and rejection of the prophet “so long as it led to the fulfilment of a divine plan”. Jeremiah 28 also attests to an instance where the prophet Hananiah blatantly contradicted and opposed Jeremiah. It was therefore paramount that the people would be able to distinguish true from false prophecy.

Deuteronomy 18:21-22 presents a criterion to be used in discerning true from false prophecy. Indeed, these verses charge the listener of prophecy with the responsibility of establishing whether it is true or false. Johnstone identifies three criteria of verification in the Deuteronomic law of the prophets, where the second criterion is subordinated to the first, and both are subsumed under the third. The first and the chief criterion is conformity with the Torah (Deut 13). The second criterion is that of prophecy fulfilment, which is subordinate to Deuteronomy 13:3. Deuteronomy 13:3, in fact, gives a proviso to the case of prophecy fulfilment, namely, that if a prophesied word does come true, but the prophet’s preaching was enticing to apostasy, that prophecy is false in the first place. According to Johnstone, the third criterion is Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 which sets authentic prophecy as being exclusively in conformity with the role of Moses in both form and content. The fundamental Deuteronomic criterion for true prophecy is therefore conformity with the role of Moses, for Moses is the one who received and communicated the Torah. Moses thus became the paradigm of authentic prophecy in Deuteronomy 18, whereas Deuteronomy 13 stipulates that the surest criterion for authentic prophecy is “fidelity to the Torah”. The Mosaic Torah emerges as the model and norm for every future prophecy. In a sense, future prophets may offer new revelations in terms of them
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132 Ibid; DAPILA, “Prophetic Fulfilment”, 16.
133 SCHMIDT, “Prophetengesetz”, 59.
134 Indeed Johnstone sees this criterion as unhelpful, particularly in situations of urgent decisions.
135 Barstad argues that the prophetic word is to be measured with the deuteronomic law. If there is any disagreement between the prophet’s word and Deuteronomy, the prophet should be disregarded. Deuteronomy 13 sets the status of prophecy as a second class revelation subordinate to the Law of Moses. See BARSTAD, “Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 241.
137 Ibid.
applying the Torah to the Sitz im Leben of their community, but they cannot go against the Torah. As Philips concludes: “By regarding Moses as the first prophet, the deuteronomists made it clear that the function of his successor was to confirm the truth of the law, and seek its enforcement”.

The second criterion, prophecy fulfilment, however, presents a serious problem. The majority of scholars contend that this criterion, in Deuteronomy 18:21-22, is indeed useless. It is a fact that on the logical level, this criterion makes no sense, for if there is a prophecy of incumbent doom, it would make the prophetic warning redundant, since that warning is aimed at achieving repentance and the consequent aversion of that same doom. First of all it would make no sense to wait for the prophecy to be verified! Secondly, this law undermines the very institution of prophecy because as Schmidt notes, the prophet is sent to preach mischief so that the people repent. But if the people do repent, the disaster would be averted, and the prophet would be proven false! It is true, that as we have seen above, the prophet was called to preach YHWH’s message, even if that would lead to a humiliation, as was the case of Jonah. But Deuteronomy 18:20 underlines that what is at stake is much more than just the prophet’s reputation! Indeed, it is the very life of the prophet.

140 ROY L. HELLER, Power, Politics, and Prophecy, 27. Indeed Carroll states that this was “inadequate and unrealistic criteriology which was probably due to the lack of the writer’s experience of prophecy in action”. See ROBERT CARROLL, When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions, London: SCM Press, 1979, 186.
141 Indeed, Christensen concludes: “The book of Jonah is a profound poetic reflection on the meaning of the law of the prophets in Deuteronomy 18:9-22… in the book of Jonah, the conflict between true and false prophecy was internalized within the person of a single prophetic figure, who demonstrates by his action the curious fact that to be a “true prophet” in the sense of doing what God asks Jonah to do makes him out to be a “false prophet” in terms of the law in Deuteronomy 18:22, at least in a superficial reading of the story”. CHRISTENSEN DUANE L., Deuteronomy 1: 1-21: 9, (=WBC; 6A), Dallas Texas: Word Books, 2001, 412.
142 SCHMIDT, “Prophetengesetz”, 65. Indeed Jeremiah 18:7-10 presents YHWH as potentially changing his mind, thus leading to an outcome which is different from that predicted by the prophetic preaching. If one utilises the criterion of Deuteronomy 18:21-22 alone in discerning prophecy, there is a potential risk of rendering every prophet illegitimate. See TODD HIBBARD, “True and False Prophecy: Jeremiah’s Revision of Deuteronomy”, JSOT 35 (2011), 356.
143 Schellenberg argues that the book of Jonah was the work of a literati group wanting to emphasise the fact that indeed, the disaster of the Exile was evitable, should the people have given heed to the prophets. The conclusion of the book of Jonah stands to underline that in the end, God’s judgement is superior to the human judgement of the prophet, who should not feel jeopardised by the fact that his prediction was averted by repentance. Rather, the prophet should rejoice that his mission was not merely accomplished, like that of Jeremiah and the rest, but actually successful, because it was met with repentance and ultimately salvation. See ANNETTE SCHELLENBERG, “An Anti-Prophet among the Prophets? On the Relationship of Jonah to Prophecy”, JSOT 39 (2015) 362.
that is at stake,\textsuperscript{144} for the prophet whose word does not come to be, is a prophet who spoke presumptuously, and should according to Deuteronomy 18:20, be put to death! But as we have seen above, in such a case the prophet should have nothing to fear! We have seen that YHWH’s plan is sovereign. The prophet should not fear death if he is given a lying spirit by YHWH. His main and only concern should be “being faithful” to YHWH’s message. If what he predicts does not come to be, it should not be a problem, since it is part of YHWH’s plan. At the end of the day, as Deuteronomy 18:19 makes clear, the death penalty of a false prophet is not in the hands of the people, but is carried out exclusively by YHWH! Moreover, if the doom does not occur, the reputation of the prophet is spared, because the primary object of the prophet’s preaching is always repentance, never the doom. So there would be no contradiction there.

4.5.3.1 The Relationship between Deut 18:21-22 and Jer 28

Jeremiah seems to address the issue of false prophecy extensively in Jeremiah 5:30-31; 6:9-15; 14:11-16; 23:9-32; 27; 28 and 29.\textsuperscript{145} As already stated above, Jeremiah 28:8-9 appears to modify Deuteronomy 18:22 for distinguishing true from false prophecy by narrowing down its margin of interpretation. It sets the criterion straight that the prophet of doom is \textit{ipso facto} authentic, whilst the prophet preaching \textit{shalom} tends to be false, and thus has to carry the burden of proof. Maimonides takes on this criterion and develops it into a clear guideline of discernment: “Words of calamity by a prophet, if not coming true, are no refutation of prophecy. If there is repentance, the Lord will repeal the intended evil. However, assurance of good things which don’t come true is a sign of a false prophet”.\textsuperscript{146}

\textsuperscript{144} Hibbard argues that the language of Jonah 3:8b-10 is a commentary on Jeremiah. At the repentance of the people of Ninwe, YHWH changes his verdict. This prompts Jonah in 4:3b to claim that it would be better for him to die than to live, most probably this being a criticism of Deuteronomy 18:21-22. See Hibbard, “True and false prophecy”, 357.

\textsuperscript{145} For this very reason, Nicholson argues that Deuteronomy 18:21-22 actually stems from the book of Jeremiah, rather than it being a source for it. Moreover, the person who is to execute the false prophet is not mentioned, for presumably it is to be YHWH’s dealing. This reminds the reader immediately of the prophet Hananiah’s death as announced by Jeremiah in Jeremiah 28:16. See Nicholson, “Deuteronomy 18:9-22”, 156.

\textsuperscript{146} Maimonides, \textit{Hilkhot Yesodei ha-Torah}, 10:4.
In the light of this apparent influence, scholars have grappled with the issue of intertextuality. Schmidt argues that Jeremiah does not apply the criterion of Deuteronomy 18:21-22 to himself, since he appears sure of his message.\textsuperscript{147} According to Schmidt, it is Deuteronomy 18:21-22 that uses Jeremiah. Todd Hibbard argues that it is the other way round, for this Deuteronomic criterion for discerning prophecy appears to be criticised by Jeremiah, especially in Jeremiah 18; 26; and 28. Jeremiah is in fact more concerned about moral and social justice, and the key accent is on YHWH potentially changing his mind should the people conform.\textsuperscript{148} Petersen argues that Deuteronomy 18:15-22 is dependent on the book of Jeremiah in four ways: 1) YHWH putting his word in the mouth of the prophet; 2) YHWH commanding the prophet to speak his word; 3) the motif of the death of the prophet who speaks presumptuously; 4) the criterion of waiting for prophecy fulfilment.\textsuperscript{149} Scholars argue that the literary unit of Jeremiah 26–29, organised around the theme of prophets and conflict, has deuteronomistic origins.\textsuperscript{150} Hibbard argues that the Deuteronomistic redactors of Jeremiah used the prophetic critique to offer a new understanding of prophecy.\textsuperscript{151} In such a case of conflicting prophecy, only one can be authentic. At face value, since Hananiah is proven incorrect, and Jeremiah’s message is fulfilled, the criterion of Deuteronomy 18:21-22 is confirmed. Contrary to Hananiah’s prophecy, restoration does not occur within two years, and he actually dies, fulfilling Jeremiah’s prediction (Jer 28:16), also underlining the punishment of death, as foreseen by Deuteronomy 18:20. Yet in this episode, the disconfirmation of Hananiah still requires two years, whilst Hananiah dies just two months after Jeremiah’s utterance. Indeed, Jeremiah is proven as the true prophet, whilst Hananiah is proven as a false one. Ultimately, the one discrediting the false prophet and carrying out his execution is YHWH himself. However, the criterion of prophecy fulfilment still proves problematic.

In my opinion, the above problems and contradictions can be solved if we view the issue of prophecy fulfilment as carrying more of an ideological import rather than
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a practical one.\textsuperscript{152} Römer in fact argues that Deuteronomy 18:21-22 was added after the destruction of Jerusalem in order to legitimate the deuteronomistic corpus of the prophets of doom as against the prophets of salvation.\textsuperscript{153} Originally, the prophets were those who preached the observance of the law and the consequent social/religious chaos should that law be ignored. At some point in time, particularly during the Exile, a change in perception took place and this message came to be regarded as essentially fulfilled.\textsuperscript{154} The Deuteronomists behind these texts wanted to show that the doom that Moses and the prophets had predicted in the face of infidelity to the Torah was actually fulfilled in the Exile. This criterion sets the agenda straight that the returnees from the Exile are to avoid the mistake of their forefathers. Johnstone argues that the exilic criteria for discerning true from false prophecy are presented in Deuteronomy 13:2-6 and 18:21-22, and it is widely recognised that these criteria were also developed in the deuteronomistically edited Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{155} Apparently, the decline of prophecy in the exilic and post-exilic periods occurred through the idealisation of prophecy, in the persona of Moses, making of him a fictionalised archetypal figure, providing strict criteria for the evaluation of prophecy.\textsuperscript{156} The criteria of Deuteronomy 13:2-6 and 18:14-22 set unattainable standards for the prophets and thus they relativize and subordinate the prophets to the Torah. According to Johnstone, these texts served as instruments for the decline of prophecy.\textsuperscript{157} On a different tone, Barstad interprets Deuteronomy 18:21-22 as having an anti-prophetic thrust, since according to him the word of Moses is contrasted with the words of the other prophets.\textsuperscript{158} I do not agree. First of all, the author clearly seeks to give authority to the prophets by tracing the
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\textsuperscript{158} \textsc{Barstad}, “Prophets in Deuteronomy”, 246. Barstad argues that the book of Deuteronomy “is hostile to prophecy”. Yet this appears to be far from the case. Indeed, as Achenbach notes, the law of the prophets seems to foresee the time where there would no longer be any kings in Israel. Apparently the ideal political system as presented in Deuteronomy 18:15-18 is a society led by prophetically inspired leaders. See \textsc{Öeinhard Achenbach}, “A Prophet like Moses” (Deuteronomy 18,15) - “No Prophet like Moses” (Deuteronomy 34,10): Some Observations on the Relation between the Pentateuch and the Latter Prophets”, in \textit{The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research}, Thomas B. Dozeman – Konrad Schmid – Baruch J. Schwartz (eds.), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011, 447.
origins of prophecy within the foundational revelation at Horeb, and secondly, the author also links it with the founding leader (Deut 18:16).\footnote{O’BRIEN, “Deuteronomy 16.18-18.22”, 169.} It is quite clear that the Deuteronomistic redactors of the book of Jeremiah worked to achieve deep intertextual relations with Deuteronomy 18:18, and show a clear enough attempt to set up Jeremiah’s standards as comparable to Moses. As we have seen, it appears that in Jeremiah 28:8ff, Jeremiah, in his self-defence against Hananiah, implies that the burden of proof lies with the proclamation of salvation not doom.\footnote{ZIMMERLI, “Der “Prophet” im Pentateuch”, 206.} Does this mean that prophecy of doom is superior to a prophecy of salvation? As already pointed out, in Deuteronomy 18:21-22, it appears the other way round, since the people are asked not to fear (גור) that prophet, if the prophetic word is proven false. Indeed, if we apply Jeremiah’s criterion, the people would not have anything to fear in the first place for the very fact that he would have preached shalom/salvation, and not for the fact that he spoke presumptuously! In my opinion, this specific criterion of verification exposes the hand of the Deuteronomist who wants to lay emphasis on the importance of the prophet Jeremiah. We have already seen elsewhere that Jeremiah was the champion prophet of the Deuteronomistic school. It is quite evident that the late exilic/early post-exilic deuteronomistic editor saw in Jeremiah the true prophet. More importantly, Jeremiah had predicted the doom of Jerusalem owing to infidelity to the Torah, and that doom actually verified itself. I thus consider Deuteronomy 18:21-22 as being the Deuteronomists’ apologia pro Jeremia. We also have to keep in mind that the Deuteronomists could have used this criterion as a legitimization for Moses’ speech especially as depicted in Deuteronomy 31:16-21 where the Exile is “foretold”, as Moses is told by YHWH that the people will face many evils on account of their apostasy.\footnote{JEAN-PIERRE SONNET, “La construction narrative de la figure de Moïse comme prophète dans le Deutéronome”, RTP 142 (2010) 11.} In fact, the Song presented to the people by Moses in Deuteronomy 32 recounts the disaster (Deut 32:15-25) and the restoration (Deut 32:36). As we have seen in chapter 1, Deuteronomy 32 is a late text, and constitutes a vaticinium ex eventu. The Deuteronomists want to portray that with the Exile, this prophetic word of the Song of Moses was fulfilled. So apparently, the Deuteronomist is working with Deuteronomy 18:21-22 and Deuteronomy 31-32 to present Moses as the prototype and true prophet. The so-called Deuteronomistic History aims at showing events as the
fulfilment of prophecy, even more so as the fulfilment of the judgements and the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy. In the end, the Deuteronomists wanted to underline the fact that the destruction of the two kingdoms, Jerusalem, and the Temple, were all foreseen by the prophetic warnings. Indeed, the falsehood of the prophets who prophesied wellbeing and *shalom* were exposed for what they were.\(^{162}\) Thus, the criterion established in Deuteronomy 18:21-22 for the verification of prophecy should not be understood as a practical rule among others; rather it was used as a basic principle for confirming the deuteronomistic theology of history.\(^{163}\) The deuteronomist wanted to build an ideal society for the return from the Exile, and Deuteronomy 18:21-22 thus forms an integral part of the deuteronic law of the prophets, for it presents the Torah as the ultimate revelation to Moses. The prophets, in turn, would continue Moses’ work of mediation, by applying the Torah to the emergent situations that the people would have to face. The Exile proved the prophets right, and therefore, rather than being a criterion, Deuteronomy 18:21-22 served more as an *apologia pro prophetis*. The prophets who exhorted the people to obey the Torah to avoid the Exile had all been proven trustworthy by the Exile. Deuteronomy 18:21-22, thus, became the Magna Carta, the credential of the prophets. 2 Kings 24:2 clearly blames the Exile on the fact that the prophetic warnings were all ignored. This law was aimed for the returnees and its message is very clear: “The doom that the prophets preached occurred! Take care not to repeat these past mistakes”.

### 4.5.3.2 The Relationship between Deut 18:15, 18 and Deut 34:10-12

Deuteronomy ends by proclaiming Moses as a prophet without equal. Perlitt sees a stark contradiction between Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 and Deuteronomy 34:10-12 since the former promises a line of prophets like Moses, and the latter presents the incomparability of Moses.\(^{164}\) Petersen in fact argues that in Deuteronomy 34 Moses is constructed as a prophet in a way that distinctly distinguishes him from the rest of the prophets, and therefore Deuteronomy 34 does not reflect a tradition of Mosaic
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prophets. As already stated, Deuteronomy 34:10-12 belongs to a late redaction, most probably the final redaction of the Pentateuch. There are scholars who disagree with this view. Stackert claims that Deuteronomy 34:10-12 is a reflection of the Elohist on Moses’ prophecy after his death. Stackert, who claims that the Elohist considers Moses as the first and last prophet of Israel, sees an elision of the verb “to be” in v10, and therefore interprets this verse as a categorical declarative sentence of the end of prophecy: “never again there arose a prophet in Israel, as Moses did”. In effect, he claims that there is no real contradiction between Deuteronomy 18:15-22 and Deuteronomy 34:10 since they arise from two different sources, namely D and E. According to Stackert, D uses E’s Deuteronomy 34:10a without any notable alteration. Štrba boldly disassociates himself from the consensus of the majority and offers a completely different reading of Deuteronomy 34:10-12. According to him, v9, which deals with the installation of Joshua, should be read in conjunction with vv10-12, and concludes that vv10-12 syntactically refer back to Joshua. V9 has Joshua as the subject and consequently v10a would have Joshua as the subject implying that “since Joshua, no prophet has arisen in Israel like Moses”. Blažej Štrba in fact concludes that Deuteronomy 34:10-12 is not an epitaph of Moses, but actually declares that Joshua was the “prophet like Moses”, equal to Moses. He attributes Deuteronomy 34:9-12 to the hand of a Hexateuchal redactor who aimed at bridging Deuteronomy and the Pentateuch on the one side and the book of Joshua on the other.

One key element is identifying the syntactical function of the comparative כ in v10. As we have seen above, the comparative כ can express “a relation of either perfect (equality) or imperfect (resemblance) similitude”. Richard Nelson argues that Deuteronomy 34:10 presents the latter case: “like Moses” does not necessarily mean
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“equal to Moses”, so that Deuteronomy 34:10 presents no real contradiction to Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Nihan argues that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 was actually revised in Deuteronomy 34:10-12 to underline the absolute superiority of Moses. It continues to build upon deuteronomic tradition, especially of Deuteronomy 13. No prophet can go against the Torah, since the Torah is the ultimate revelation of YHWH to Moses, as revealed on Horeb. Moses is not repeatable, however Deuteronomy 18:15-19 addresses the issue that mediation between YHWH and the people is required, particularly in the guidance and leadership required by the people to follow the Torah in evolving situations within the particular Sitz im Leben. This will be the task of the “prophet like Moses”, whose job is to interpret and apply the Torah of Moses. So really and truly, there is no need to see any contradiction between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Deuteronomy 34:10-12. Indeed, there is a continuation and an evolution.

It is interesting to note that Deuteronomy 34:10-12 presents the expression that YHWH knew Moses face to face (ל־פָנִים אין). This phrase evokes another text that stresses the incomparability of Moses as compared with the prophets. In Numbers 12:8, YHWH states that with the prophets he speaks in visions and dreams, whereas with Moses he speaks mouth to mouth (הֵשֵבֶל פָנֵים). Achenbach argues that this term does not emphasise intimacy, but rather faithful human mediation in the passing of the message, an act of literal communication. The promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, that YHWH will place his word in the mouth of the prophet, paralleled with Jeremiah 1:7, 9, implies that after the canonical Torah, communicated by Moses, the oral teaching would be continued by certain elected prophets. This actually divests the traditional forms of prophecy through divination and dreams, and lays emphasis on a direct communication of YHWH’s word. So the incomparability of Moses appears to lie in the fact that he passed on the canonical Torah. The prophets after him would communicate YHWH’s word to the community, not to the level of a canonical Torah, but rather an application of that Torah to the concrete evolving Sitz im Leben of the
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community. Achenbach argues that this was the work of a group of priestly scribes who wanted to change the concept of Deuteronomy 18:15, rejecting the possibility that any prophetic tradition could claim to stand above the Torah of Moses.\footnote{ACHENBACH, "A prophet like Moses", 453-454.}

The deuteronomistic law of the prophets in Deuteronomy 18:9-22 seeks to formulate a doctrine about the relationship between the Law, the authority of Moses, and that of the prophets without setting them as opposites. Like Moses, the prophet conveys the word of YHWH to the people.\footnote{Whilst the prophets are not depicted as speaking with YHWH mouth to mouth like Moses, they do receive the word of God in their own mouth: Deuteronomy 18:18 יִשְֹרְאִי לָכֶם בְּפִיו יְהוָה יִשְֹרְאִי לָכֶם בְּפִיו; Jeremiah 1:9 יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו יְהוָה יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו; Isaiah 6:7 יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו יְהוָה יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו; Ezekiel 3:1 יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו יְהוָה יָדִיא לָכֶם בְּפִיו.} The authority of Moses will remain unequalled, for he is the direct receiver of the Law from YHWH, receiving it, face to face, indeed, mouth to mouth. This will be continued by the prophets, whom YHWH will appoint to reveal to them the application of the Torah in the concrete requirements of the Sitz im Leben. There is therefore no contradiction between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Deuteronomy 34:10-12. Apart from underlining the intimacy of the relationship between YHWH and Moses, Numbers 12:6-8 implies that what Moses received was the fundamental revelation of Torah which could never be altered by any other prophecy. The note of Deuteronomy 34:10-12 states that there has never been a “prophet like Moses”.

In the end, the majority of scholars agree that Deuteronomy 34:10-12 can be identified in the setting of the canonical closure of the Torah, and it thus reflects a “canonical re-reading” of the life of Moses. Many scholars agree that Deuteronomy 34:10-12 comes from the hands of the Pentateuchal redactor who underlines the incomparability of Moses and set to close the Torah there.\footnote{ромер – бреттлер, “Deuteronomy 34”, 401-419.} This text is imbued with the theology of canonical interpretation establishing the canonical relationship between the Torah and the Nebi’im.\footnote{nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 44.} Moses is thus presented as the perfect paradigm prophet, and as such, the Torah is being presented as the definitive revelation given to Moses on Sinai. Consequently, the rest of the prophets are a mere commentary on the Torah.
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4.6 Redaction Criticism of Deut 18:9-22

As we have seen, Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is most probably a text written in the late exilic, early post-exilic, period. Many scholars however do consider Deuteronomy 18:9-22 as a composite text made up of an early stratum belonging to the 6th cent B.C.E. that was probably part of Urdeuteronomium, and of a later redaction belonging to the late exilic/early post-exilic period. However, I consider the deuteronomistic stratum as more than just a mere redaction. In my opinion, the deuteronomistic author could have used some minor laws from Urdeuteronomium to compose this new section of the laws of offices, precisely to address the pressing needs of the return from the Exile. Smend argues that “the Deuteronomic Law of the Prophets” (Deut 18:9-22) has doubtlessly been reworked by deuteronomistic writers if not even composed by them”.

Various scholars have proposed various solutions as to the redactional strata of Deuteronomy 18:9-22. A.F. Pukko sees vv9-14 as belonging to Urdeuteronomium, whilst vv15-22 as being redactional. Steuernagel considers vv10-12a as belonging to the primitive text whilst v9 and 12b as being redactional. L’Hour is of the opinion that the original text is to be found in v10a, 11, and 12b; and v10b and 11b as added by the deuteronomistic redactor. Von Rad holds that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is composed of three parts, namely vv9-14; vv15-18 and vv19-22. Seitz identifies four redactions in Deuteronomy 18:9-22: 1) the pre-deuteronomistic text vv10-12a; 2) a deuteronomistic collection in vv9, 12b, 14-15; 3) a deuteronomistic elaboration vv16-18; and 4) a deuteronomistic elaboration vv19-22. Martin Rose concludes that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is composed of three strata: Deuteronomy 18:10-12 as pre-deuteronomistic, Deuteronomy 18:9, 14-20 as deuteronomistic, and Deuteronomy
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18:13, 21-22 as a late-deuteronomistic addition. Barstad identifies a similar division. According to him, Deuteronomy 18:9-14 deals with idolatry and only marginally with prophecy; Deuteronomy 18:15-19 is of deuteronomistic origins; whilst Deuteronomy 18:21-22 is a later discrediting of prophecy, in the sense that prophecy can only be confirmed after the stipulated lapse of time, thus undermining the very institution of prophecy. For Barstad the issue of the “prophet like Moses” is concluded in v19, in that whoever would not listen to Moses’ successor, God would demand a reckoning with him. According to Barstad, this lays emphasis on Joshua as successor of Moses, paralleled in what the people affirm to Joshua, as recorded in Joshua 1:16-18. He argues that Deuteronomy 18:21-22 comes from a final redaction since the word of Moses is contrasted with that of the other prophets. For Barstad, this is evidence of an “anti-prophetic” thrust. He concludes: “Thus what we find represented in the so-called “laws of prophecy” in Deuteronomy 18 are three different kinds of “prophetic activity”, the individual pericopeia of which have no internal logical connection”. If, however, we accept the three redactional layers, we can identify a strong logical connection; after all, a final redactor would have used some minimal logic to organise his material! Von Rad had identified the following logical flow within this pericope: Deuteronomy 18:9-14 lists prohibited practices that seek to ascertain the will of the deity; Deuteronomy 18:15-20 presents the antithesis to these mantic practices in the office of the prophet; and Deuteronomy 18:21-22 present the simple criteria for Israel to discern the quality of the prophetic revelation. Muilenburg actually sees a climatic crescendo in the law of offices, especially marked off by the transition from the other offices through Deuteronomy 18:9-14 rendering two apodictic commands (9b-10; 13) followed by two stark motivations introduced by a strong כִּי (vv12,14). García López offered an extensive study of this pericope, concluding that this law is actually composed of an original to’ebah law, part of Urdeuteronomium, which was subsequently expanded by two further deuteronomistic
redactions. Apparently, the original to’ebah law consisted of the interdiction of divinatory practices, and is made up of vv10ab; 11; 12. The second redaction came from the hands of a deuteronomistic redactor who elaborated the chapters of Deuteronomy 5–11, and demarcated the to’ebah law with vv9a and 14. This redactor also placed the figure of the נבíיא in v15a as opposed to the forbidden practices, and also included the criterion of distinguishing true from false prophets of vv21-22. The second and last redaction expanded this law with vv15b-20 which presented another thematic interest, namely that of presenting prophecy as being derived from the person of Moses. AGarcía López argues that this section has the most notable thematic contacts with the Deuteronomistic History and with the book of Jeremiah. Schmidt argues that Deuteronomy 18: 9-15 constitutes an original core, containing many similarities with the priestly language, and was probably part of the pre-exilic law. According to him, the second part of the law consists of three subsections, vv16-18; 19-20 and 21-22. Probably the law was expanded thanks to the experience of Jeremiah or the traditions surrounding him, especially after the realisation of the truthfulness of his message, since in retrospect, the events of the Exile proved him right. Indeed, within the theological tradition of the Deuteronomists, especially in the light of the criterion of Deuteronomy 18:21-22, Jeremiah is decisively a true prophet.

From the above excursus of previous studies it is clear that the absolute majority of scholars agree that vv10-12 are pre-deuteronomistic. I agree that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is a composite one, with an original core consisting of the to’ebah law, which was later expanded into the law of the prophets. At a first redactional stage, the figure of the prophets might have been presented as the only means of divination that could be allowed in Israel. At the second and last redactional stage, the figure of the prophet had to be given further authority, and therefore Moses is presented as the first in a line of prophets. I affirm that the last part of this law, namely vv21-22, belongs to this last redaction. This section is more linked with
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Jeremiah 28 rather than with the standoff at Mount Carmel of 1 Kings 18. There, the issue was not the discernment of true from false prophecy, since it is very clear that Elijah was the true prophet, and the others were prophets of Ba’al, and did not purport to speak in the name of YHWH. The thematic link appears to be stronger with Jeremiah 28. Indeed, Jeremiah is the one who had predicted the disaster of the Exile and was therefore proven to be the true prophet. This criterion of prophecy fulfilment of vv21-22 appears to be a direct allusion to the authenticity of Jeremiah’s prophecies. We shall analyse this issue further below. So we conclude that there is a clear logic as to the evolution of this law. Whether we accept one or two deuteronomistic redactions, it is quite evident that the presentation of Moses as a prophet within this law comes from a late deuteronomistic hand, and this is of major importance for this study.

4.7 Conclusion

It is apparent that the return from the Exile marked a good parallelism with Israel’s entry into the land after the Exodus. The authors of Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 took full advantage of such a parallelism and sought to legislate a law for the people ordering and controlling the different offices in the light of past experience. Once bitten, twice shy, and therefore the law of the king aimed at containing his power. As O’Brien concludes, “each piece of legislation in this pericope aims to promote the Deuteronomic ideal for Israel as it prepares to occupy the land with many towns in proximity and in proximity to other nations with their kings and their multiple forms of mediation”. During the Exile, Israel had to face the challenges of multiculturalism, having to set itself apart from the other nations. With the return into the land, Israel would have to face similar challenges. Within this context, the legislation of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 seeks to envisage another way in which Israel will be set apart from the other nations via its intermediaries, the prophets. Whenever YHWH would want to speak to Israel, especially to apply the law to ever-evolving
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situations, he would speak through the “prophet like Moses” that he himself would raise up.

This text offers three main reasons as to why prophecy is instituted. The first is linked with the first part of the diptych, which is linked with the primitive to’eba law. Vv9-14 lists prohibited pagan cultic and mantic activities which the nations use as a means of determining the will of the deity. These practices are forbidden, so Israel can determine the will of God, especially in new evolving historical situations, through prophecy, the only legitimate means of mediation between God and the people as stipulated in vv15-22. Rüterswörden argues that the text is placing emphasis on the fact that the prophet is to take the place of all those proscribed offices, especially in addressing the cravings of humanity for coming to know the future. Against this negative backdrop, the “prophet like Moses” is presented in the foreground. The second reason why prophecy is instituted is that the people had specifically called for mediation during the covenant at Sinai/Horeb (Deut 18:16). The third reason that prophecy is instituted is that YHWH considers as good the people’s request for such mediation (Deut 18:17). Within this context, since the people had asked for such a mediation, it logically follows that the term “prophet like Moses” does not refer to a single prophet, but rather to a future series of prophets, whom YHWH will set up as necessity dictates.

As it has become evident so far, there is an evolution in the understanding of the office of the “prophet like Moses”. One can identify at least three major moments in identifying the office of the prophet. As Deuteronomy is presented as Moses’ last speech, he, as covenant mediator, sets the office of the prophet like him precisely in the light of a covenant mediator. So at a point in time the office of the “prophet like Moses” is presented as that of the covenant mediator. Just as the people referred to Moses whenever they had problems of jurisprudence as regards the Covenant Law, so in the future they would have the “prophet like Moses” whom they could consult. In minor issues the people would still recur to the judges and the elders as in Exodus 18:26a. In more serious issues, just as they would have consulted Moses in Exodus 18:26b, they would consult the “prophet like Moses”. Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Deuteronomy 13:2-7 present the deuteronomistic theory of prophecy.
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prophet is to be understood as modelled on Moses, as asked by the people themselves at the request for mediation in the Horeb Covenant in Deuteronomy 5:23-29 and 18:16. The role of the prophet therefore arose in the context of covenant mediatorship, which therefore includes the reception of revelation and the passing on of that revelation to the people. The chief concern of the prophet is therefore to provide communication from God’s part in relation to commandments, statutes, and ordinances, thus providing guidance for the life of the people.204 There is no reference to negative judgements against the monarchy, itself regulated in Deuteronomy 17:14-20 as part of an institution asked for by the people and permitted by God. There is also no reference to the preaching of social justice. Apparently, these themes are implicitly part of God’s communication within the emerging prophetic preaching. Nihan concludes: “For the Deuteronomistic scribes of the early Persian period, the prophet has now replaced the king as the authoritative figure of the post-exilic and post-monarchical community because he exemplarily illustrates the ‘theocratic’ ideal of that community”.205 The “draft constitution” of Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22 places the prophet as the most important figure in office, as we have seen. The deuteronomistic layers within this text clearly work back beyond the confines of Deuteronomy by placing the foundation of prophecy directly in line with the founding experience of Horeb. Prophecy is here given ultimate dignity. Such an exposition betrays the Exile situation. For the exilic community, the prophetic word of God was of crucial importance. It was their link with the past and with any possible future, and this is the main reason why prophecy became so central and important during the Exile.206 The prophets were right all along in what they had predicted!

The various prophets mentioned in the Deuteronomistic History fall within the deuteronomistic perspective of what constitutes a prophet. Moses is presented as the servant of YHWH, יְהוָה. Even though Joshua is presented in terms of his relation to Moses’ ministry as minister of Moses, מְשָרֵת מ, he too is presented as יְהוָה in Joshua 24:29 and Judges 2:8. The prophets Ahijah (1 Kings14:18; 15:29), Elijah (1 Kings 18:36; 2 Kings 9:36; 10:10), Jonah son of Amittai (2 Kings 14:25) and

204 BLENKINSON, “No Mention of the Prophets”, 347.
206 RÜTERSWORDEN, Gemeinschaft, 109. Rüterswördten concludes that during the Exile the deuteronomists presented two important offices linked directly with the centrality of the Torah; the Levitical priests were the executives of the Torah and the prophets were the legislature.
collectively the prophets are called “the servants of YHWH (2 Kings 17:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2); with their principal task being that of preaching observance of the law and the consequences of disobedience. This mode of preaching is in line with that of Moses in “deuteronomistic Deuteronomy” in Deuteronomy 4:25-31; 28:62-68; 30:17-18.

The exegetical study conducted above, however, has also shown that Moses as a figure, particularly in his call narrative, has particular affinities with the other prophets as well, particularly Jeremiah. There appears to be the work of various traditions, each appropriating the figure of Moses according to its theological/political agenda. The next chapter will deal with the various prophets that could be easily considered prophets like Moses. In this chapter we have concluded that the promise of the “prophet like Moses” does in fact refer to a future line of prophets, whom YHWH will appoint as the need arises. The question, however, as to the possibility of the author of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 still having a particular prophet in mind remains valid. We have seen that the full conception of Moses as a prophet is an exilic one at the earliest. In the next chapter we shall analyse the possibility as to how traditions, especially late ones, appropriated the person of Moses or the event of the Exodus to give authority to a particular passage, or to present a positive kerygmatic message of hope to the exiles who were facing the return.
Chapter 5 – The “Prophet like Moses”
5.0 Introduction

Much ink has been spilt on the matter of the “prophet like Moses”. It seems that scholars are divided on this matter and some actually have taken the pains of identifying who this individual was historically. Others have considered this “prophet like Moses” as referring “to a prophetic order”.¹ In any case, as Jean-Louis Ska states, identifying an individual as a “prophet like Moses” “cannot be excluded”.² It is pertinent at this stage to ask the question together with Nicholson: “did the author of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, have any of the canonical prophets in mind?”³ There are clear literary and theological ties between Moses and the prophets. Scholars have thus argued that there is an intentional shaping of the prophets within the prophetic books in deuteronomistic and Mosaic terms.⁴ Even though, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the author of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 referred to a line of prophets, he could very well have done so with a particular individual in mind. In my opinion both views are legitimate since, as we have seen throughout this study, the identity of Moses, particularly as regards his religious functions, has evolved throughout the history of traditions, and consequently, the identity of the “prophet like Moses”, evolved as well. Thus, whilst it is legitimate to say that the “prophet like Moses” does in fact refer “to a prophetic order”,⁵ it is nonetheless legitimate to state that a particular tradition, responsible for a particular redaction, both in the Former Prophets as well as in the Latter Prophets, could have actually undertaken its redactive process with a particular candidate in mind. This chapter deals with the various individuals that could qualify as “prophets like Moses”.

⁴ Obviously not all scholars agree. Stackert, for example, dismisses these parallels as mere “family resemblances”. JEFFREY STACKERT, A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 165.
⁵ Terblanche notes that Moses is frequently described in the Deuteronomistic History as וָהֲדָ יְהֵ וָע, where in a similar manner, the prophets are depicted as עֲבָדַי הַנְבִיאִים. He argues that these prophets were the living voice of Moses. See MARIUS TERBLANCHE, “No Need for a Prophet Like Jeremiah: The Absence of the Prophet Jeremiah in Kings”, in Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets, Harry F. van Rooy (ed.), Leiden: Brill, 2000, 308-309.
5.1 Joshua

Joshua is never called “prophet” within the Hebrew canon, however Sirach 46:1 places Joshua as “successor of Moses, where prophecy is concerned” (κραταιὸς ἐν πολέμῳ Ἰησοῦς Ναω καὶ διάδοχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείαις). This shows that at a certain point in Jewish tradition, Joshua was actually considered as a “prophet like Moses”. The book of Sirach is not part of the Hebrew canon, but as its prologue attests, it was originally written in Hebrew, and therefore there can be no doubt that this book is witness to important traditions. Spina states that whilst Moses is a central figure in the Hebrew Bible, Joshua runs a close second, eventually being presented as a “second Moses”. Together with Moses, Joshua is present for special encounters with YHWH in Exodus 24:12-13 and 32:17. Interestingly, only Moses and Joshua are designated as servants of the Lord (ד יְהוָה בֶּע) posthumously. Spina contends that such a title is applied to them after their death in virtue of their being spokespersons for YHWH, especially in their valedictory speeches. These figures emerge as offering great service to the Lord, because they both interpret and write down the Torah, and call the people to uncompromisingly fear and serve the Lord. That Joshua is inferior to Moses is made evident in the way he is described in Joshu 1:1. Indeed, whilst Moses is qualified in his direct relation to YHWH as ד יְהוָה בֶּע, Joshua is only qualified in terms of his relation to Moses as עשנים משת. This makes of Joshua a Moses redux. Joshua can be considered as the first successor of Moses, but there is a qualitative difference between the two. Whilst Moses received the Torah directly (Deut 30:10; Num 12:7), Joshua is the first to have a scroll in his hands, and in Joshua 1:7-8 he is commanded to obey and meditate on it day and night. Not all scholars agree. Štrba studies the figure of Joshua at length, and argues that Joshua was indeed equal to Moses, and the

---


7 SPINA, “Moses and Joshua”, 78.


9 CHRISTOPH DÖHREN, “Mose schrieb diese Tora auf” (Dtn 31,9): auf der Suche nach dem biblischen Ursprung der Vorstellung von der mosaischen Verfasserschaft des Pentateuch”, in “Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben” (Gen 18,19), Reinhard Achenbach – Martin Arneth (eds.), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009, 257.
unequalled “prophet like Moses” as qualified within Deuteronomy 34:9-12.\textsuperscript{10} In short his argument runs as follows: Joshua is installed as successor of Moses three times, the first is a priestly installation by Eleazar in Numbers 27:22; then he is installed by Moses in Deuteronomy 31:7-8, then finally in Deuteronomy 31:23 there is the third and final installation by YHWH himself; here Joshua is given the same authority as Moses.\textsuperscript{11} Joshua and Moses appear as equal in dignity, and after the end of the mourning period for Moses, Joshua is presented as the only equal to Moses in Deuteronomy 34:9b.\textsuperscript{12} Štrba argues that Deuteronomy 34:10 is not Moses’ epitaph, but that it actually refers to Joshua as the true “prophet like Moses”, after whom there will be no other. Štrba argues that v8 mentions how the days of mourning for Moses were ended. In v9, the subject changes and Joshua is presented as the successor of Moses, to whom the people listened, and did as YHWH had commanded Moses. V10a then presents the incomparability of the prophet, which according to Štrba, syntactically refers back to the preceding verse, thus implying that Joshua is in fact the “prophet like Moses”.\textsuperscript{13} He concludes: “In fact, since Moses solemnly introduced Joshua to this role in the sight of all Israel and YHWH himself also commissioned him directly in the presence of Moses, the narrator may safely state for the reader only (!), that afterwards, that is, after the installation of the new leader Joshua, there has never again been a leader to compare with these two”.\textsuperscript{14} Štrba also studies the links between Deuteronomy 34:9-12 and Deuteronomy 18:9-22, and notes that many scholars saw a contradiction between these two texts.\textsuperscript{15} Štrba solves this apparent contradiction by identifying Joshua as the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. According to him, this is hinted at in Joshua 1:16-18, where the Rubenites, the Gadites and half the tribe of Manasseh acknowledge death as a consequence of disobeying Joshua. This, according to Štrba, places Joshua on a par with the “prophet like Moses”, whose words must be heeded, otherwise anyone failing to do so would face the death penalty.\textsuperscript{16} Štrba concludes: “It is legitimate to conclude that the “prophet like Moses” as presented by Deuteronomy 18:15 matches the image of Joshua as presented by the

\textsuperscript{11} ŠTRBA, “Take off your sandals from your feet!”, 121-122.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, 122.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 171.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 261.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 262.
narrator in 34:9 according to which all Israel paid undivided obedience to Joshua, a man filled with the spirit of wisdom”.17

Lohfink argues that the formula of succession in Joshua 1:1-9 has strong echoes with the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17:14-20.18 The encouragement and warnings in Joshua 1:1-9 are addressed to the person who is about to take the divine commissioning for an office, and the strongest parallel lies within the command to read/meditate on the Torah, all the days of one’s life (Deut 17:18-19 // Josh 1:8). Indeed, in Joshua 1:1-9, we get the idea that Joshua represents the ideal figure of the leader, and as such, he would represent the ideal royal figure.19 It is interesting to note that the only king who is intimately tied to a book is actually Josiah, who carries out his reform according to the book that was found within the Temple. The Deuteronomistic School appears to want to describe Joshua in royal terms, and most probably draw a parallel with King Josiah.20 It is highly likely that the exilic Deuteronomist created this parallel and drafted the deuteronomic law of the king as a model for what the king should do when kingship would be reinstated: just as Joshua is about to lead the people into the land and is ordered to meditate on the law day and night (Josh 1:8 מָם וָלַיְלָה וְהָגִיתָו), the king, upon sitting on the throne on return from the Exile, is ordered to make a copy of the law, and from it, read all the days of his life (Deut 17:19 כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּיו).21 In my opinion, this is something that is already reflected within exilic deuteronomistic theology. The finding of the book in 2 Kings 22-23 makes of Josiah the ideal king for the Deuteronomists, where his incomparability is stated in a way that even seems to exclude King David. The Deuteronomists already sought to give central importance to the Torah as is clear in the deuteronomic law of the king in Deuteronomy 17. Joshua 1:7-8 could therefore very well be dependent upon Deuteronomy 17:19, and not the other way round! Another interesting parallel lies between Joshua and the righteous king Hezekiah. It is interesting to note the parallels created by common vocabulary, terminology, and

17 Ibid, 263. Such a reading in fact disproves the supposed tension between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Deuteronomy 34:9-12.
20 NELSON, “Josiah in the Book of Joshua”, 534. Nelson in fact comments: “Much of the present picture of Joshua is nothing but a retrojection of the figure of Josiah into the classical past”.
concepts between Joshua 1:8 and 2 Kings 18:6-7.  

This helps us conclude, together with Porter, that the Deuteronomistic School portrays Joshua as successor to Moses in royal terms, where he is a second Moses where “kingship” is concerned. However there could be another current at work here. Römer rightly notes that Joshua 1:7-8 is actually aimed at placing the prophets under the authority of the Torah. So it could well be that this section reflects a rather late insertion, building upon the incomparability of Moses, as expounded in Deuteronomy 34:10-12 and Numbers 12:6-8. Nihan in fact argues that Joshua 1:7-9 belongs to a late post-pentateuchal hand, which aimed at underlining the centrality of the Torah. After the Torah was isolated canonically from the book of Joshua through the text of Deuteronomy 34:10-12, the former prophets, that once formed part of the great national history, were separated from the Pentateuch, and Joshua became “the exemplary prophet after Moses”. This canonical re-reading also led to the development of the tradition within the prophet Malachi which reinterprets Deuteronomy 18 and 34 respectively, as we have seen in the previous chapter. Malachi 3:22 is reminiscent of Joshua 1:7-9, and this forms the editorial envelope for the Nebi’im, where Malachi 3:22 is the final editing of this collection. This forms the great canonical inclusio where Joshua was the first prophet after Moses and Malachi was the last prophet before the coming of the eschatological prophet Elijah. The author of Deuteronomy 34:9 proleptically summarises the time after Moses in the person of Joshua who, filled with the spirit, will mediate between YHWH and Israel.

It is clear that the author of the book of Joshua takes the pains of depicting strict parallels between Moses and Joshua. Moses sent scouts to spy the land (Num13) and Joshua sent scouts to spy Jericho (Josh 2). Moses splits the waters of the Sea of Reeds for Israel to cross (Ex 14:21-30) and Joshua splits the Jordan for Israel to cross (Josh 3:7-13). Indeed Štrba considers this parallel as a tertium comparationis of the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 34:10, conferring the unrepeatable status on

---

22 This is especially so in the use of the expression of turning away to the left or to the right, or from behind the Lord, and the use of the verb שָכַל.


25 CHRISTOPHE NIHAN, “Moses and the Prophets”: Deuteronomy 18 and the Emergence of the Pentateuch as Torah”, SEA 75 (2010), 43.

26 Ibid, 44.

27 Ibid, 48.
Joshua, as equal to Moses. Moses sets twelve pillars of stone at the base of Mount Sinai, representing the twelve tribes of Israel (Ex 24:4) and Joshua likewise places two sets of stone pillars, twelve at Gilgal (Josh 4:1-3) and twelve on the bed of the river Jordan (Josh 4:4-5). Moses encounters the angel of YHWH at the burning bush (Ex 3:2-5) and Joshua meets the commander of the army of YHWH (Josh 5:13-15), and both are ordered to remove the sandals from their feet, because the place on which they stood was holy ground. Martin Rose notes striking similarities between the call of Moses and the encounter of Joshua with the divine commander in Joshua 5:13-15.

1) Both introduce the recipient of the theophany and the location; Moses at Horeb, and Joshua at Jericho. 2) Both narrate the theophany, with emphasis placed on the recipient seeing something unusual and deciding to inquire about it. 3) Both narratives develop in a similar climax as to confrontation. 4) In both cases God identifies himself and commands the removal of the sandals from the feet.

Furthermore, Joshua juxtaposes his military feats in Joshua 12:7-24 with those of Moses in Joshua 12:1-6. Joshua functions as a covenant mediator at Shechem in Joshua 24, just as Moses did at Sinai in Exodus 20-24. Joshua appears to repeat the actions of Moses. David Zucker concludes that these parallels in the book of Joshua present him as much more than a successor of Moses; rather, Joshua appears to be the counterpart, or equal of Moses, especially in view of Joshua 1:5; 3:7, where it is stated:

ךְּהַעֲרֹקָהּ שֶׁמֶרֶפֶתָּךְ שֵׁם מִיָּוָמֵי

and especially in 4:14:

תְּיָרָאָהּ בְּעֵינָיְךָ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּרֶנֶתָהּ יְהוָּה אֵלֶּה הָיָה עִם־מִיָּוָמֵי.

Moreover, in the third narration of the installation of Joshua in Deuteronomy 31:23, it is YHWH himself who installs Joshua, giving him the same authority as Moses. According to him, this equality is especially marked in the parallelism that exists between the commands that both receive, Moses in Exodus 3:1-5; 4:18, and Joshua in Joshua 5:13-15; 6:5. He concludes that this parallel “implies that the two human recipients are equal in honour”.

Moreover, in the third narration of the installation of Joshua in Deuteronomy 31:23, it is YHWH himself who installs Joshua, giving him the same authority as Moses.

28 ŠTRBA, “Take off your sandals from your feet!”, 269.
29 MARTIN ROSE, Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke, (=AZTANT; 67), Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981, 78-92. It has to be noted that the twofold introduction in Exodus 3:5 and 6, has led many commentators to conclude that the commandment to remove the sandals was actually added from Joshua 5:15.
31 ŠTRBA, “Take off your sandals from your feet!”, 337.
32 Ibid, 337-338.
Whilst the role of Joshua does not appear to be prophetic, Chapman contends that: “historically, the portrait of Joshua has been increasingly ‘propheticised’ according to the deuteronomistic understanding of prophets and prophecy”. Some scholars in fact, identify in Joshua the promised prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Petersen retains that Deuteronomy 18:19 refers specifically to one individual, namely Joshua as the successor of Moses and possessor of the Torah, the Word of God given through Moses. Barstad concludes that Deuteronomy 18:15-19 specifically refers to Joshua as Moses’ successor. He argues that Moses’ speech in Deuteronomy is presented as the actual received word of God as a communication of the prophet to the people and not just as a narration of past events and proclamation of laws. According to him, the הַדְבָרִים of Deuteronomy 1:1 can be equated with the typical prophetic utterance הַדְבָרִים אֵל. This is very important, for it reflects how Deuteronomy understands Moses as being a prophet, and also reflects the deuteronomistic understanding of what prophecy is. As Deuteronomy 34 implies, the book of Deuteronomy is the last definitive revelation of YHWH to his people through Moses, and as such, contains all that the people should know and have to know. Based on this principle, no prophet is comparable to Moses. Barstad contends that this principle confirms that Deuteronomy 18:15-19 has nothing to do with a series of “future” prophets of YHWH. He argues that the key word to understand the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15-19 is the נִי of v15, where the only one to fit the criteria of a full Moses-like function is Joshua. The installation of Joshua is prepared for in Deuteronomy 3:23-29 and ratified in Deuteronomy 31. Deuteronomy 34:10 then presents Moses as “the prophet”. The fullness of revelation lies within the book of Deuteronomy, the last essential revelation of YHWH. Barstad concludes that Deuteronomy 18:15-19 is thus not an institutionalisation of prophecy, but rather, in referring to the “prophet like Moses”, it only refers to the successor of Moses. Barstad maintains that this is a one-time phenomenon and does not refer to a series of prophets,

33 Chapman, “Joshua Son of Nun: Presentation of a Prophet”, 23.
36 Barstad, “The Understanding of the Prophets”, 244.
37 Barstad, “The Understanding of the Prophets”, 247.
interpreting the נִיָּּךְ of v15 as referring exclusively to Moses’ mission, a mission which, as a military leader, only Joshua fulfils.  

Sonnet too concludes that Joshua is presented as the “prophet like Moses”, especially through the theme of listening, which comprises the great narrative arch of Deuteronomy, especially as portrayed in Deuteronomy 1:3; 18:20 and 34:9. The inclusio of Deuteronomy 1:3 with 34:9 keeps the development of the 34 chapters of Deuteronomy within one single act of successful communication between the enunciation on the part of Moses and the reception of the people. Indeed, Deuteronomy 34:9 is presented as the fulfilment of Deuteronomy 1:3. Deuteronomy 1:3 is presented with 34:9: הבש בְּבַדְתֵּיָהּ יָשָׂרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל בָּנֵי יְהוָה אֶלֶת finden. However there is a discrepancy: it is not Moses who is heard but Joshua, his successor! It is through the mediation of Joshua that the Mosaic Torah is heard. Deuteronomy 34:10-12 in turn presents a more inclusive thematic arch, for the execution of the commandments of Torah is made possible by the teaching mediation of Moses and of Joshua. It is important to note that the reference to the people listening to Joshua elicits the two instructions regarding the prophet: again a thematic arch forms in Deuteronomy 13:4-5; 18:15; and 34:9. According to Sonnet, this arch has a double duty, for it stands to show that the words spoken by Moses came to fulfilment, and that Joshua is the announced “prophet like Moses” in Deuteronomy 18:15, especially in the words אִלּוּתִּשְמָּם. The request of the people to Moses to draw near to YHWH and recount his words in Deuteronomy 5:27, is fulfilled in the person of Joshua in Deuteronomy 34:9, with a verse that echoes the commitment made by the people at Sinai in Exodus 24:7. Indeed, in Deuteronomy 31:14-29 Moses feared that after his death, the people would immediately backslide into apostasy. According to Sonnet, this was avoided thanks to the prophetic word of Joshua and to the fact that YHWH constituted Joshua as the “prophet like Moses”. Joshua appears to be the first in a line of prophets who follow the ranks after Moses. As Sonnet concludes, the communication enterprise of Deuteronomy is ordered to the re-realisation of the

38 Ibid.
40 SONNET, “La construction narrative de la figure de Moïse”, 18.
41 Ibid, 19.
singular event: that the God of Horeb continues to address new generations through the mediation of the prophet that he chooses. Moses will remain unequalled for it was he who brought the Torah to the people. Obedience to that received Torah will then be ensured by the “prophet like Moses”.

5.1.1 Conclusion

As we have seen, Joshua presents many parallels to Moses, especially as a military leader. As Moses’ successor he takes over the leadership of the people, particularly where military and legal issues come in. It is also true, however, that his leadership includes the religious sphere, since he presides over the covenant renewed at Shechem. Despite this, scholars are divided as to the prophetic identity of Joshua. We have already considered the fact that he is never called a prophet within the Hebrew Bible. Sven Tengström argues that there are no traces of any prophetic traits in Joshua. The fact that Joshua is never called a prophet, neither in Deuteronomy, nor the book of Joshua itself, nor in the Hebrew Bible for that matter, does not exactly help the interpretation of Joshua as being the intended “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. It is very difficult to pinpoint exactly whether Joshua was actually considered a “prophet like Moses” or not. I do not agree with Štrba’s view that Joshua was in any way presented as equal to Moses, and also as the incomparable “prophet like Moses”, as we have seen. In my opinion, the way Joshua is qualified as המסרת מ in Joshua 1:1, is a clear indication as to where Joshua’s status in relation to Moses stands. I seriously doubt that the author, or a later redactor of the book of Joshua, had the intention of presenting Joshua as the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:9-22. Neither did the author/redactor of Deuteronomy 18:9-22 seem to have Joshua in mind when speaking about the figure of the “prophet like Moses”. As we have seen in section 4.5.1, the syntax of Deuteronomy 18:9 seems to exclude such a scenario, because this conditional temporal clause states that the “prophet like Moses”.

42 Ibid, 20.
43 The only apparent exception, as we have seen, is in the “non-canonical” Book of Ben Sirach, which does attest to a tradition that did consider Joshuah as a prophet.
Moses” would be raised up by YHWH “when you enter the land which YHWH your God is giving you (ךְָלָּתֵן לָךְ נַחֲלֹה רֵיְהוָה אֲשֶׁר תֵּאתָ בָּא אַכִי). Deuteronomy 18:9 would thus imply that Joshua was not a “prophet like Moses”, at least until the time when the people actually crossed the Jordan and entered into the Promised Land! I tend to explain the parallels between Joshua and Moses by attributing them to a Hexateuchal tradition\textsuperscript{46} that was seeking to unite the book of Joshua with the Pentateuch. Besides strengthening the view that Joshua was a continuation of the Pentateuch, the actual entry into the land and the conquest, would constitute the fulfilment of the divine promises to Abraham, the main literary overarching theme of a so-called Hexateuch.

5.2 Deborah and Huldah

Some scholars have noted the parallels that exist between Deborah and Moses. Sigrid Eder states that this prophetess fits well in the tradition of the prophets who were raised up following Moses.\textsuperscript{47} Herzberg too offers a detailed study of the parallels that exist between Deborah and Moses.\textsuperscript{48} As regards the connection between Huldah and Moses, studies are even less. One notable exception is the study of Hugh Williamson who analyses the parallel between Deborah and Huldah, and also their link with Moses.\textsuperscript{49} In this section, I comment on the findings of these scholars and draw my own conclusion in the light of their findings and my own studies so far. Apparently, these two prophetesses are linked together by a deuteronomistic redaction, most probably a late one, which sought to seal them as “prophets like Moses”.

Herzberg concludes that Deborah is portrayed by the text of Judges as an avatar of Moses.\textsuperscript{50} The parallels between them are very marked, particularly in the battle at Mount Tabor, where the account presents various parallels with the crossing of the Sea of Reeds. The story of Deborah presents elements in common with Exodus 14–15. In both, the Israelites defeat a better-armed army equipped with chariots. In both,

\textsuperscript{46} As discussed in chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{48} BRUCE HERZBERG, “Deborah and Moses”, \textit{JSOT} 38 (2013) 15-33.
\textsuperscript{50} HERZBERG, “Deborah and Moses”, 17.
the military leader is a prophet, and both narratives are followed by a victory song. Herzberg identifies five points which offer direct parallelism between both characters.\(^{51}\) 1) Deborah, unlike the other ‘judges’ in the book, actually carries out the function of a judge (Judg 4:4-5), and like Moses (Ex 18:15-16), offers judgements for the people who approach her for judgement (לַמִשְפָט).\(^{52}\) 2) Like Moses, Deborah is presented as a prophetess who channels God’s word.\(^{53}\) 3) Deborah, like Moses, has a specific place where to offer her judgement – the palm of Deborah. 4) Deborah represents God’s orders, much like Moses. Both order military leaders into action, staying behind on the hill, inspecting the troops rather than fighting themselves.\(^{54}\) In a sense both appear as military strategists. 5) In both narratives, one narrating the crossing of the Sea of Reeds, the other the battle in the plain under Mount Tabor, the chariots of the enemy are rendered useless by God.\(^{55}\) 6) Both Moses and Deborah sing victory songs.\(^{56}\)

Herzberg gathers the parallels into a table which I reproduce here:\(^{57}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>Deborah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tent of Meeting (Ex 33:7-11)</td>
<td>Palm of Deborah (Judg 4:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges the people (Ex 18:13</td>
<td>Judged Israel (Judg 4:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks for God (many instances)</td>
<td>A Prophetess (Judg 4:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends troops to battle (Num 31:12)</td>
<td>Sends troops to battle (Judg 4:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariots (Ex 14:6)</td>
<td>Chariots (Judg 4:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water stops chariots (Ex 14:25; 15:4-10)</td>
<td>Water stops chariots (Judg 5:4,21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God looks down (Ex 14:24)</td>
<td>Stars fight from heaven (Judg 5:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Victory (Ex 15)</td>
<td>Song of Victory (Judg 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God causes panic in the enemy camp (Ex 14:24)</td>
<td>God panics the camp (Judg 4:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{51}\) Ibid, 16.
\(^{52}\) Ibid, 17-18.
\(^{53}\) HERZBERG, “Deborah and Moses”, 19-20. According to Herzberg, the rhetorical question referring to the command of the Lord in Judges 4:6 implies the fulfilment of the command of the Lord in Deuteronomy 7:1-2, alluding that the battle at Mount Tabor would constitute the fulfilment of that commandment.
\(^{54}\) Ibid, 23.
\(^{56}\) Ibid, 26-29.
\(^{57}\) Ibid, 27.
Not one remained (Ex 14:28)  
לא נישאר טעם עד אהמה  
Kenites (Num 24:21)  
Yael (Judg 4:11; 5:24)  
Not one remained (Judg 4:16)  
לא נישאר עד אהמה

In the light of these strong parallels, Herzberg argues that just as in Deuteronomy 18:15-18, Moses states that God will raise up a prophet like himself, “it seems highly likely to me that Deborah was seen as that prophet, the Moses of her time”.

Williamson too notes these parallels between Exodus 14–15 and Judges 4–5, however, he focuses on a rather overlooked parallel that seems to betray a late deuteronomistic redaction. This parallel is between Judges 4:4-5 and 2 Kings 22:14:

The parallelism can be specifically identified within the following elements:

Williamson comments: “As is readily apparent, both passages follow the scheme of citing personal name, designation as prophetess, name of husband (with some elaboration in Kings) and place of residence”. The narrative presenting Deborah as prophetess appears to be secondary to the narrative, and heavily dependent on that of Huldah, most probably coming from the hands of a deuteronomistic redactor. What is particularly interesting is that the first and the last prophets that feature by name within the Deuteronomistic History are women! There is no such title applied to Joshua, or to any other judge before Deborah in the book of Judges. In the narrative of 2 Kings 23:2, Josiah consults Huldah, and besides her, the other prophets are only mentioned in a general way. Only Huldah is mentioned by name, and she has the last prophetic utterance within 2 Kings, and consequently, the Deuteronomistic History.
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Moreover, there seems to be a clear effort by the Deuteronomist to link these two prophetesses with the “prophet like Moses”. Williamson notes how Josiah follows precisely the dictates of the Deuteronomic law of the prophets, namely in 2 Kings 23:24 he removed the mediums and the wizards, thus following the “to’ebah law” of Deuteronomy 18:9-14, blocking the alternative avenues to the knowledge of divine will. Obviously the alternative to those forbidden roles was the “prophet like Moses”, and it is here that Huldah comes into the picture. Josiah, the ideal “deuteronomistic king”, needed to consult YHWH about the book of the law that was found, and did so not by consulting wizards or mediums, but a prophetess, a prophetess that was clearly within the line of Mosaic succession, a “prophet like Moses”. Obviously, as Williamson notes, this presents a theological argument that is circular: Josiah’s response to the finding of the law book is approved by a prophetess, whose authority and authenticity is validated by that very same book. However, it is evident that the literary presentation of this redaction is ingenious. Williamson states: “Huldah, I conclude, is presented as that prophet [i.e. “prophet like Moses”] in that generation.”

Apart from noting the parallels that have been already mentioned above between Deborah and Moses, Williamson concludes that if Deborah was presented as a prophetess by a redactor with an eye on Huldah, and Huldah was seen as a “prophet like Moses”, it logically follows that Deborah was considered as such as well.

### 5.2.1 Conclusion

As we have seen, Deborah is presented in a way that evokes the crossing of the Sea of Reeds, and is the first to be explicitly called “prophet” within the Deuteronomic History. In 2 Kings 22:14 Huldah is presented as a “prophet like Moses” in her own right since she is the prophetess that Josiah consults as an ideal king. Indeed, the first and the last prophets of the Deuteronomic History were not just women prophetesses, they were “prophets like Moses”. This is a very important

---

63 Two categories which are actually mentioned in Deuteronomy 18:11 (אֶלֶף וְאֶלֶף מֵאָד).  
64 This ideal “deuteronomistic king” is in fact described as incomparable in 2 Kings 23:25: כֹּל בְּעַלָּתוֹעַלְּהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתוֹעַלְּהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתוֹעַלְּהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתְהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתְהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתְהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתְהוֹקְרָא הָיָה כָּל בְּעַלָּתְהוֹקְרָא  
65 WILLIAMSON, “Prophetesses in the Hebrew Bible”, 72.  
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inclusio! As we have seen, the link between Huldah and Moses in terms of her prophecy centres on the episode of the finding of the book within the Temple. As concluded in chapter 1, this episode of book finding is a late insertion into the text, late during the Exile, or early in the post-exilic period.67 This episode became the “founding myth” of the Deuteronomistic School,68 and as such, it appears that this redactional stratum aimed at championing Josiah as the model king for any future king in “the great programme for the return into the land”. Apart from his incomparability (2 Kings 23:25), Josiah is the one who truly read from the law and obeyed it, in the light of what the late deuteronomistic law of the king dictates to him in Deuteronomy 17:19. He obeyed what Urdeuteronomium dictates, in the to’ebah law of Deuteronomy 18:9-14, banning the mediums and the wizards, and indeed, what the law of the prophets of Deuteronomy 18:15-22 dictates, when he consulted the prophetess Huldah. In doing so, this late deuteronomistic redactor presented Huldah as the prophetess like Moses, and most probably, wanted to present Deborah as such as well. This was part of the deuteronomists’ programmatic reform. Indeed, the prophets had been right in what they prophesied, and prophets marked, by way of an inclusio, the beginning and the end of the so-called Deuteronomistic History. Prophecy came before kingship, and if the king was ever to be successful, he was required to be humble enough to follow the guidance of the “prophet like Moses”.

5.3 Samuel

Samuel is the last of the judges and is a prophet. The line of leadership appears to have passed from Moses to Joshua, to the line of judges, with Samuel being the last in that succession. Samuel, in fact, appears as the legitimate leader of the people until the installation of King Saul. As such a leader, he is recognised as a prophet, as attested in 1 Samuel 3:20: “And all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established as a prophet of YHWH.” Rendtorff argues that the people knew how to

68 RÖMER, “Le roi est mort”, 36.
identify the prophet in Samuel because Moses is presented as the prophet par excellence in Numbers 12:6-8 and Deuteronomy 34:10. Since Moses, no one had ever had such an immediate contact and encounter with YHWH as Samuel had in 1 Samuel 3:1-18; 8:6-9; 9:15-17; 15:10-11,16; 16:1-13. The most basic parallelism between Samuel and Moses is the fact that both were leaders of the people, but none held a definite and clearly definable office, both being guided by divine inspiration. In the beginning of his ministry, Samuel was both prophet and leader of the people. As such, then, he was begged by the people to ask YHWH for a king, and though reluctantly, through a divine mandate, he became the great initiator of kingship. Indeed, from Samuel onwards, the prophets, whether court prophets or individual prophets, would always be present at Israel’s particular moments in the history of kingship. Whilst really and truly, as we have seen above, Deborah was the “first” prophetess of the Deuteronomistic History, it is actually Samuel who got the ball rolling definitively. The prophet was there to confirm, advise, or criticise the king. Samuel thus became the great initiator of the relationship between prophecy and kingship. Albright argues that Samuel was the first great religious reformer after Moses, who diminished the spiritual role of the Levites replacing the sanctuary of Shilo with local sanctuaries. In Hosea 12:14 we read מִצְרָיִם תִּיַּשְׁרָאֵל מִעָלָה יְהוָה אֶל בְּנָבִיא וּבְנָבִיא נִשְׁמָר וּבְנָבִיא. Albright argues that the first נבִיא refers to Moses whilst the second most probably refers to Samuel. Samuel appeared to have a general leadership role, which, like that of Moses, included the political, the religious and the cultic. Samuel was the one to confront King Saul on ritual and political issues, especially in the episode of 1 Samuel 15. Samuel’s position towards ritual appears to be identical to that of Hosea, Isaiah, Micah and Jeremiah, as attested in 1 Samuel 15:22 יָאָרָה יְהוָה בֶּן שְּאוֹל הַחֵפֶץ לִפְנֵי אֵילִים מְזַכִּים כִּשְׁמַר מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׂה מְזַכִּים מַעֲשֵׁ... Leuchter argues that apart from the issue of leadership, it is clear that in their mission, Moses and Samuel constitute a parallel: both intercede for the nation with YHWH (Deut 5:4-5; 18:16 // 1 Sam 7:3-14; 12:18-23); both convey prophecy through

70 Ibid, 31.
divine word and command (Deut 18:18 // 1 Sam 3:22); both institute legislation regarding kingship (Deut 17:14-20 // 1 Sam 10:25); and both commission civil leaders who were to function within the parameters of prophetic teaching and authority (Deut 31:14; 23; Josh 1:1ff // 1 Sam 10:17-27; 12; 16:1-13). The Moses/Samuel parallel within the Deuteronomistic History was part of the Deuteronomistic attempt to present the prophets of the past as a united front. Leuchter argues that initially, the parallel between these two figures featured in Psalm 99:6, where both are said to call upon YHWH (יְהוָה). Indeed, both do so in Exodus 19:16-19 and 1 Samuel 7:9 respectively. Psalm 99:6 predates Deuteronomistic material and presents Moses and Samuel as priests rather than prophets. Indeed, there are parallels on more than one level between the two, even in their relationship with YHWH. Both receive the call from YHWH, with their name being repeated (Ex 3:4 // 1 Sam 3:4). Both respond with a הנני (Ex 3:4 // 1 Sam 3:4, 8). There is the strong intimacy that existed in the way YHWH spoke to both Moses (Num 12:6-8) and Samuel (1 Sam 3) directly and in the awoken state. Leuchter argues that these parallels were drawn within the tenth century context to establish priestly supremacy within the sanctuary at Shiloh and to address the abuses of Eli’s sons within that same sanctuary. This tradition survived in the memory of Psalm 99:6. Leuchter argues that later on this parallel was taken on board by the Deuteronomistic School to qualify Samuel as a Mosaic prophet, thus giving weight and authority to the 8th century prophetic movement. Another text which places Moses and Samuel in tandem is Jeremiah 15:1. It is interesting that in Jeremiah 15:1 and Psalm 99:6 these two figures are considered as having the roles of intercessor and priest. Jeremiah 15:1 in fact, claims that Israel had passed the point of no return: if not even Moses and Samuel could intercede for the people and change YHWH’s decision, then it follows that Jeremiah’s intercession is depicted as utterly futile.

---

5.3.1 Conclusion

As I have concluded in chapter 2, Moses’ leadership role is in a way incommensurable. Indeed, within Israel’s history, the one closest to this role is Samuel. As we have seen, Joshua, was more of a successor to Moses as concerns his military role. Samuel, on the other hand, appears to fall within a multi-role leadership. He is a judge, a prophet, a cultic leader, and a political/military advisor to the king. Apart from this particular fact, and the other parallels with Moses noted above, Samuel appears to be portrayed as a very important prophet. Walter Dietrich makes a very pertinent observation: “DtrP makes sure that Samuel meets the requirements of the law of the prophets. He is clearly an Israelite (‘from among your brothers’). Furthermore, he embodies a severe rejection of fortune telling and necromancy as becomes obvious in 1 Samuel 28” 78. Indeed, both these issues constitute the subject matter of the law of the prophets in Deuteronomy 18:9-22. As Leuchter and Dietrich note, there is a clear attempt by the deuteronomists to make of Samuel a “prophet like Moses”. In my opinion, Samuel was originally more important as a leader, thus incorporating within his office the role of judge and prophet. Really and truly, he was the one to set the ball rolling, and though his prophetic role was much wider, as the anointer of Saul and David and their advisor, he can be considered as the first of the court prophets. Apparently, at a later stage, the deuteronomists worked on the parallels that already existed, especially in terms of intercession, and portrayed Samuel as a “prophet like Moses”, most probably in the late exilic/early post-exilic period, with the scope of investing prophecy with authority and credibility.

5.4 Elijah

Whilst the Elijah cycle does not mention Moses by name, the vast similarities and intertextual links that exist between these two characters call for a comparison between them. The Elijah narratives in 1 Kings 17-21 and 2 Kings 1-2 offer abundant

parallels\textsuperscript{79} with the life of Moses in the Pentateuch, so much so that we can conclude that the author intentionally created such parallels between the two. A closer study of this comparison would enable us to identify whether this correspondence was actually intended in presenting Elijah as a “prophet like Moses” or not.

Many scholars see that the Elijah narrative is written in line with the Moses tradition.\textsuperscript{80} Jörg Jeremias summarises the various parallels between the two, especially in the forty days and nights at Horeb, the use of the term עָבַר in both theophanies (Ex 34:6 and 1 Kings 19:11), the succession, and the timing in the morning.\textsuperscript{81} Theodor Seidl sees them as sharing a common prophetic tradition with the typical theophany, dialogue, and re-commission.\textsuperscript{82} Thompson and Bigger see certain redactional features in the contest of Mount Carmel that seem to point back at Moses and Deuteronomy. There Elijah built the altar with twelve stones, much like Moses did in Exodus 24:4, and Joshua in Giglal in Joshua 4:1-24. The execution of the false prophets at Mount Carmel also evokes the precept in Deuteronomy 13:1-5 of the execution of prophets inducing the people into idolatry. There is also a link with Deuteronomy 11:17 which states that idolatry leads to drought, and implies that once it is eradicated, rain would fall again on the land.\textsuperscript{83} 1 Kings 19:7-18 evokes the mighty theophany of Sinai/Horeb in Exodus 33:17-23, and like Moses, Elijah is appointed to institute Elisha who succeeded him. Just as Joshua ministered to Moses (Ex 24:13), Elisha ministered to Elijah (1 Kings 19:21).\textsuperscript{84} James Nohrnberg states that the Sinai pericope in Exodus is portrayed in such a way as to anticipate Elijah’s situation: “Given our anachronic reading of the claim in 1 Kings 19 that Elijah was virtually a second Moses, the Sinai pericope conversely implies that Moses in the wilderness had suffered the situation of the prophet in Northern Israel.”\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{79} The list of parallels has been noted quite early in the Midrashim. See Peskita Rabbati, Vol 1., William G. Braude (trans.), (= YJS; 18), London: Yale University Press, 1968, Piska 4.2.
\textsuperscript{80} BRIAN BRITT, “Prophetic Concealment in a Biblical Type Scene”, CBQ 64 (2002) 37-58.
\textsuperscript{81} JÖRG JEREMIAS, “Die Anfänge der Schriftprophetie”, ZAW 93 (1996) 486; 496.
\textsuperscript{84} Joshua is described as מְשָרֵת piel participle of שָרַת. It is interesting to note that in 1 Kings 19:21 Elisha is described as ministering to Elijah using the piel of משרה ליהו (יָשָרְתְה יָּו וַיְשָרְתֵה יּ אֵלִּ֫֫הּ וַ).\textsuperscript{85} JAMES NOHRNBERG, Like Unto Moses: The Constituting of an Interruption, (=ISBL), Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995, 329.
It is very interesting to note that whilst the similarities between Moses and Elijah are underlined by almost all scholars, Moshe Reiss observes a strong contrast between the two. He sees a stark contrast between them, for whilst their life stories are very similar, their personalities are very different. Moses, on one hand is very humble, as Numbers 12:3 describes him, whilst Elijah, on the other, is not, for he describes himself as zealous, and uses his power sometimes for his own aggrandisement. In Exodus 32, Moses, at the mountain of God, intercedes for the people, but at Horeb, Elijah exposes the people as those who have broken the covenant. However, despite these contrasts, as Dharamraj’s extensive study shows, the Elijah cycle is very well authored so as to create strong parallels with the Exodus narrative, and consequently, parallels between the persons of Moses and Elijah. In my opinion, these parallels are so extensive and intrinsic to the narrative that they cannot belong to a redaction. Whoever authored the Elijah cycle did so with the Exodus narrative at the back of his mind. Indeed some scholars question this direction of influence. Many do conclude that the Elijah narrative is built in a way as to allude to the Exodus. However, as we have seen above, Nohrnberg contends that the Sinai pericope was redacted in a way to anticipate 1 Kings 19. Joseph Blenkinsopp suggests that Elijah and Elisha actually served as a background that served to influence the succession of Joshua to Moses and the commissioning of the seventy elders. Brian Britt, without entering into diachronic issues, focuses on the synchronic approach of the biblical type scene and concludes that the Elijah cycle is dependent on the Mosaic one. The author of the Elijah cycle derives his story from a well-established set of elements, and thus underlines the way in which the Mosaic narrative is extraordinary. 1 Kings 19 is
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considered to be a legend later refashioned in the image of Moses and according to the Deuteronomistic Historian’s view.  

As already mentioned, Dharamraj makes an extensive study of the parallels in her monograph. Here I offer a brief summary of her observations. Right from the beginning of his career, Elijah’s mission appears as a constant confrontation to Ahab’s mode of ruling. This evokes a parallel with Moses’ confrontation with Pharaoh. In 1 Kings 17:1-24, Elijah miraculously provides food for the widow, evoking Moses’ miraculous provision of food to Israel in Exodus 16. The standoff at Mount Carmel has strong allusions to the Exodus event, and is reminiscent of Moses’ last speech in Deuteronomy. Just as Moses sets the choice in front of Israel to choose YHWH or otherwise (Deut 30:19), so too does Elijah in 1 Kings 18:21. According to Dharamraj, in such an episode, “the reader cannot but check his stride and turn his head for a second glance at this prophet so ‘like’ Moses (Deut 18:18)”. The strongest parallels appear to be in 1 Kings 19. Both are led into the desert; 1 Kings 19 is the only episode outside the Pentateuch where Horeb is ever visited again. There are also strong conceptual parallels; just as Moses asks two times for his life to be ended (Num 11:4-15), so too Elijah asks God two times to take his life in 1 King 19:1-10. Indeed, this story evokes Israel’s wilderness wanderings, with the only difference that the journey is geographically reversed. In the wilderness, God provides food and water to the Israelites, as He does to Elijah. Dharamraj notes that as the narrative of 1 Kings 19 progresses, the parallel between Elijah and Israel shifts into the parallel between Elijah and Moses. With the food provided, Elijah walks for forty days and forty nights (1 Kings 19:8) without eating anything. This evokes Moses’ forty days and forty nights of fasting (Ex 34:28; Deut 9:9). Scholars note that in 1 Kings 19:9, the cave which Elijah enters carries the definite article (הַמְעָרָה), attributing this detail as an allusion to

---
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95 In both Exodus 19 and 1 Kings 18, Israel is assembled as a people, in both there is an encounter of the people with YHWH. Carmel becomes like Horeb, where the fire of God falls from heaven. Indeed, these two episodes are full of conceptual and theological overlaps. The strong theological overlap is that whilst at Horeb, Israel realised that YHWH is God, at Carmel, Israel has to realise that YHWH “alone” is God.
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the cave where God hides Moses whilst passing by in Exodus 33:22.\footnote{99 BIBLIA: ASSOCIAZIONE LAICA DI CULTURA BIBLICA, Elia o il Mosè del silenzio: Atti del seminario invernale: Trevi, 22-25 gennaio 1998, Firenze: Giuntina, 1999, 39.} I do not see such a strict allusion however, for the term נְקָרָה used in Exodus 33:22 is very different from the term מְעָרָה used in 1 Kings 19:9. I seriously doubt that these terms are synonymous, for whilst מְעָרָה refers to a natural cave, the term נְקָרָה implies an “excavated place”\footnote{100 See HALOT a.v. נקר. It is interesting to note that the term could be a derivative of the verb רָמ which means “to dig”, “to gouge out”, sometimes with God as subject. See HALOT a.v. רמ. This would fit the context of Exodus 33:22 very well, since the subject there is God hiding Moses with his hand, in a way that he would not be able to see Him.}. The theophany is preceded by the wind, the earthquake, and the fire, which immediately recall the events of the covenant in Exodus 19-20, and on the verbal level, also Exodus 33-34. Both Moses and Elijah cover their face which is considered as “a reflexive response of self-preservation”\footnote{101 DHARAMRAJ, A Prophet Like Moses?, 102.}.

Other important parallels lie within the succession of Elijah by Elisha, highly evocative of the succession of Moses by Joshua. In fact, after Joshua’s appointment as successor (Num 27:18-23), Moses continues his duties and Joshua lies as leader in waiting, ministering, in the meantime, to Moses. The same applies to Elisha’s relationship to Elijah. Both successors then, will be confirmed as leaders in the eyes of the witnesses through the miraculous partition of the river Jordan in Joshua 4:14 and 2 Kings 2:15. Even here, there is a very interesting parallel. As we have seen above, Joshua is presented as repeating the deeds of Moses on more than one occasion. Similarly, Elisha is presented as repeating the deeds of Elijah. Just as Moses parted the Sea of Reeds, Joshua parted the river Jordan, and just as Elijah parted the river Jordan, so too does Elisha.\footnote{102 Dharamraj notes that there is a strong verbal correspondence, marked through the use of the verbs עָמַד and עָבַר, used in both texts. See DHARAMRAJ, A Prophet Like Moses?, 175.} The mysterious way in which Elijah ascends into heaven is also seen as presenting a parallel with Moses. In 2 Kings 2:11 Elijah ascends (יָּהָב) to heaven in the whirlwind. The closest to this text is Genesis 5:24 where God is said to have taken (לָקַח) Enoch. But there is also an allusion to Moses who dies an enigmatic death and who is also called “man of God” in Deuteronomy 33:1.\footnote{103 Ibid, 83.} Both of them knew about the time and place of their departure. Moses dies full of life, not of natural causes, but because of the will of YHWH. Likewise, Elijah is active till the very end, and is carried away in a supernatural manner. Moses is buried by YHWH himself, in
a place unknown to humanity, Elijah is caught up in the chariots of fire never to be seen again.

Looking back on the Elijah cycle, the reader cannot but notice how this narrative was enriched with Mosaic motifs. These motifs are too numerous and very much well woven into the narrative to be coincidental. There is a clear intention to draw a parallel between the two figures. Dharamraj concludes that “the Elijah narratives portray a prophet who models Deuteronomy 18:18”. I seriously doubt this, because Deuteronomy 18, as we have seen, is a late exilic/early post-exilic text. The author of the Elijah cycle, in my opinion, is addressing the way the Omrid rule made the land plummet into idolatry and apostasy. By evoking the theme of the Exodus, and setting up Elijah with a leadership role like Moses, the author is encouraging the people to choose YHWH over Baal. The people have to free themselves from the Omrid tyranny by choosing to serve YHWH, the only one true God.

5.4.1 Elijah the Eschatological “Prophet like Moses”

As we have seen in chapter 3 section 3.5.5, during the Second Temple period, Deuteronomy 18:15 started being interpreted eschatologically. Within this eschatological re-reading of Deuteronomy 18:15, Elijah becomes the “prophet like Moses” of Malachi 3:22. This was possible because of the many parallels between Elijah and Moses which we have seen above. In Malachi 3:22-24, Moses appears together with the prophet Elijah. In this text, Elijah represents the prophets, as the prophet who has to come, whilst Moses represents the Torah. The final redactors of the Pentateuch, after the disaster of the Exile, started expecting an eschatological restoration that, according to the prophetic tradition of Malachi 3:24, was to be brought about by Elijah. Most probably the reference to Elijah is due to the fact that in 2 Kings 2:11, Elijah did not die but was taken into heaven.
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5.4.2 Conclusion

It is evident that there are very strong parallels between the Elijah and Elisha cycles and the Exodus. Indeed, in all this, Elijah does appear as a new Moses. However, be that as it may, Elijah is not presented as a “prophet like Moses”. It is apparently clear enough in my opinion, that what is at stake here is a biblical re-reading of the Exodus narrative, where the authors of 1 and 2 Kings are making present to their contemporaries the salvific action of YHWH with his people. As Mezzacasa notes, the author is making a re-actualisation of the archetypal salvation of the desert. Elijah clearly appears to be a type of Moses, and Malachi appears to draw on this typology when he mentions Moses and Elijah together. It is important to note, as we have seen, that the parallelisms studied above, together with this typology, would be an important step towards an eschatological re-reading of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. The fact that Elijah did not die meant that this would form a seminal development in the belief in his return as the eschatological prophet.

In my opinion, the strong parallels between the Elijah cycle and the Exodus event and the person of Moses, carry a particular theological aim. The key to understanding such resonance is that whilst in the Exodus event it was a journey of Israel getting to know that YHWH is God, in the Elijah cycle this journey is further continued for them to realise that YHWH alone is God. The cycle starts with Ahab hardening his heart and giving heed to Jezebel his wife. The issue of rivalry between a false god and the true God re-emerges: in the Exodus it was Pharaoh, in the Elijah cycle it is Baal. In the end, the plagues crush Egypt much like the plague of drought brought Israel to its knees in 1 Kings. The faithful, ironically a Sidonian woman, is preserved, whilst Baal, the official deity of Sidon, lies dead, as manifested in the Carmel saga. In the end, Ahab, like Pharaoh, will end up ruined in battle (Ex 14 // 1 Kings 22). It is apparent that the author works on the Exodus motif on the verbal and the conceptual level, and as a consequence, the emergent figure of Elijah is inevitably like that of Moses, a great intercessor and covenant mediator, leading the people to the

renewal of the covenant. Ultimately, the main focus will always remain the people, and God’s dealing with their apostasy.\textsuperscript{110} The Elijah and Elisha narrative were evidently authored with the Exodus generation functioning as a paradigm. The author used this to create assonance with the Exodus to show that once again the covenant is endangered.\textsuperscript{111} In view of this, the people are once again faced with the choice of Deuteronomy 30, choosing between life and death, namely, choosing either between serving YHWH, the one true God, or serving Baal, a “dead” god.

5.5 Amos

Amos does not appear to feature as a “prophet like Moses”. Scholars have considered the statement of Amos 3:7: “Surely the Lord does nothing without revealing his plan to his servants the prophets” as being deuteronomistic.\textsuperscript{112} There is widespread agreement that this verse presupposes the existence of a canonical prophetic tradition, and that this was actually part of the deuteronomistic redaction of the book of Amos.\textsuperscript{113} Meindert Dijkstra concludes that “the story of Amos 7:9-17 was intentionally inserted into the framework of visionary reports in order to present Amos as a new type of prophetic personage, a “prophet like Moses”.\textsuperscript{114} He was not strictly a prophet by profession. He was a simple herdsman and a dresser of sycamore, a prophet only by virtue of his calling. This is a strong parallel with Moses who was a simple shepherd. Dijkstra argues that this unit appears to be a redactional insertion, and given this parallel with Moses, it could well be the case that the Deuteronomist drew his material in order to create a canon of “prophets like Moses”.\textsuperscript{115} However, I doubt that this is an intentional parallel, created by a Deuteronomistic redactor. There were other

\textsuperscript{110} This fact is confirmed by the other parallels that lie between Joshua and Elisha, as we have seen. The focus is not so much on the protagonists, namely Moses or Elijah, but on the whole of the exodus narrative and the entry into the land and its subsequent conquest. In other words, the main aim of the author of the Elijah and Elisha cycle in drawing such allusions to the exodus remains Israel.
\textsuperscript{111} DHARAMRAJ, A Prophet Like Moses?, 141.
\textsuperscript{112} MEINDERT DIJKSTRA, “I am neither a Prophet nor a Prophet’s Pupil”: Amos 7:9-17 as the Presentation of a Prophet Like Moses”, in The Elusive Prophet, Johannes C. De Moor (ed.), Leiden: Brill 2001, 123.
\textsuperscript{114} DIJKSTRA, “I am neither a Prophet nor a Prophet’s Pupil”, 127.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid, 107.
prophets in Israel who originally were not prophets. Jeremiah was a priest, from the family of priests of Anathoth, and Elisha was tilling the land when he was called to his prophetic office.

Amos has been considered as the “beginnings” of “classical” prophecy in the middle decades of the 8th century B.C.E. I consider Amos 3:7 as part of the original nucleus of the book, and therefore conclude that the phrase עֲבָדָיו הַנְבִיאִים, is actually pre-deuteronomistic. Apparently, this text could very well have been the source to the famous deuteronomistic phrase בְיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְבִיאִים, used in 2 Kings 17:32; 21:10; 24:2 and Jeremiah 25:4. Moreover, as Nihan notes, the phrase in Amos 2:11: נָשָׁהָ מִבְנֵיכ, most probably constitutes the earliest source for Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. In my opinion, keeping the above arguments in mind, the book of Amos does not seek to present its protagonist as a “prophet like Moses”.

5.6 Hosea

Regarding the prophet Hosea, not much can be said except that very particular verse in Hosea 12:14 referring to Moses as a prophet. As we have already seen, this phrase offers quite a few problems to the exegete. According to Muilenburg, the prophet Hosea considered himself to belong to the succession of “prophets like Moses” as is evident in Hosea 6:5; 9:7; 12:11, 14. In 12:14 Hosea does not mention Moses by name, but the allusion to Moses is clear: the one through whom YHWH brought Israel out of Egypt is being considered “a prophet”. It is interesting that there is no definite article, meaning that the author did not understand Moses as being a paradigmatic prophet. Did Hosea understand Moses as being just a prophet like the rest, maybe as being merely the first prophet? Whilst it could be that Hosea reflects the earliest understanding of Moses as a prophet, I retain that the book of Hosea does not present this prophet as a self-proclaimed “prophet like Moses”, especially not in the line of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. If anything, it could very well have been the case

116 BLENKINSOPP, History of Prophecy, 73.
117 NIHAN, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 55.
that the note of Hosea 12:14 served as a source for Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. In my opinion, Hosea stressed that the Exodus event was led by a prophet to legitimise his own position as a prophet. This is especially so when we consider the function of the second נביא within the verse: ובנביא נשר ותיושר ועלא יהוה איבנביא כו. Whilst God used a prophet (Moses) to lead the people out of Egypt, God also used a prophet (also Moses?) to preserve Israel. Apparently, it will be the task of Hosea as a prophet to preserve Israel. In my opinion, Hosea 12:14 are Hosea’s ipissima verba. If however we do accept that Hosea 12:14 is a late text, as some scholars tend to suggest, and that it comes from a deuteronomistic hand, then it follows that the redactor would have strived to present Moses the prophet as leader of the Exodus event, whilst the prophet preserving נביא Israel would be precisely the role of the “prophet like Moses”. Apparently, Israel would always be preserved through such a prophet, set up by YHWH. Thus, the redactor would have legitimised Hosea as an authentic prophet keeping Israel, whilst also presenting him as a “prophet like Moses”. The fact that נביא lacks the article however, is a strong argument against this conclusion.

5.7 Isaiah

When hearing of a parallel between Isaiah and Moses, the first thing that comes to my mind is their objection to their divine call, linked with their speech apparatus, as is typical of the Gattung of the prophetic call narrative. This parallel of the motif linked with the mouth, or the lips, is in fact observable in Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In any case, it is always interesting to note that whilst Moses claims that he is not a “man of words”, and Jeremiah says that he is still “too young”, Isaiah claims that he is “a man of unclean lips” (Isa 6:5). Isaiah here lays emphasis on his

---

119 As we have seen above, Nihan considers Amos 2:11 as being the source for Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. See Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 55.
120 As already noted above, Albright thinks that this second נביא could actually refer to Samuel. See Albright, “Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement”, 157.
121 TENGSTROM, “Moses and the Prophets”, 260
122 Not all scholars agree on this point. Williamson notes that unlike the other prophets, who are commissioned, Isaiah volunteers. This would constitute a major difference from the typical Gattung. Williamson also considers that the nature of Isaiah’s objection is completely different from that of the others. See Hugh G.M. Williamson, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 6-12, (=ICC), London: T & T Clark, 2018, 38.
Redewerkzeuge, thus implying that he is not the best candidate for being a prophet. Most probably, these parallels are there simply because of the typical Gattung, and there is no reason to suppose that a particular redaction aimed particularly at creating such a parallel with the aim of presenting Isaiah as a “prophet like Moses”.

It is however important to note that the introductory verses of Isaiah contain certain parallels with the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32:4b-5. The heavens and the earth are called to bear witness to YHWH against his people. Based on these similarities, Martin O’Kane suggests that an appropriate starting point for comparison between Moses and Isaiah are Moses’ last words in Deuteronomy 31-34. This is especially so in the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 31:30-32:44, which anticipates 2 Kings 12:7-23. Basically, what Deuteronomy 31:30-32:44 predicts, especially in terms of the incumbent evil that would befall the land should the people grow unfaithful to YHWH, 2 Kings 21 narrates as being fulfilled. The same observation can be done in 2 Kings 21:10-15. What Moses predicts in Deuteronomy 31:29 is fulfilled by Manasseh in 2 Kings 21:10-15. It is interesting to note that 2 Kings 17 and 2 Kings 21 form an inclusio, framing the mission of the prophet Isaiah to Hezekiah in 2 Kings 18-20. The links between Hezekiah and Moses are also drawn out by the author of 2 Kings: 1) Hezekiah destroyed Nehushtan, the Bronze Serpent which Moses had erected, because the people were burning incense to it (2 Kings 18:4); 2) Hezekiah is described as keeping the commandments of Moses (2 Kings 18:6); 3) his faithfulness is in stark contrast to Israel, which refused to listen to the prophets of YHWH. This theme marks an inclusio in 2 Kings 17:13 and 2 Kings 21:10. Indeed, Hezekiah is an ideal king for he obeys both Moses (2 Kings 18:6) and Isaiah (2 Kings 20:19). In this sequence, Isaiah, is indicated by the author of 2 Kings as the authoritative successor of Moses.

Isaiah 1:2-3 provides the basic theme by which to approach the whole book of Isaiah especially through the themes of hearing and seeing. As such these verses offer an excellent introduction to the whole book. The book therefore opens with a complaint of YHWH about the disloyalty of Israel and calls upon the heavens and the earth as witnesses against the people. As already noted above, these verses have a

---
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strong resonance with Deuteronomy 4:26; 30:19; 31:28; 32:1. Alphonso Groenewald argues that this resonance, created by the last redactor of the book, makes of Isaiah a “prophet like Moses”, because he is the prophet who continues the teachings of Moses. Groenewald concludes that the opening words recall Moses’ words spoken in Deuteronomy, and were presented by the compilers of the book of Isaiah who wished to present Isaiah as someone who repeats Moses’ Torah and applies it in a new setting. Alphonso Groenewald, “Isaiah 1:2-3 and Isaiah 6: Isaiah ‘a Prophet like Moses’ (Deut 18:18)”, HTS Theological Studies 68 (2012) 1-7.

The book of Deuteronomy, which is presented as the testament of Moses, is read within the context of the Pentateuch as the actualised Sinai-Torah at Moab. With this understanding of Deuteronomy, the Torah-mediated Moses is understood as a “Prophet”. Consequently, after many other prophets and prophetesses, a canonical reading the writing-prophet Isaiah... The prophetic word is also “Torah”, insofar as it actualises the Torah of Moses.

The Song of Moses can be considered as vaticinium ex eventu. In Deuteronomy 31:19 YHWH commands Moses to write down the Song as a witness for him “against the people of Israel”. In Isaiah 30:8, Isaiah too, like Moses, is instructed to write down the words of his teaching as a witness against the people. Indeed, there is a very strong thematic parallel between Deuteronomy 29:4 and Isaiah 6:10. The theme of YHWH not giving the people “a mind to understand, or eyes to see, or ears to hear”, is developed into a well concentric structure within Isaiah 6:10:

---

128 Ibid. See also ALPHONSO GROENEWALD, “Isaiah 1:4-9 as a Post-Exilic Reflection”, JS 20 (2011) 87-108.
131 For a fuller account of this concentric structure see GREGORY POLAN, “The Call and Commission of Isaiah”, BT 43 (2005) 351.
Groenewald argues that Isaiah preached during the 8th century B.C.E., and therefore it was very unlikely that he knew of the Mosaic Torah which did not come into prominence until the reforms of Ezra in the 4th and 5th centuries B.C.E. However, whilst it is very true that the Torah of Moses was fully redacted in the 4th and 5th centuries B.C.E., it is inconceivable that some body of laws did not exist in the 8th century B.C.E. and even before that! Groenewald argues that the occurrences of the term Torah within Isaiah 1:10 and Isaiah 2:3 have been introduced at a later time with the purpose of linking the message of the prophet with the central authority of the Torah. Most probably this was a move that occurred later when the books were being fitted within the canon. At that point, Isaiah, together with the other prophets, was depicted as a “prophet like Moses”, so that the prophetic message would be perceived as an application of the Torah itself. The prophet therefore became the direct mediator of the Torah, whose words were meant to guide the people to follow what is written in the Torah that YHWH on Mount Sinai gave to Moses, the prophet par excellence. Indeed, it is a fact that the book of Isaiah recapitulates the Pentateuch, from the concept of creation (Isa 45:18) to the Exodus event. Sweeney identifies the book of Isaiah as serving the role of a prophetic Torah, in line with the reform and restoration programme of Ezra and Nehemiah.

---

132 Alphonso Groenewald, “The Significance of תורת תורה (Isa 2,3) within Isaiah 2,1-5: the Relationship of the First Overture (1,1 - 2,5) to the Book’s Conclusion (Isa 65-66)”, OTE 26 (2013) 696.
133 We cannot enter into details here, but as outlined in chapter 1, many scholars date the early conception of Urdeuteronomium in the time of Hezekiah. So whilst the Torah still had a few centuries to be finalised, there clearly was a body of laws that were normative for everyday life.
134 Groenewald, “The Significance of תורת תורה”, 704.
135 Hyun Chul, “The Song of Moses”, 147, and references therein.
There are very strong parallels between the Song of Moses and Deutero Isaiah, indicating that the redactor aimed at interconnecting these texts, or at least create an allusion. Keiser notes the following parallels:137 Israel is only called Jeshurun (יְשֻרִין) four times in the Hebrew Bible, three times in Deuteronomy 32:15; 33:5; 33:26 and once in Isaiah 44:8. The word for God שֵׁם coupled with the word רָכִּב “rock” to refer to God, is only used in Deuteronomy 32:15 and Isaiah 44:8. The word רָכִּב “rock” is used in a specific way to describe the incomparability of YHWH in sharp contrast with the other gods (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37 // Isa 44:8; 49:14; 51:1, 13).138 An even stronger parallel is that this theology of incomparability of YHWH in both Deuteronomy and Isaiah is coupled with Israel’s (Jeshurun’s) failure. It is apparent that there is a conscious dependency between Isaiah 44 and Deuteronomy 32.139 There are further parallels with the rest of the chapters of Deutero Isaiah. The term “I am he” (אני הוא) is used seven times in the Hebrew Bible, once in Deuteronomy 32:39, and the rest in the book of Isaiah in Isaiah 41:4; 43:10, 13; 44:4; 48:12; 52:6. There are also strong theological parallels, including: the incomparability of YHWH (Deut 32:12; 39 // Isa 41:4; 44:6; 45:21; 48:12); the sin and failure of Israel; forsaking YHWH for false gods; deliverance following judgement; deliverance for YHWH’s sake; and a concern for all nations.140 Indeed, the Song of Moses does carry some archaic features, however, the way the themes feature in it indicate that it was composed independently of Deuteronomy and was composed in the post-exilic period, most probably using older material. It was added to Deuteronomy during the time when the book was being united with the Pentateuch.141 With this in mind, we ask which text influenced which. Hyun Chul suggests a complex route of interconnection rather than a simple rectilinear influence.142 There is the possibility that the final redactors of both texts were contemporary. Whatever the case, there is a clear intended effort to create a coherent dialogue between the two texts.143 Whilst these strong links between Deuteronomy

139 KEISER, “The Song of Moses”, 489.
140 Ibid, 491.
142 HYUN CHUL, “The Song of Moses”, 169.
143 Ibid, 169.
and Isaiah are undeniable, a close study of the text of the book of Isaiah does not reveal that there is a redaction in Isaiah that can be called deuteronomistic. Indeed, as Groenewald, Sweeney and Clements note, these parallels were most probably very late and can be dated within the Persian period, at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Most probably this was an attempt to present the book of Isaiah as prophetic Torah, as Sweeney contends. The canons were being established, and whilst the Torah was presented as the ultimate one-time revelation at Sinai/Horeb, the prophetic books were being presented as the application of that Torah to the Sitz im Leben of the community.

5.7.1 Conclusion

In the Second Book of Kings, Isaiah is portrayed as a prophet who in his historical context continues the mission of Moses as we saw in the parallels between Deuteronomy 31-32 and 2 Kings 12 and 21, a continuation which enhances his prophetic authority. Isaiah’s call too echoes, to an extent, that of Moses. He, like Moses is commanded by YHWH to write his oracles as witness against the people. Keeping in mind the late composition of the Song of Moses, it becomes apparent that these parallels were created quite late. Such appears to be the case of Isaiah 36-39 and of 2 Kings 18:17-20:19. If this is so, keeping in mind the fact that none of the latter prophets are associated with Moses in 1-2 Kings, it becomes evident that the final editors of Kings must have held Isaiah in very high regard, if they associated him, not Jeremiah or any of the other prophets, with Moses.

5.7.2 Isaiah’s Suffering Servant

It has already been noted that Moses is presented as suffering on behalf of the people much like Jeremiah and the suffering servant in Isaiah. For van Seters, J’s theology presents a democratization of the covenant, much like Isaiah 55:4-5, where

146 See O’KANE, “Prophet in the Footsteps of Moses”, 48.
147 Ibid, 50.
Israel is presented as the “collective leader” among the nations, and Exodus 19:6, where Israel’s mission is that of being “a kingdom of priests” with the specific mission of observing and teaching the law amongst the nations. According to van Seters, Moses’ role in J’s theology unifies both the royal role as well as the deuteronomistic prophetic role. He concludes that in the Servant Songs of Isaiah 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9 and 52:13-53:12, “Israel is personified with the same mixture of royalty and prophetic roles that one finds in J’s Moses”.148 Many scholars have sought to identify the person of the suffering servant. Gordon Hugenberger worked on demonstrating that the suffering servant of Isaiah is the expected “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:14ff and Deuteronomy 34:10ff.149 More specifically, he argues that Isaiah leaves the identity vague so as to point to a future fulfilment, blending in the figure with prophetic, royal and priestly features, thus building a strong assonance with the promised prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15 and 34:10.150 Indeed, Deutero Isaiah is replete with imagery from the Exodus.151 The return from the Exile into the Promised Land is depicted in Deutero Isaiah as the second Exodus.152 According to von Rad, this prominence in the theme demands an identification of the servant of the Lord with a second Moses figure.153 Westermann notes that the word servant could have been chosen to place all the traits of prophet, king, and priest into one individual, much like Moses, who is called servant some forty times within the Hebrew Bible.154 All of this fits well with interpreting the suffering servant in terms of a second figure of the “prophet like Moses” described in Deuteronomy 18:15-22.

152 This can be observed in the Song of Cyrus in Isaiah 44:29-45:13, where the author draws upon Israel’s past traditions and uses them to elaborate a prophetic message of comfort. Cyrus’ military venture is directed towards Israel’s benefit. The return into the Land constitutes the new exodus. See GRAHAM OGIDEN, “Moses and Cyrus: Literary Affinities between the Priestly Presentation of Moses in Exodus vi-viii and the Cyrus Song in Isaiah xliv 24 - xlv 13”, VT 28 (1978) 195-203.
Hugenberger notes that there are parallels between the call narratives of the Servant in Isaiah 49:1ff and that of Jeremiah in Jeremiah 1:4-10. As we have seen, there is an intertextual connection between the call of Jeremiah and that of Moses. In my opinion, Isaiah 49:1b (ָיהוָה מִמְעֵי אִמִי הִזְכִיר שְמִי) carries a strong allusion to Jeremiah 1:5 (ךְָאָנִי מִמְעֵי אִמִי מִבֵּית מִקְרָאָנִי מִמְעֵי אִמִי הִזְכִיר שְמִי). Another strong allusion is the equipping of the mouth in Isaiah 49:2 (ם פִי כְחַדָּה), which again is evocative of Jeremiah 1:9 (ַגַע עַל־פִי) and Moses in Exodus 4:11 (רֶם אֵלָיו מִי שָם פָּה לָאָדָם). It is interesting to note that whilst Jeremiah is appointed as “a prophet to the nations” (Jer 1:9), the Servant is appointed as “a light to the nations” ( Isa 49:5). As Hugenberger notes, Isaiah 50:4-5 further evokes the response God gave to Moses in Exodus 4:11.

The recurrent theme of the Servant being rejected by the people also has Mosaic resonance. Israel complained and rebelled against Moses, and brought legal charges against him as in the lawsuits of Exodus 17:2 and Numbers 20:3, and the legal execution by stoning that they wanted in Exodus 17:3 and Numbers 14:10. Indeed, in Numbers 12:3 Moses is described as humble (עֲנָו) more than anyone. It is also interesting to note that in Isaiah 53:9, the grave of the servant is said to be with the wicked. This seems to evoke Moses’ burial site outside the Promised Land, the place where the whole generation of the disobedient from among the people were condemned to die and be buried in Numbers 26:65; 32:13 and Deuteronomy 4:21. Hugenberger claims that by identifying the servant as the second Moses, the integrity of the songs as well as their context are preserved. Indeed, Hugenberger’s observations are very pertinent and we could very well conclude that the author of Deutero Isaiah presented the suffering servant with strong Mosaic overtones. However, I seriously doubt that the author actually intended to present the Suffering Servant in terms of the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18: 15, 18. Deutero Isaiah’s main theme is the imminent salvation of exiled Israel, and therefore these overtones were most probably created to depict the great return from the Exile back into the Promised Land in terms of a second Exodus.

156 Ibid.
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5.8 Jeremiah

Jeremiah has been considered by various scholars as a “prophet like Moses”. Indeed, Georg Fischer named his monograph of collected articles on Jeremiah studies: “Der Prophet wie Mose”. The fact that he used the definite article implies that he interprets Jeremiah as being “the” “prophet like Moses” promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Fischer in fact argues that the first chapter of the book of Jeremiah takes up the promise God makes to Moses in Deuteronomy 18:18. From the very beginning, the prophet Jeremiah is presented as God’s promised prophet, as is evidenced by the strict parallel that exists between Jeremiah 1:7, 9, and Deuteronomy 18:18. In general, therefore, scholars agree that Jeremiah understood himself to be a prophet, if not “the prophet”, like Moses. The affinities between the call of Jeremiah and the call of Moses, and the subsequent affinity of both with Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, are beyond dispute, yet the direction of influence is not easy to determine. Mark Brettler suggests that this influence is a complex one, for whilst the Deuteronomists revised parts of Jeremiah, in turn, such revisions influenced the late developments in the book of Deuteronomy. Others argue that Deuteronomy 18:18 is dependent on Jeremiah 1:7 and 1:9. H.H. Schmid is of the opinion that the narrative call of Moses

159 GEORG FISCHER, Der Prophet wie Mose: Studien zum Jeremiabuch, (=BZABR; 15), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
160 FISCHER, Der Prophet wie Mose, XI. As he himself argues: „Von daher erklärt sich der etwas ungewöhnliche Titel für einen Sammelband zu Jeremia-Studien“.
was modelled on the great prophetic calls of Isaiah and Jeremiah and applied to the 7th or 6th century Judah. Blenkinsopp suggests that a deuteronomistic hand in Exodus 3:1-4:17 draws on the accounts of prophetic commissioning, especially that of Jeremiah. Exodus 3:1-4:17 can thus be considered as a deuteronomistic contribution to the call of Moses, thus leading to an understanding of Moses that can be called: “Deuteronomistic Moses”.167

There are further parallels between Jeremiah and Moses. Jeremiah appears to be the only one amongst the prophets to have written books. This insistence on him having written a book might be an allusion to the figure of Moses who wrote the Torah.168 There are hints within the deuteronomistic parts of the book of Jeremiah, that Jeremiah was considered by the deuteronomists as being the last prophet up to the exile.169 There is an identical conclusion in 2 Kings 25:1-30 and Jeremiah 52:1-32; these two texts, narrating the end of Judah, correspond almost word for word, with the redactor in Jeremiah adding some details.170 Jeremiah appears to be the last prophet of Israel up to the exile for the Deuteronomists, since the destruction occurred under his ministry, as he himself had predicted.171 If this is the case, just as Moses is the first prophet, as presented in Deuteronomy 18:15-22, Jeremiah would be the last prophet of YHWH. This would be the case up to the Exile at least. Indeed, even if this were not the case, Jeremiah would still be the candidate for the “best” prophet in deuteronomistic terms since, according to the criteria set by Deuteronomy 18:20-22, what he foretold actually came to be. Teeple states: “the parallels between Moses and Jeremiah only serve to enhance the latter’s prestige and facilitated the identification of Jeremiah with the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18”.172 As we shall see, it
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Lohfink argues that this parallelism is a clue from the redactors that Jeremiah and Kings should be read together as one book. See Norbert Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?“ in Jeremia und die „deuteronomistische Bewegung“, Walter Grosi (ed.), Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995, 313-382.
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is quite apparent that the announcement of a prophet to come in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 was applied deuteronomistically to Jeremiah.

### 5.8.1 Jeremiah, Deuteronomy and its Deuteronomistic Redaction

There is widespread agreement that there is a deuteronomistic redaction of the book of Jeremiah. Römer contends that the final deuteronomistic redaction was done in the Persian period by scribes belonging to the deuteronomistic circle so that the book would become part of the existing deuteronomistic collection of books.\(^\text{173}\) He makes a very interesting observation on the text of Jeremiah 44:10, where he notes that the phrase “the Land given to our fathers”, became in the Persian edition, “the Torah given to our fathers”, thus indicating that the land was less important to the Babylonian redactors of Jeremiah 1-45 who transformed the golah into a diaspora.\(^\text{174}\)

Jeremiah appears to have been a very important prophet for the deuteronomistic movement. Indeed, if Josiah was the champion of this movement as a king, Jeremiah must have been his prophetic counterpart. Scholars disagree as to whether Jeremiah ever supported Josiah’s reform. Sweeney contends that Jeremiah 30-31 provides enough evidence that this prophet supported Josiah’s deuteronomistic reform.\(^\text{175}\) James Philip Hyatt, on the other hand, claims that it was the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah that actually worked on the text of Jeremiah to make him approve the deuteronomistic reforms. He contends that Jeremiah started his ministry only under Jehoiakim,\(^\text{176}\) when the reforms of Josiah had already failed. Jack Lundbom

---


\(^\text{175}\) MARVIN SWEENEY, Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature, (=FZAT; 45), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005, 109-122; Whilst there is some consensus that Jeremiah 30-31 addresses the restoration of Israel following the Babylonian Exile, many scholars, especially Lohfink, argue that the Urtext of Jeremiah 30-31 constitutes the prophet’s statements in support of King Josiah in 640-609 B.C.E. see NORBERT LOHFINK, “Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet. Zum Grundstock von Jer 30-31”, in Le livre de Jérémie. Le prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission, P. M. Bogaert (ed.), (=BETL; 54), Leuven: Peeters, 1997, 351.

\(^\text{176}\) Indeed, many scholars argue for such a dating. Whitley suggests that the date of Jeremiah 1:2 refers to Jeremiah’s birth rather than the beginning of his ministry, and that Jeremiah 25:1 is the first definitive date that relates Jeremiah’s activity to the 4th year of king Jehoiakim and the year of the battle of Carchemish. See CHARLES WHITLEY, “The Date of Jeremiah’s Call”, 17’ 14 (1964) 482-483. A similar argument, as regards the deuteronomistic dating of Jeremiah’s career, is put forward by HENRI...
solves the problem of chronology by stating that Jeremiah did receive his call in 627 B.C.E, in the thirteenth year of Josiah, but being very young at that stage, he would only accept it after the discovery of the book in the Temple in 622 B.C.E as indicated in Jeremiah 15:16. \(^{177}\) Jeremiah 5:19; 9:11-13; 16:10-13, and 22:8-9 are deuteronomistic passages designed to explain why the Exile occurred. \(^{178}\) Similar passages of deuteronomistic flavour are found in Deuteronomy 29:21-27 and 1 Kings 9:8-9. These passages, Hyatt contends, come from the same editorial school. \(^{179}\) Jeremiah 11:1-20:18 and the portrayal of Jeremiah therein, present Jeremiah as the outstanding example of the deuteronomistic conception of the “prophet like Moses”, especially as concerns Jeremiah’s mediatorial role. \(^{180}\) Indeed, there is wide agreement today that the deuteronomistic editors worked on the book of Jeremiah to depict him along the lines of the theology of Deuteronomy. \(^{181}\) Jeremiah 7:33 (הָיְתָה נִבְלַת הָעָם וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד הֱמַת הָאָר לְמַאֲכָל לְֹוף הַשָמַיִם) can be considered as a quote of Deuteronomy 28:26 (לֹּעֵלֵבָּלַתְּךָ צַר מַשָנְכַד אֶל לְעַבָּר כָל־הָוִים הָאֵל וּיַעַל צַל נָתַבְּרָז). \(^{182}\) Indeed, Jeremiah 28:14 can be read as the fulfillment of Deuteronomy 28:48. As concerns the direction of influence, Fischer contends that the redactor of Jeremiah is apparently using Deuteronomy, suggesting that there is the intention of modelling Jeremiah and his message after Moses. \(^{183}\) It is evident that the deuteronomistic editor in Jeremiah has


\(^{181}\) Indeed, these editors conceived of Moses as the first prophet, as attested in their theology of Deuteronomy 18:18. In this light Seitz argues: those who shaped the book of Jeremiah saw him as the last Mosaic prophet. See CHRISTOPHER SEITZ, “The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah”, ZAW 101 (1989) 12.

\(^{182}\) GEORG FISCHER, “Das Ende von Deuteronomium (Dtn 26-34) im Spiegel des Jeremiabuches”, in “Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben” (Gen 18,19), Reinhard Achenbach – Martin Arnh (eds.), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009, 283.

\(^{183}\) FISCHER, “Das Ende von Deuteronomium”, 290-291. Fischer identifies three intentions behind such use of the last chapters of Deuteronomy: 1) The redactor wants to assert that Jeremiah can claim similar authority to Moses. 2) The book of Jeremiah could be regarded as the continuation of the end of
his closest affinities in style and substance to the exilic deuteronomistic editor of Deuteronomy. Hyatt concludes: “The primary purpose which led D to make an edition of Jeremiah was to show how Jeremiah, the outstanding prophet at the time of Judah’s decline and downfall, was in general agreement with the ideas and purposes of the Deuteronomic School”. This purpose appears to be extensively reflected in the parallels that exist within the call narratives of Moses and Jeremiah.

5.8.2 Literary Genre of the Call Narrative

Scholars are unanimous in stating that the strongest parallels that exist between Moses and Jeremiah lie within their call narrative. The text of Deuteronomy 18:15ff comes into this parallel as well. Does this reflect a redactional attempt to portray Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses”? The following sections seek to answer this question in detail. Many scholars have identified a clear literary genre (Gattung) for the prophetic call narrative. Each scholar has presented a schema, and though there are many variations, they still basically, identify the same elements. Habel contends that the classical prophets appropriate and develop the call traditions reflected in the calls of Moses and Gideon with the specific aim of establishing a link with the past history of Israel. This direction of influence however is not so straightforward. Critical studies have shown that the call of Moses has been connected with the phenomenon of classical prophecy, and that it was actually classical prophecy that influenced this narrative on Moses, taking as a base text Deuteronomy 18:14ff. The evidence of intentional borrowing indicates that the prophetic call accounts seem to be the product of later redactional reflection, serving to legitimate the prophet in question. Hans Mallau identified two types of typical call narrative scenes, one

Deuteronomy and of the Torah as a whole. 3) Jeremiah interprets the downfall of Jerusalem and Judah as the incoming curses predicted by the last chapter of Deuteronomy.


Norman Habel, “The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives”, ZAW 77 (1965) 316. The fact that this Gattung is applied to Gideon shows that there is “a significant pre-prophetic history” to it. See ibid, 305.


Habel, “Form and Significance”, 317. Ferry identifies three functions for the use of this Gattung: 1) placed at the beginning of the ministry it serves to define the prophetic mission as speaking on behalf of YHWH; 2) to legitimise the prophet; 3) to insert the subject into the long line of prophets within the prophetic tradition. See J. Ferry, “Les récits de vocación prophétique”, EB 60 (2002) 219.
based on vocation through audition, typical of Gideon and Jeremiah, and the other, based on vocation through a vision, typical of Isaiah and Ezekiel.\(^{188}\) It is interesting to note that the more complex call of Moses in Exodus 3–4 seems to include both types.

As we have already seen, the strongest resonance between Moses and Jeremiah is in their call narrative. It is evident that the vocation narrative of Exodus 3:1-4:18 has parallels to the schema of the vocation of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others, in what is the typical Gattung of the prophetic call.\(^{189}\) Habel in fact states: “By employing the form and some of the language of the call of Moses, Jeremiah also claims to stand in the prophetic succession of Moses. This fact is further demonstrated by Jeremiah’s dependence upon the prophetic magna carta of Deuteronomy 18:15-22”.\(^{190}\) I retain that it is important at this point to have a look at this literary genre and its possible import on the affinities that exist between Moses and Jeremiah.

Various scholars have identified various schemas,\(^{191}\) however, the majority of scholars, tend to stick with Habel’s excellent schema for the call Gattung which involves the following sequence: 1) Theophany, 2) Divine Word, 3) Commission, 4) Objection, 5) Reassurance and 6) Sign.\(^{192}\) As we shall see, this schema is followed for almost every call within the Bible, even though at times, some elements are missing, or the order of the stages modified.\(^{193}\) The fact that there is such a strong correspondence within this literary genre seems to imply that these call narratives are literary constructs and not the actual “authentic” words of the individual being called.\(^{194}\) Wolfgang Richter argues that this schema is indeed a literary fiction,
probably developed before the time of the prophetic circles, that is a product of a theological reflection on the intimacy that lies between YHWH and his chosen one.\textsuperscript{195}

Habel, as well as many other scholars, notes that Moses’ call account embraces all the major features of Gideon’s call.\textsuperscript{196} Indeed, this call appears to be the oldest narrative, where most probably the scheme here is pre-deuteronomistic.\textsuperscript{197} Gideon was not a prophet but was called to save Israel from an emergency. The same can be said of Moses. Habel notes that the redactors responsible for the call narratives of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, appropriate and develop the call narratives of Moses and Gideon with the specific aim of creating a link between these prophets and the previous leaders and saviours, making them their successors.\textsuperscript{198}

5.8.2.1 The Call of Moses

In Exodus 3–4 the vocation of Moses is described along the formulary of prophetic vocation.\textsuperscript{199} According to Römmer, this was done by the Deuteronomists so that they could redeem the prophets.\textsuperscript{200} In Exodus we find two vocation narratives, one in Exodus 3:1–4:18, which classical exegesis attributes to JE, and the other in 6:2–7:6, which scholars agree to have been written by P.\textsuperscript{201} Scholars have typically identified the reflection of the biblical author and his understanding of the matter. The experience of the call would forever remain the very personal matter of the individual. See Habel, “Form and Significance”, 305.

\textsuperscript{195} WOLFGANG RICHTER, \textit{Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte: Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Studie zu 1 Sam 9,1-10,16, Ex 3f. und Ri 6,11b-17}, (=FRLANT; 101), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970, 59-60.
\textsuperscript{197} SCHMIDT, “Die Berufung des Mose in Exodus 3”, 342.
\textsuperscript{198} HABEL, “Form and Significance”, 316.
\textsuperscript{199} Habel divides the call of Moses as follows: 1) divine confrontation (Ex 3:1-4); 2) the introductory word, God calls out of the burning bush (Ex 3:4b-9); 3) the commission, sending to Pharaoh (Ex 3:10); 4) the objection (Ex 3:11); 5) the reassurance (Ex 3:12); 6) the sign (Ex 3:12). See HABEL, “Form and Significance”, 303-304; Habel here only gives one objection and one reassurance, those that are parallel to the call of Gideon. Indeed, Moses presents some five objections to God. Fischer summarises the schema into four main salient elements giving a fuller account of Moses’ objections and God’s assurance: introduction (Ex 3:1-9); 1) order (Ex 3: 10, 16, 12); 2) objection (Ex 3:11, 13; 4: 1, 10, 13); 3) assurance (Ex 3:12a, 14f., 4:8ff (11), 12b, 15); 4) signs (Ex 3:12; 4:3, 6, 9b, (17); conclusion (Ex 4:18). See GEORG FISCHER, \textit{Jahwe unser Gott: Sprache, Aufbau und Erzähltechnik in der Berufung des Mose (Ex 3-4)}, (=OBO; 91), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, 48.
\textsuperscript{200} THOMAS RÖMER, “Moïse entre théologie et histoire”, \textit{LV} 49 (1998) 12.
\textsuperscript{201} GEORGE COATS, “Moses in Midian”, \textit{JBL} 92 (1973) 3. Coats argues that J wanted to present Moses in the light of typical heroic sagas, both at his birth and his death. In the vocation account too, the
the E version as being comprised of Exodus 3:1b, 4b, 6, 9-15; 4:10-17, 20b-23, 27-28, 30a, and the J version as being Exodus 4:1ab, 2-4a, 5, 7-8. Richter contended that the J and E sources use the vocation scheme giving two different versions, namely, that E builds on Judges 6 and 1 Samuel 3, which belong to the schema of a saviour, whilst the J narrative is to be associated with the calls of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, within the prophetic call scheme. Werner Fuß considers the text as having the classical sources J and E at its origin, both of which have been edited and redacted by the Deuteronomist. Weimar states that the deuteronomistic redaction in these chapters consists of the following verses: Exodus 3:8ab, 17; 4:3, 19-20. Similarly, Renaud builds upon Schmid’s conclusions and identifies the following literary composition in Exodus 3–4: The Yahwist described the transmission of a salvific oracle to Moses, the Elohist applied the literary genre of the call narrative to Moses for the first time, depicting Moses’ call as a call to action as a leader and saviour, whilst the deuteronomist, as the final redactor, united the two and elaborated the call narrative to depict Moses as receiving a prophetic call. Berge contends that most probably Exodus 3–4 is to be attributed to the redactional activity of the deuteronomist working on the growth of the Pentateuch. Stackert is the most recent scholar to argue that the sources for Exodus 3–4 are J and E. He contends that these Pentateuchal sources already wanted to portray that Moses was a prophet in the typical call narrative scene. Many scholars, however, see Exodus 3–4 as a post-deuteronomistic text, commissioning of Moses in Exodus 3:1-4:23 makes of Moses an active agent in the redemptive event.
modelled on Jeremiah 1:4-19. Given the clear parallels, as we shall see, I conclude that Exodus 3:1–4:18 is of the hand of a late author/redactor who wanted to portray Moses as the prophet par excellence, building his vocation narrative on that of Jeremiah and inflating it quite extensively in the light of Moses’ biography. Most probably, the Deuteronomist built on a much older, probably original, tradition which claimed that Moses received his divine call and commission in Midian. Such would make sense, since I have concluded, with other scholars, that the Midianite layer is very old material. It is in Midian that Moses was introduced to Yahwism, and most probably, it is in Midian that Moses felt the call to return to Egypt to lead his brothers from there and mediate their meeting with YHWH. Otherwise, what motivation could Moses possibly have had to return to Egypt, once he was well settled in Midian? If I am correct in seeing Moses’ five excuses for not following the divine commission as reflecting particular concrete moments in Moses’ biography, then it follows that Exodus 3:1–4:18 is one of the latest texts to enter into the Pentateuch. Blum concluded that Exodus 3 is the opening text of the D composition which presupposes the deuteronomistic history and revises the pre-sacerdotal narratives of Exodus and Numbers. He contends that this redaction wanted to create the great history running from Exodus to Kings. In fact for him, Exodus 3:1–4:18 is a unified D-Komposition inserted between 2:23 and 4:19. When considering the flow of the text it appears


Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 59; see also Nihan, “Moses and the Prophets”, 35 and references therein.

Coats does not see Midian as the setting for Moses’ call and commission. For him the vocation account at its earliest stage describes Moses’ call without specifying that Midian is the setting. The vocation account was later joined with a theophany report, set on the mountain of God. In my opinion this could be the hand of the Deuteronomist, who refers to the mountain with the typical deuteronomistic name “Horeb”. Coats argues that it is only the mentioning of Jethro as the owner of the sheep Moses was tending and the later mention of Jethro at the mountain of God in Exodus 18, that opens the door for attracting the idea that the call was set in a Midianite context. See COATS, “Moses in Midian”, 9.

Coats himself notes that the objections of Moses echo the inner and outer struggles of the prophets of Israel. He however contends that the setting for this text obscures the character of this influence. According to him, both Moses’ vocation as well as that of the prophets were influenced by a third source. See GEORGE COATS, “The Moses Narratives as Heroic Saga”, 41. I do not agree. I do see a direct influence from the prophets. What is original in Exodus 3-4, in my opinion, is the actual re-reading of Moses’ biography and the formulation of Moses’ objections in relation to salient points of difficulty within that biography.


BLUM, Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch, 22-28.
that the vocation narrative of Exodus 3:1–4:18 has been inserted at a later stage. 3:10 makes no sense in conjunction with 4:19. Yet 4:19 makes perfect sense if it were to continue after 2:23. Römer states that Exodus 3:1–4:18 is marked by late deuteronomistic terminology and most probably belongs to a post-priestly redactor.

From this brief outline one can infer that much ink has been spilt on the issue of the composition of Exodus 3–4. Scholars appear to be divided between those who accept the Documentary Hypothesis considering Exodus 3–4 as a composite text between J and E, and the other group of scholars who consider Exodus 3–4 as a late composition. Many have concluded that Moses received a different mission, where in Exodus 3:10-11 he is sent to Pharaoh, whereas in Exodus 3:16 he is sent to the elders. However this does not necessarily mean that these details attest to two different sources, as there is no apparent contradiction between the two; indeed, v10 is the fundamental task, whilst v16 is the first step towards its fulfilment. Today, however, there is an emerging scholarly consensus in which the composition of Exodus 3–4 is attributed to a post-priestly redactor, most probably the one responsible for the final form of the Pentateuch, who reinterprets the priestly version of the commissioning of Moses in Exodus 6:2–7:7. As we have seen, Blum argues that the call of Moses in

---


216 THOMAS RÖMER, “Exodus 3–4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion”, in The Interpretation of Exodus: Studies in Honour of Cornelis Houtman, Riemer Roukema – Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte – Klaas Spronk – Jan-Wim Wessellius (eds.), Leuven – Paris – Dudley (Mass.): Peeters, 2006, 65-79; Ibid., “Tracking some “Censored” Moses Traditions Inside and Outside the Hebrew Bible”, HBAI 1 (2012) 68; Römer notes that Exodus 4:6-7 is an even later insertion into a very late text which constitutes a counter reaction against the description of Moses as a leper. This view appears to have circulated in a parallel tradition to the Pentateuch and known by Manethon. According to Josephus in Contra Apionem 1:238ff. Manethon knew of an Egyptian king Amenophis who wanted to purify Egypt from lepers and sick people and put them in stone quarries in the city of Avaris, the former capital of the Hyksos. A priest named Osarseph, who later changed his name to Moses, headed the colony there and gave it new laws, especially with regards to worship. Eventually they joined forces with the Hyksos from Jerusalem and fought with the Egyptian king. Interestingly, Deuteronomy 7:15 might reflect such a tradition that Egypt harboured terrible diseases.

217 RÖMER, "Exodus 3-4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion", 74.

Exodus 3:1–4:18 is a key text of the D-Komposition, and is a post-exilic literary composition aimed at linking the patriarchal stories with the salvation from Egypt. Konrad Schmid concluded that Exodus 3:1–4:18 is a post-P composition that actually reinterprets Exodus 6:2–7:7. Römer does attribute Exodus 3–4 to a post-P author, but he claims that the link between the patriarchal stories and the Exodus event comes from the Priestly redaction. Dozeman distinguishes between two authors, the non-P and the P author, and attributes Exodus 3–4 to the non-P author.

These conclusions are very relevant to my thesis. I conclude that the text of Exodus 3–4 contains deuteronomistic phraseology. The name of the Mountain is Horeb, the list of the people that Israel is to dispossess is typical of deuteronomistic language. The way the Land is described as ֶּרֶבֶל (Ex 3:8//Deut 8:7), and as ֶּרֶבֶל (Ex 3:8), is also typically deuteronomistic. This description also features in the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah in Jeremiah 11:5 and 32:22. The vocation narrative of Moses with some five objections does appear to be the most elaborate of all the call narratives. When studied closely, Moses’ objections are clearly set in line with the difficulties that he encountered with the people. Moses’ objections in Exodus 4:1, 14, reflect the situation of Exodus 5 where the people accuse Moses. Moses’ objections clearly reflect the troubles that Moses faced when facing the people throughout his mission in Exodus-Numbers. The author of Exodus 3–4 clearly had the time to reflect on the life of Moses, in order to compose this masterpiece of a call narrative!


Konrad Schmid, Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments, (=WMZANT; 81), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999, 199-200. Schmid argues, that if P were dependent on D, it would have placed the call on Horeb, the mountain of revelation, rather than in Egypt.

Römer, Israels Väter, 344-352, 552-554.


Contra Stackert, who states that the D source in the Pentateuch does not include a call narrative of Moses. See ibid, 61.

Fischer notes that the name Horeb occurs seventeen times in the Bible. This is the first occurrence, followed by three other times in Exodus and nine times in the late deuteronomistic parts of Deuteronomy. See Fischer, Jahwe unser Gott, 100.

Dozeman, Commentary on Exodus, 101.

Thiel, Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, 139ff.
In the end, whether one accepts the Documentary Hypothesis or not, it is clear that the text has been heavily redacted. If the documentary hypothesis is accepted, Exodus 7–10 can be seen as the redactor’s work at conflating the older documents. As Römer notes, most probably the starting point for the composition or redaction of this text was a reflection upon the prophet Moses as depicted in Deuteronomy 18:15-22 and on the deuteronomistic environment of the theological interest in the holiness of the name YHWH.\textsuperscript{227} It is apparent that Exodus 3–4, containing deuteronomistic phraseology, bears the stamp of the Deuteronomist who wanted to make of Moses the first prophet of Israel. This deuteronomistic author took as model the great call narratives, including that of Gideon\textsuperscript{228} and Jeremiah. In my opinion, this text presupposes Deuteronomy 18 and appears to give it, as Römer contends, a narrative basis.\textsuperscript{229} According to Römer, in fact, Jeremiah 1 compares Jeremiah to Moses by taking up Deuteronomy 18.\textsuperscript{230} There are also clear parallels which hint at an influence between Jeremiah and Moses’ call in Exodus 3:1–4:18. Whilst it is very difficult to decide which text is older, and which text is influencing which, I tend to agree with Römer who thinks that Exodus 3:1–4:18 is actually dependent on Jeremiah 1.\textsuperscript{231} It could also be the case that both texts are contemporaneous, building on the theology of Deuteronomy 18:9-22, seeking to establish an intimate connection between these two figures, as I seek to show in the next section.

5.8.2.2 The Call of Jeremiah

The call of Jeremiah has been studied extensively within the psychological sphere. As Winfried Thiel notes, this has pushed literary critical analysis into the background, and commentators have often considered the text as Jeremiah’s \textit{ipsissima

\begin{footnotes}
\item[227] RÖMER, “Exodus 3-4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion”, 77.
\item[228] The parallels are few but significant: the כִּיּוֹם אָנֵה of Exodus 3:11 parallels the יְהִי בִּי אֲדֹנִי of Judges 6:13, and the reassurance כִּי־אֲדֹנֵי הָעָם in Exodus 3:12 is word for word the reassurance given to Gideon in Judges 3:16. See HABEL, “The Form and Significance”, 304.
\item[229] THOMAS RÖMER, \textit{Les guerres de Moïse}, in \textit{La construction de la figure de Moïse}, Thomas Römer (ed.), Paris: Gabalda, 2007, 170. Strictly speaking, in the context of the Torah, the first prophet is Abraham, in virtue of his intercession (Gen 20). But as we have seen in chapter 3, Genesis 20 is clearly one of the latest insertions in the text. Probably at this time, Moses was no longer seen as the first prophet but as the “super prophet” of Deuteronomy 34:10-12. See RÖMER, “Moses, Israel’s first prophet”, 143.
\item[231] Ibid, 172.
\end{footnotes}
verba. Holladay, studying the psychology and the inner stirrings of Jeremiah in his call narrative, contends that the prophet took Deuteronomy 18:18 and used it as a background for his self-understanding. Holladay concludes that Jeremiah 1 belongs to the original Jeremianic material, where Jeremiah communicates how he understood himself and his call within the parameters of Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22. Jeremiah’s call is very similar to that of the other prophets such as Isaiah and Ezekiel, but it lacks the visionary aspect. However Jeremiah is evidently not confident like Isaiah. He is fearful and hesitant, and much like Moses, in this regard, lacks the credentials for prophetic success. These parallels are often attributed to the typical Gattung of the prophetic call. Habel’s analysis of Jeremiah’s call can be summarised as follows: i) Divine confrontation – the word event formula: יְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמ (Jer 1:4); ii) The introductory word: the intimacy with which YHWH knows his prophet (Jer 1:5); iii) Commission: setting him as a prophet to the nations (Jer 1:5); iv) Objection: the ejaculatory נָי אֲדֹהֵּא is highlighted by the subsequent הנ and the emphatic כי (Jer 1:6); v) Reassurance (Jer 1:7-8); vi) Sign (Jer 1:9-10).

What is particular to Jeremiah, however, is that this call carries two almost word for word parallels with the text of Deuteronomy 18:18. Indeed, the sign of reassurance that YHWH gives to his prophet is the actual placing of the word of YHWH in his prophet’s mouth. This sign actualises the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18 in the life of the prophet Jeremiah. Gregorio Del Olmo Lete notes that the

---

232 THIEL, Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jermia 1-25, 62.
233 WILLIAM L. HOLLADAY, “The Background of Jeremiah’s Self-Understanding”, 313-324.
234 Holladay considers Deuteronomy 16-18 as being part of Urdeuteronomium, and thus he contends that Jeremiah knew these texts very well. See ibid, 160.
235 JOSÉF SCHREINER, “Jeremias Berufung (Jer 1,4-19), eine Textanalyse”, in Homenaje a Juan Prado, Juan Prado (ed.), Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1975, 131.
236 HABEL, “Form and Significance”, 307-309.
237 This objection is full of irony. Jeremiah feels inexperienced at the start of his public role, and like Solomon in 1 Kings 3:7, he identifies himself as still being a נער. Jeremiah recognises that he needs the knowledge of speech, something attributed to the זקן. The irony lies in the fact that whilst Jeremiah claims: יִתֵּן רְשָׁפִי, YHWH had already claimed that he had already known him (יְדַעְ) before forming him in his mother’s womb. Jeremiah’s lament is well grounded, for being led by a נער is considered as a miserable condition (Isa 3:4-5; Qoh 10:16). Here Jeremiah is called to trust completely in YHWH, who knows him intimately. See PIETRO BOVATI, “Je ne sais pas parler” (Jr 1,6). Réflexions sur la vocation prophétique”, in Ouvrir les écritures, Paul Beauchamp (ed.), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1995, 39-41.
238 Gouders sees this as an act of divine assistance by which the words of YHWH are brought into the prophet’s mouth. KLAUS GOUDERS, “Siehe, ich lege meine Worte in deinen Mund”: Die Berufung des Propheten Jeremia (Jer 1,4-10)”, BL 12 (1971) 184.
touching of the prophet’s mouth is a theologoumenon that defines the prophet, as results in Deuteronomy 18:18, and also in Exodus 4:12, 14, where the same theme is dramatized.\textsuperscript{240} The same can be said of Isaiah, where the seraphim touches his lips with the burning ember to purify them (Isa 6:6), as well as for Ezekiel, who is specifically asked to literally eat the scroll containing the Word of God (Ezek 3:1).\textsuperscript{241} Del Olmo Lete contends that Jeremiah knows these texts and traditions and perceives himself as the New Moses.\textsuperscript{242}

Indeed, these parallels call for a thorough analysis of the direction of influence, which is a much-debated issue. Rüterswörden comments: “It is quite evident that on the one hand Deuteronomy 18:16-20 can be identified within the roots of Deuteronomy; on the other, it shows a relationship with the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah”.\textsuperscript{243} We have to keep in mind that the deuteronomistic editing of Jeremiah, \textit{prima facie} supports the dependency of Jeremiah 1:9 on Deuteronomy 18:18.\textsuperscript{244} Thiel in fact argues that Jeremiah 1:7, 9, 17 actually took from Deuteronomy 18:18.\textsuperscript{245} Broughton argues that Deuteronomy 18 is part of \textit{Urdeuteronomium}, and therefore, according to him, this passage is key to understanding the call and life of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{246} Apparently, Jeremiah understood the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18 as referring to an ideal prophet who would be like Moses, and could well have identified himself with

\textsuperscript{240} Del Olmo Lete, \textit{La vocación del Líder}, 279.
\textsuperscript{241} Mathews sees that Jeremiah lacks two important features in the structure of the call narrative, namely, the explicit indication of a crisis or need that occasions the call, and the lack of a sign, given as reassurance to the commissioned one. See Mathews, \textit{Royal Motifs}, 103. I do not agree because the crisis is ever present throughout the book of Jeremiah, trouble will indeed pour onto the land from the North (Jer 1:14). As we have seen, the sign of reassurance is given by YHWH when touching Jeremiah’s mouth, literally placing his word (Jer 1:9). Moreover, I firmly believe that the first vision, namely Jeremiah 1:11-12, which really and truly constitutes a pun between the substantive שָקֵד and the participle קֵדֹּשׁ, is indeed YHWH affirming his prophet. Jeremiah should be confident, as indeed he will be in his quarrel with Hananiah in Jeremiah 28, for the word of YHWH, which he proclaims as his prophet, is constantly watched over by YHWH himself, so that it occurs. This evokes the theme of the authentic prophet of Deuteronomy 18:20-22 as well.

\textsuperscript{242} Del Olmo Lete, \textit{La vocación del Líder}, 280. Del Olmo Lete in fact, follows Holladay, in that he considers vv4-10 as being of Jeremianic provenance and therefore communicates his self-understanding, where the prophet himself relies on the existing Mosaic tradition and on the deuteronomistic speculation around the figure of the prophet. Ibid, 287-288.

\textsuperscript{243} “Als Resultat ergibt sich, daß Dt 18,16-20 einerseits in der Terminologie die Verwurzelung im Deuteronomion erkennen läßt, andererseits eine Verwandtschaft zur deuteronomistischen Redaktion des Jeremiabuches zeigt”. Udo Rüterswörden, \textit{Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16,18-18,22}, (=BBB; 65), Meisenheim: Peter Hanstein, 1987, 87.

\textsuperscript{244} Nicholson, “Deuteronomy 18:9-22”, 154; see also Weinfeld, \textit{Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School}, 359.

\textsuperscript{245} Thieli, \textit{Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25}, 65.

\textsuperscript{246} P. E. Broughton, “The Call of Jeremiah: The Relation of Deut 18:9-22 to the Call and Life of Jeremiah”, \textit{ABR} 6 (1958) 42.
such a prophet.\textsuperscript{247} Nihan concludes that this strong conformity between the two texts is the result of a redaction seeking to portray and make of Jeremiah a “prophet like Moses”.\textsuperscript{248} In my opinion however, the mechanism is much more complex than that. Nicholson argues that it is actually Deuteronomy 18:18 that is dependent on Jeremiah 1:9.\textsuperscript{249} Josef Schreiner argues that Deuteronomy 18:15-22 is a later text than Jeremiah 1.\textsuperscript{250} Atkins argues that the theme of “putting the words into the mouth” of the prophet predates both Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, for it is a theme found within the Balaam tradition of Numbers 22:38 and 23:5, 12, 16, where Balaam could only speak what God commanded.\textsuperscript{251} Fischer notes that Exodus 4:15 contains the theme of Jeremiah 1:9 and Deuteronomy 18:18 as well;\textsuperscript{252} YHWH declares the he himself shall be present “with Moses’ mouth” (ךָה עִם־פִי הְיָכִי אָנ), an exclamation even stronger than Jeremiah and the would-be “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:18, since the mouth, the organ so important to the prophet, is being emphasised. Moses, in turn, will have to place this word into Aaron’s mouth (Ex 4:15-16). Given that there are strong parallels between the call of Moses and Jeremiah, as well as the text of Deuteronomy 18:15, and these parallels are attributable to a deuteronomistic redaction, I tend to conclude that these texts actually carry the same deuteronomistic agenda and it could very well be the case that they were redacted contemporaneously, thus exerting a “dialogical” influence on one another.

5.8.2.3 Jeremiah: the Authentic and Last “Prophet like Moses”

As we have seen, Jeremiah appears as the last of the prophets of the Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{253} Blenkinsopp comments:

\textsuperscript{247} Broughton, “The Call of Jeremiah”, 42. In fact, Jeremiah does refer to the times of Moses as the purest and the ideal days, describing them in bridal terms (Jer 2:2).
\textsuperscript{248} Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 57.
\textsuperscript{249} Nicholson, “Deuteronomy 18:9-22”, 154; see also García López, “Un profeta como Moisés”, 301-302, 305-308; Carroll, Jeremiah, 99.
\textsuperscript{250} Schreiner, “Jeremias Berufung”, 135-136. Schreiner even argues that Deuteronomy 18:20-22 have as their background the episode of Hananiah of Jeremiah 28, whose word did not come true and ended up dying because he spoke presumptuously.
\textsuperscript{252} Fischer, Jahwe unser Gott, 109.
\textsuperscript{253} Nihan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 57.
It is significant that, in spite of Jeremiah’s criticism of scribes and lawyers, his book has received by far the heaviest overlay of Deuteronomic editing. The reason may be that the D editor thought of him as standing at the end of the prophetic succession as Moses the proto-prophet stood at the beginning. The parallelism between the call of Jeremiah and that of Moses (Jer 1:4-19; Ex 3:1-4:17) is noted in the commentaries, and the connection is further strengthened by the forty years of prophetic activity editorially allotted to him in the opening verses of the book (Jer 1:2-3, corresponding to 627-587 B.C.).

Apparently Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 reinterprets Amos 2:11, and presents this line of prophets as starting with Moses and ending with Jeremiah as the last “prophet like Moses” in Israel’s history, as suggested by Jeremiah 29:15, namely, that the prophetic tradition reached its end in Babylon. Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Jeremiah 1:4-10 delimit a tradition of a continuous line of prophets sent by YHWH to a people who refused to obey the laws; a line which started with Moses on Horeb and ended with Jeremiah during the Exile. This is also hinted at in Jeremiah 7:25-26 where the text speaks of YHWH sending his prophets “from the day that your fathers came out of the Land of Egypt, unto this day”. Again this is a strong link with the tradition of Deuteronomy 18, where Moses is considered to be the first prophet. Indeed the people did not listen to any of these prophets. Jeremiah is the champion prophet for the Deuteronomists, and as such a champion, he is the one who came closest to Moses, the paradigm prophet of Deuteronomy 34:10-12.

In my opinion, these texts witness to a clear redactional trend to underline that what Moses does as the first prophet, Jeremiah does as the last prophet, especially in terms of intercession, mediation, and the fulfillment of prophetic oracles. According to Seitz, the Deuteronomistic redactors of the book of Jeremiah were interested in the figure of Moses, particularly as the figure of the first prophet of the desert generation. We have seen in chapter 2 how there are strong parallels, created by a late redaction, between Moses and Jeremiah as intercessors. Moses intercedes for the
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254 BLenkInSopp, The Pentateuch, 235.
255 NiHan, “Un prophète comme Moïse”, 58.
256 Ibid, 57.
257 נָשָּׁנָה לְאַתִּים דְּבָרַים וְאַתִּים דְּבָרַים יָדָעָם תֵּשֶׁב יְשַׁעיהוּ הָשַּׁמֶּר יָדֹתִים וְאַתִּים דְּבָרַים יָדָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל וַתֵּשֶׁב יְשַׁעיהוּ הָשַּׁמֶּר יָדֹתִים.
259 Ibid, 139.
people many times – we need only mention Exodus 32–33 and Deuteronomy 5:26-27. Jeremiah is compared in his intercession with Moses and Samuel in Jeremiah 15:1. What is particularly striking is that whilst Jeremiah does intercede for the people, there are instances where God specifically forbids Jeremiah from interceding for the people (Jer 7:16; 11:14; 14:11 and 15:1). Moses’ intercession in the golden calf episode was successful, Jeremiah receives an embassy from the people, asking him for intercession in Jeremiah 21:1-2. Jeremiah remains faithful to YHWH’s request not to intercede, and actually pronounces the harsh oracle describing the disaster (Jer 21:3-14). Moses interceded, Jeremiah could not, for the definite line had been crossed. Seitz gives a very interesting conclusion as to the reason for this prohibition. God had warned the people “through his servants the prophets” for long. Moses was the first one amongst these. With Jeremiah’s warnings the people were still unheeding and thus YHWH rejected them like “unwanted silver” (Jer 6:30). So what Moses had started in Deuteronomy as the first prophet, Jeremiah brings to an end in his generation as the last prophet.261 Jeremiah foretold the disaster, and it actually occurred in his time. This is manifested within the late deuteronomistic text of Deuteronomy 30 where Moses “becomes” a prophet and foretells the disaster of the Exile. In my opinion, this is clearly a proleptic text to present Moses as the first great prophet of Israel. The deuteronomistic overtone of this text is also clear from the fact that Deuteronomy 30:6 speaks of the circumcision of the heart, underlining the context of the post-exilic renewal of Jeremiah 31:33.262

For the deuteronomistic editors it is clear that Jeremiah was the last of the Mosaic prophets. Jeremiah 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 35:15; 44:4 refer to the prophets as servants of YHWH, indeed, in strong Deuteronomistic overtones. Whilst Jeremiah is not mentioned in these texts, they do hint that he is to be considered one of them. Jeremiah is perceived as the last prophet in a long chain leading up to the exile.263 For the Deuteronomist, this chain started with Moses and ended with Jeremiah. A particular theme which witnesses to this conception is that of intercession. The parallels between Moses and Jeremiah are striking. Jeremiah’s addressees are compared to the desert generation in Jeremiah 2:1-5, and just as Moses dies with his

generation, so does Jeremiah with his generation, again, outside of the Land. In both cases, the generation will have to change: for the exodus generation it will take forty years, whilst for the Exile generation it will take seventy. In both cases two positive figures will survive their generation to enter the Land, Caleb and Joshua for the Exodus (Num 14:30; Deut 1:35), and Ebed-Melek (Jer 39:15-18) and Baruch (Jer 45:1-5) for the Exile. As Seitz concludes: “Such convergences are further proof of the mutual influence between Deuteronomy and the final form of the book of Jeremiah”. It is apparent that the deuteronomistic redactors of the book of Jeremiah had the particular aim of presenting Jeremiah as the last of the prophets with the destruction of the Temple. Even more important is to consider the fact that at some point in time the deuteronomists started retaining that the Mosaic succession of the prophets came to an end with Jeremiah. This explains all the pains of the Deuteronomists who sought to work on the various convergences between these two figures. Indeed, whilst there is no one in Israel like Moses in terms of prophecy (Deut 34:10-12), the Deuteronomists worked hard to underline that Jeremiah comes in as a close second. Römer suggests that since Jeremiah fits well the deuteronomistic criteria of true prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:21-22, with his oracles of judgement becoming a reality, it could well be the case that vv21-22 were added by this deuteronomistic group to Deuteronomy 18, with the specific aim of giving higher valence to Jeremiah. This argument is further bolstered by that obscure short vision/oracle that Jeremiah receives in Jeremiah 1:11-12. This vision/oracle comes right after the call of Jeremiah which appears to continue in Jeremiah 1:17 with a series of three verbs in the future: נָשָׁה הַשָּׁמָּאָל יִהְמָר וְקַמְּר מָתְנָא. Indeed Renaud sees a tripartite concentric structure within Jeremiah’s call:

A Jeremiah 1:4-10

B Jeremiah 1:11-12

A¹ Jeremiah 1:13-19

265 THIEL, Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, 71.
The correspondence lies in the ending of A in vv7-10 especially in v10 and A1 with vv17-19 that describe the prophetic mission as a very dynamic and strong one. Whoever will not give heed to such a “prophet like Moses” will be held accountable (Deut 18:18), and in fact, the generation of the Exile was held accountable. The central piece, Jeremiah 1:11-12, marks the important part that seals Jeremiah as an authentic prophet since it focuses on the theology of the accomplishment of the word. The oracle of Jeremiah 1:11-12 is indeed a curious pun with the substantive שָקֵד (almond tree) of v11 and the participle קֵדָש (watching over) of v12. In my opinion, the redactor is creating a bridge with Deuteronomy 18:21-22. Apparently the redactor inserted this vision right after the call so as to underline that it is YHWH himself who is confirming Jeremiah as an authentic prophet. Jeremiah should have no fear, for YHWH himself is watching over his word to accomplish it. Whatever Jeremiah will utter as a prophet will necessarily come to be as YHWH promises here. Apart from addressing the authenticity of Jeremiah and the rest of the prophets, this redaction aimed at developing a theological reason for the Exile. During the Exile, apart from the identity and faith crises that the community was facing, the community must have also asked itself: “in the face of the victory of the enemy, what was the real power of YHWH?” The redactor responded; “Not only YHWH had announced that which actually occurred, namely the victory of the Babylonians, but it is He who made it occur”. The sovereignty and power of YHWH was thus preserved and He emerged as the Universal Lord, so much so, that He subjects the nations to his service, especially in realising his plan. It is important to note at this point, that within this dynamic, Jeremiah is immediately proclaimed a יִם וֹ נָבִיא לַג, and not simply a prophet to Israel! Renaud contends that Jeremiah 1:11-10 was intended as an overt ure to the
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269 This pun is completely lost in translation; YHWH asks Jeremiah: “what do you see Jeremiah?”, and Jeremiah replies: “the rod of an almond tree”. The reader is quite baffled with such a strange vision! Even stranger is YHWH’s reply: “you have seen well, for I am watching over my word to accomplish it”. Obviously the pun lies within the Hebrew original, where the words שָקֵד and קֵדָש are only linked through assonance.
270 Lundbom argues that whilst this vision is an interpolation, it was inserted as part of the call narrative. JACk LUNDBoM, Jeremiah 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, (=TAYB; 21A), New York: Doubleday, 1999, 226.
271 This is clearly manifested in Jeremiah 21:5 in typical deuteronomistic words. YHWH, who fought against Israel’s enemies during the conquest of the Land כָּל הָאָדָם וּמָצְאָה מִי יִשָּׁר יָּדָה וּלְבָנִי (Deut 5:15; 26:8), will now himself fight, in like manner, against Israel his people: יִשָּׁר וְלָבָנִי בָּאָדָם כָּל הָאָדָם וְלָבָנִי בָּאָדוֹן בָּאָדוֹן כָּל הָאָדָם (Jer 21:5).
272 Indeed, in v10 YHWH establishes Jeremiah with authority upon the nations, so much so that he, as YHWH’s prophet, has the authority: לֹּא יֵלֵא הָאָדָם אַל כָּל הָאָדָם וְלָבָנִי אַל כָּל הָאָדָם.
whole book since it underlines that the prophecies of Jeremiah are efficacious because they have divine origins and are divinely fulfilled.273

5.8.2.4 Deut 18:14-22; Ex 3-4 and Jer 1:4-9, and the Tradition Behind them

We have touched on the parallelisms that exist between Deuteronomy 18:14-22; Exodus 3–4 and Jeremiah 1:4-9. So far we have concluded, that these texts belong to the late exilic or early post-exilic period, that they come from a deuteronomistic hand, and that they are somehow linked. We have seen that the link that exists between them, especially as regards the direction of influence, is a much-debated issue. Studying closely the links that exist between these texts, I argue that they mutually influence one another, and were most probably formulated contemporaneously as part of the deuteronomistic project of the legitimation of prophecy.

The parallels that I observe are:

Deuteronomy 18:18b: נביא tabindex="0" אֵת כָל־קוּם יְהוָה יִרְכֶּם כָּפִי יִדְבָּו בְּפִיו וְנָתַּן;

Jeremiah 1:9c: נביא tabindex="0" יִדְבָּו בְּפִי יִהוָה אֵלַי הִנֵה נָתַּן;

We notice the following intertextual connections between these verses:

Deuteronomy 18:18b // Jeremiah 1:9c // Jeremiah 5:14c נביא tabindex="0" אֵת כָל־קוּם יְהוָה יִרְכֶּם כָּפִי יִדְבָּו בְּפִי

Exodus 4:12c: נביא tabindex="0" יִדְבָּו בְּפִי אֶל־אַהֲרֹן אֶל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְוָה וְשִל֞ח אֵל פַרְעֹון אָחִּיךָҮ אֲהֻרֹן יִדְבָּו בְּפִי;

Exodus 7:2c: נביא tabindex="0" יִדְבָּו בְּפִי אֶל פַרְעֹון אֶל־אַהֲרֹן אֶל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְוָה וְשִלָּח אֵל פַרְעֹון אָחִּיךָҮ אֲהֻרֹן יִדְבָּו בְּפִי;

We notice the following intertextual connections between these verses:

Deuteronomy 18:18b // Jeremiah 1:9c // Jeremiah 5:14c נביא tabindex="0" אֵת כָל־קוּם יְהוָה יִרְכֶּם כָּפִי יִדְבָּו בְּפִי

The first thing to note is that Deuteronomy 18:18b and Jeremiah 1:9c have almost word for word correspondence. The only difference is the pronominal suffix attached

to the substantive נָתַן, obviously according to the dictates of the context: in Deuteronomy 18:18 the 3rd person singular, whilst in Jeremiah 1:9c the 2nd person singular. There is a clear parallel between Jeremiah 5:14c and Jeremiah 1:9c. The correspondence is almost identical and the very peculiar verb נָתַן is used. The differences are clearly dictated by the context, as well as for the fact that Jeremiah 5:14c contains a further element of judgement: the word given to the prophet is as fire, and the people are as wood to that fire (הָעָם הַזֹּה נָתַן דְָבָרַי בְָךָ לְאֵשֶׁת עֵצִים וַאֲכָלָתָם).

This is a very important point to note. The literary context of Jeremiah 5 is Jeremiah’s prophetic pronouncement to the unheeding people, and Jeremiah 5:14c is part of YHWH’s judgement on the nation. Scholars contend that Jeremiah 5:14 is part of the original material from Jeremiah. Deuteronomy 18:18b and Jeremiah 1:9c are clearly from the hand of the Deuteronomist. It follows that Jeremiah 5:14c is a source that the Deuteronomist used to compose Deuteronomy 18:18c and Jeremiah 1:9c. The text of Exodus 4:12b offers a much stronger modification. The parallel is here no longer word for word correspondence. It is evident, however, that the conceptual parallel is there, and therefore, we can, at least, speak of an allusion. The promise goes that YHWH will place his word in the mouth of the “prophet like Moses”, and the fulfilment of that promise is Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses”. It makes sense that Moses, the paradigm prophet, the one receiving the ultimate revelation on Sinai, the one who speaks with YHWH, הת?'ו יֹאמֶר (Ex 33:11; Deut 34:10), should not simply have the word of YHWH placed in his mouth, but rather have YHWH’s presence itself with his mouth. In my opinion, there is also a strong allusion to the great theme of YHWH’s presence, who will be present with Moses throughout: the one who names himself אַלְּנֵה אֶלֶּה אֱלֹהֵי יָדִיעָה (Ex 3:12 השפך נפ') will definitely be with Moses, and with his mouth (Ex 4:12 השפך נפ'). In Exodus 4:15b, YHWH stresses this presence again, this time not only with Moses, but also with his brother Aaron (Ex 4:15 השפך נפ'). It is interesting to note that there is
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278 The declarative הִנֵה here strongly supports the interpretation that Jeremiah 1:9 is indeed the fulfilment of the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18.
a very strong connection between these verses, especially when considering the verb that is being used. Usually in such contexts, the verb used to describe YHWH’s act of placing his word in the mouth of the prophet is שים as in Numbers 22:38; 23:5; Isaiah 51:16 and 59:21. In Deuteronomy 18:18 and Jeremiah 1:9, the verb used is נתן, as indeed is the case of the other parallel verse of Jeremiah 5:14. García López sees another interesting parallel in Exodus 4:15b where Moses is ordered to place (שים) the word of YHWH in his brother’s mouth (ועשה את הדרים בפיו). In fact, this strengthens the allusion of Exodus 4:12. Moses had objected that he is not an eloquent man, and in the end begs YHWH to send someone else. Moses is here reaffirmed within his mission; he would still be the one to receive the word, but then, as a “god” with his prophet, he would have to pass on that word to Aaron his brother, so that he would utter it to Pharaoh. These verses seem to be loaded with meaning. Priotto notes that the meeting of these two brothers seeks to unify the unity that exists between prophecy and priesthood, right at the moment before the mission of Exodus and the definitive birth of the People of God. This unity is especially marked by the parallelism of Exodus 4:12b and 4:14b, where the first refers to Moses alone, the second, to both Moses and Aaron. But here, the two are not being presented on the same level. Moses is being presented as a “god” to his prophet Aaron (Ex 4:16). Could this be a polemical reflection of the later Deuteronomist who sought to present prophecy as superior to priesthood? Apparently, this would corroborate what has been concluded, namely, that within the laws of offices in Deuteronomy 16:18-18:22, the central and most important office is that of the prophet.

The next strong parallels are: Deuteronomy 18:18c ויקרא אלהים את דבר ע أجلו וארה // Jeremiah 1:7c ואני יכול לארה את דבר ע أجلו וארה // Jeremiah 1:17c בסבתא את דבר ע أجلו וארה // Exodus 4:12c אируיא,רש. הנדרש.
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281 Indeed, these verses are quite enigmatic. It is legitimate to ask: Who is the true Moses? Is it the timid and doubtful one of Exodus 4 or the authoritarian one when dealing with the people’s idolatry in Exodus 32:26-27?
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The first thing we note is that if we place Deuteronomy 18:18c and Jeremiah 1:7c next to each other, they show a chiastic parallelism:

Deuteronomy 18:18c

Jeremiah 1:7c

This chiasmus is also manifested between Jeremiah 1:7c and Jeremiah 1:17c:

Jeremiah 1:7c

Jeremiah 1:17c

In my opinion there is an even stronger parallel between Jeremiah 1:17c and Deuteronomy 18:18c; besides the obvious linear parallelism, one should also note that both the דִּבְרָי of Deuteronomy 18:18c and the דִּבְרָי of Jeremiah 1:17c, carry an energetic.

The redactional use of the words is markedly evident. Notice that the emphasis is being laid on the verb דָּבַר “to speak”. This is the mission of the prophet, speaking what he/she is ordered to do by YHWH. Indeed, both Moses and Jeremiah will find a specific objection to YHWH, stating their inability to speak, because of ineloquence.

A close study of Moses’ objections and his fears shows that they are paralleled by those of Jeremiah, who is ordered not to fear the people. The people’s rebellion against Moses in Exodus 5:20; 15:24; 16:2; 17:3; Numbers 14:2, 36; 16:3, 41-42; 20:2; 21:5-7, and the people’s rebellion against Jeremiah in Jeremiah 1:19; 15:20; 18:18; 26:10-11; 38:4, offer a very strong parallel. Both had fears that were well grounded, for both were met with opposition from their own people. But YHWH was with them throughout, as he himself promised. One might argue that the parallel between Exodus 4:12c and the other verses is not so strong, since the verbs used are different. Whilst in Deuteronomy 18:18c; Jeremiah 1:7c, and Jeremiah 1:17c, YHWH will order
what the prophet should say, with Moses it is a different story, since YHWH will show (ךָ) what Moses should say. In my opinion this is a harmonisation with Exodus 33:11, Numbers 12:8, and Deuteronomy 34:10, and it reflects the incomparability of Moses in terms of his intimate relationship with YHWH, and the special revelation he received, as is underlined by Numbers 12:8. The redactor of this text might very well have had Exodus 33:11; Numbers 12:8; and Deuteronomy 34:10 at the back of his mind. At the end of the day, the “prophet like Moses” will never be identical to Moses in terms of the deep relationship with YHWH and in terms of the revelation received.

5.8.3 Conclusion

As we have seen, a Deuteronomistic redactor heavily re-worked Exodus 3–4 applying the *Gattung* of the prophetic call to Moses. This redactor sought to make a prophet, or indeed, “the prophet” out of Moses, so that the prophets could be “prophets like Moses”. We have seen that the parallels that exist between Exodus 3–4//Deuteronomy 18:15-22//Jeremiah 1: 4-9, tend to confirm that whilst the author of Deuteronomy 18:15-22 might have wanted to include all the prophets under the title “prophet like Moses”, it is also evident that he wanted Jeremiah to be portrayed as the “prophet like Moses” par excellence. We can conclude that whilst the historical Moses was not a prophet, the deuteronomistic redactors of the Torah met up with the need to make a prophet out of Moses, and thus confer to prophecy an even greater authority. The title prophet (נָבִיא) thus came to refer to one of the central roles of the literary Moses. As we have seen, the direction of influence between Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Jeremiah 1:5-9 is much debated. Given the above parallels, I conclude that Deuteronomy 18:9-22, Jeremiah 1:5-9 and even Exodus 3:1-4:17 evolved together within the same deuteronomistic redaction during the post-exilic period. It is evident that the parallels seek to link Moses and Jeremiah together. The deuteronomistic redactor championed Jeremiah as the true prophet who foretold the disaster of the Exile. Wanting to give prominence of place to Jeremiah, this redactor sought to make of Moses the first prophet within Israelite tradition, linking the origins of prophecy back to the founding experience of the Covenant at Horeb. Having done so, the
redactor made Moses a prophet, through the use of the typical prophetic call narrative. Once Moses was invested as a prophet, it was an easy task to make of Jeremiah the “prophet like Moses”. The deuteronomistic edition of Jeremiah shows him to be a true prophet in accordance with Deuteronomy 18:20-22, for the doom announced had indeed occurred: the people did not give any heed to the promised prophets and therefore, in line with Deuteronomy 18:19, they were held accountable and had to face the consequences.²⁸⁴

5.9 Ezekiel

Ezekiel refers to himself as נביא in Ezekiel 2:5 and 33:33. Of particular importance is the reference in 2:5: חְדָו כִי בֵית מְרִי הֵמָה וְיָדְו כִי נָבִיא וְהֵמָה אִם־יִשְמְּו וְאִם־יִהְיֶה בְֹוכָם. Ezekiel here seems to be referring to Deuteronomy 18:18 and Deuteronomy 34:4 which, as we have concluded, are dated as late exilic, early post-exilic texts. If this is the case, as some scholars contend, then this text is a late addition to the book.²⁸⁵ Both Ezekiel 2:5 and 33:33 appear to be a late deuteronomistic addition to the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel’s call also falls within the typical prophetic vocation scheme. The call narrative in Ezekiel 2:1-3:4-11, in fact, has the following schema: 1) Divine confrontation (Ezek 1:1-28); 2) Introductory word (Ezek 1:29-2:2); 3) Commission (Ezek 2:3-5); 4) Objection (Implied in 2:6, 8); 5) Reassurance (Ezek 2:6-7); 6) Sign (Ezek 2:8-3:11).²⁸⁶ What is striking is that in Ezekiel 3:1, Ezekiel is asked by God to eat the scroll containing the words of YHWH, just before going to speak with Israel. This implies a more dramatic placing of YHWH’s word in the prophet’s mouth. Is this an allusion to Exodus 4:15 and Jeremiah 1:9? As we have seen above, the commissioning of Ezekiel and his mission, irrespective of whether the people listen or not, is qualified by YHWH as showing them that “there was a prophet among them”

²⁸⁴ RÖMER, “Moses, Israel’s First Prophet”, 140.
²⁸⁶ Habel, “Form and Significance”, 313. Vogels identifies a different schema: 1) Invitation to listen (Ezek 2:1); 2) First reception (Ezek 2:2); 3) Order for the mission (Ezek 2:3-5); 4) Assurance (Ezek 2:6-7); 5) Prophetic ordination (Ezek 2:8-3:11). See Walter Vogels, “Les récits de vocation des prophètes”, NRT 95 (1973) 10.
(Ezek 2:5). Does this statement allude to the promised prophet of Deuteronomy 18:18?

At a first glance, Ezekiel’s call narrative would seem to lack the typical objection to the call. Phinney however argues that this objection comes in Ezekiel 4:14, where the prophet refuses to eat bread baked on human dung, for that implied a defilement of ritual purity. In 4:15, YHWH reassures his prophet and offers an alternative. While this is true, we also have to underline that Ezekiel does not offer any direct specific resistance or any objection to his call whatsoever. Phinney argues that Ezekiel, being of a priestly origin, was already accustomed to priestly mediating and leadership activities, and as such, had more confidence in accepting YHWH’s call. Whatever the case, it is evident that Ezekiel was acquainted with the priestly Torah, and clearly shows that he knows it, quotes it, and also, at times, modifies it. Yet it is also clear that Ezekiel draws from deuteronomistic terminology as well. The people in fact, go to Ezekiel to inquire the will of YHWH (Ezek 14:3; 21:1), reflecting the typical role of deuteronomistic prophecy. Ezekiel also gives primary importance to “the word of YHWH” as the means by which prophetic revelation is communicated. He is a prophet writing to the exiled community and he proclaims a prophetic word to the people full of hope for the restoration. It is interesting that whilst Ezekiel words these prophecies in priestly language, he also uses typical deuteronomistic terms such as בְיָד חֲזָקָהוּ and בִזְֹועַ נְּוַיָה (Ezek 20:33, 34). Indeed, Ezekiel 20:33-42 is a text that is heavily imbued with deuteronomistic terms and theology. One of the most important things to note in Ezekiel is that he emerges as a legislator, for in Ezekiel 40-48 he promulgates laws that Moses never promulgated. Levenson picks up the fact that these laws are strikingly similar to Numbers 27-36: liturgical calendar and sacrificial laws: Numbers 28:29 // Ezekiel 45:18-25; 46:1-15; allocation
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Jason Gile studies some very significant parallels between Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32, and concludes that whilst the former is a רִיב and the latter a שִיר, there are strong רִיב elements in the song as well, particularly Deuteronomy 32:15-18, 19-29.296 The strong parallels are: YHWH’s discovery of Israel (Deut 32:10 // Ezek 16:6); YHWH’s lavish care (Deut 32:10b-14 // Ezek 16:7-13a); Israel prospers (Deut 32:15a // Ezek 16:13b-14); Israel forsakes her God (Deut 32:15b // Ezek 16:15a); Israel’s idolatry (Deut 32:16-17 // Ezek 16:15b-22); Israel forgot her origins (Deut 32:18 // Ezek 16:22); Israel angers YHWH (Deut 32:16, 21 // Ezek 16:26); Israel’s indictment and punishment (Deut 32:19-25 // Ezek 16:35-43); Israel’s restoration (Deut 32:35-36, 41-43 // Ezek 16:53-55, 59-63).297 It is quite apparent that Ezekiel 16 draws a creative transformation of Deuteronomy 32. The prophet is apparently using the song to build his oracle.298 The author/redactor in Ezekiel 16 draws from the song for rhetorical reasons. He accuses and judges his fellow Israelites for their transgression by re-contextualizing Moses’ depiction of Israel’s decline and applying it to his contemporary context of idolatry.299

There are other strong parallels: just as Moses received the design of the tabernacle, Ezekiel receives a detailed vision of the Temple. The descriptions of both are curiously complementary. It is interesting to note that the reused P material in Ezekiel also reflects allusions to Moses. Ezekiel hears God speaking to him from the restored Temple, much like Moses does from the finished Tabernacle. Ezekiel sees the vision of the Temple from a high mountain (Ezek 40:2), much like Moses sees the land of Israel from Nebo. It is apparent that what Moses does for the first version of the tabernacle, Ezekiel sees in the ideal Temple of Ezekiel 20. Ezekiel only manages

295 LEVENSON, Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48, 43.
297 GILE, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses”, 89-94.
298 It would be difficult to hold the other way round, as concerns influence. Ezekiel adds the theme of harlotry. It would be quite improbable that the song would eliminate such a theme. See GILE, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses”, 99.
to see the land about which he preached in visions, much like Moses saw it upon Mount Nebo, but never made it there. Probably the redactors who organised the P and D material in the book wanted to convey that Ezekiel was a Moses figure. McKeating concludes: “Whether these organisers connected him specifically with Deuteronomy 18:15 and with the “prophet like Moses” who is mentioned there we cannot say. That they saw him as a “prophet like Moses” seems very certain”.300

5.9.1 Conclusion

It is evident that the prophet’s retelling of Israel’s history in Ezekiel 20 shows him to be well versed in the sources that made up the redacted Torah. The D and P materials used in Ezekiel were not simply imitated, but rather integrated, and used in a way as to create a parallel with Moses.301 There seems to be a late current that seeks to model Ezekiel on the ancient lawgiver Moses, issuing laws in anticipation of the second Exodus and the resettlement into the land.302 The late redactor of the book of Ezekiel models this prophet’s mission upon Moses’, the prophet and lawgiver par excellence. Most probably, the redactor wanted to attribute a stronger authority to Ezekiel, and thus depicted this prophet as issuing new laws in anticipation of the “New Exodus”, namely the return into the land, and the resettlement in there.

5.10 King Josiah

Strictly speaking in this thesis we are only dealing with the figure of the “prophet like Moses”, and therefore as such, King Josiah does not fit into this picture. Yet it is also true that prophecy is attributed to Saul and to David. A short paragraph on this just “deuteronomistic” king is therefore apt. Even though Moses is never called a king, as we have seen in chapter 2, the Pentateuch does have specific details that do portray him as it would portray a king. In my opinion, the Deuteronomist does appear to take the pains to present Josiah as an ideal king/leader, just like Moses. Or else, as
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Römer notes, we have a case where Moses is already being used as a “political yardstick” to legitimise the reform of Josiah. According to some scholars, Moses seems to be characterised with “Josianic” traits in the primitive narrative of the golden calf. Römer suggests that the text of Exodus 32 stigmatises the official sanctuaries of the northern kingdom established by Jeroboam I (Ex 32:4 and 1 Kings 12:28). There are various parallels: Aaron builds an altar and proclaims a feast (Ex32:5), just like Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:32-33); Aaron becomes the prototype announcing the sin of Jeroboam whilst Moses becomes the precursor to Josiah’s reform: Moses burns the golden calf and gives it to the Israelites to drink (Ex 32:20), Josiah orders Hilkiah to burn the cult objects outside Jerusalem and have the ashes taken to Bethel (2 Kings 23:4). The Deuteronomist applies the formula of incomparability to Josiah as well. Just as Moses is the incomparable prophet (Deut 34:10: לא אקם נביא ישלו; Josiah is the incomparable king (2 Kings 23:25: ויהיה ר׳ משך אֵלַי־יהוּה, ובַּעֲבֵד וַכָּל־גוּם כְּכַל־נַפְרֹו וַכָּל־מְאִם). Both Moses as well as Josiah, die an “untimely” death. We have seen how leadership originally constituted the embryonic phase of prophecy properly understood. Indeed, in Josiah, the Deuteronomist appears to harmonise back the prophetic and the political. The death of Moses in Deuteronomy 1:37; 3:26; 4:21 and 32:51 depicted as a share in corporate guilt, appears to challenge the earlier theology of Jeremiah 31:30, where every man is supposed to die for his own sin. Indeed, in 2 Kings 23:26 we read that despite Josiah’s merits YHWH’s anger was still relentless because of Manasseh’s evil ways. Josiah, just like Moses, dies an untimely death on account of others. The just king Josiah, therefore, like Moses, shares in this corporate guilt. The exiles are thus invited to a reassessment of their understanding of personal responsibility. They should seek personal piety and observance of the Torah as a united people. The ideal leader should follow Moses and Josiah. The people should be faithful to the Torah, so that just like a new wilderness generation, the exiles would be able to make it back into the Land. There seems to be a link between the deuteronomic law of the king in Deuteronomy 17 and the way that Josiah acted in 2 Kings 22. The only positive law stating what the
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305 Having dies at a hundred and twenty years of age, I only use the adjective “untimely” for the death of Moses in the sense that Deuteronomy 34:7 describes him as dying whilst still “full of vigour”. Deuteronomy 34:7 wants to underline that Moses dies as decreed by YHWH rather than for any other reason.
king should do in Deuteronomy 17:18-19 was to commission a copy of the law and to read it all the days of his life, much like Josiah did when the book of the law was discovered in the Temple in 2 Kings 22.

5.11 The “Prophet like Moses” in Qumran

In this thesis we are dealing specifically with the Hebrew Bible, and though the Qumran texts are extra-biblical material, they offer an interesting viewpoint as to the figure of the “prophet like Moses” within the inter-testamental period. I have already studied this issue in chapter 3, section 3.3. I present here a brief concluding summary. The Qumran community believed that Moses was both a lawgiver and a prophet, and considered his law-giving role to be directly related to his prophetic status as God’s intermediary. George Brooke identifies a development in the understanding of prophecy in Qumran. The Qumran library witnesses as to how certain Jews during the Second Temple period viewed their own activities, particularly as concerns their interpretation of the scriptures, namely as a community that was a continuation of biblical prophecy as mediators of God with their communities. Exegesis was being considered, up to a certain extent, as the continuation of prophecy. In the 2nd century B.C.E. the primary figure to emerge was the Teacher of Righteousness, and during this period the re-writing of the scriptures gained new interpretations particularly for future generations. Even though the Teacher of Righteousness appeared to behave like one of the prophets, he is not called a prophet and this title appears to have been reserved for the great figures of the past and for the future eschatological prophet. We can conclude that within the Qumran community the figure of the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 was interpreted as referring to the single Mosaic eschatological prophet. Many identify this prophet as
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Elijah *redivivus*, whilst other scholars contend that this prophet was to arise from within the community. It is therefore not easy to identify precisely who this prophet was really understood to be. Suffice it to note that the Qumran texts, particularly 1QS 9:9-11 and CD 12:23-13:1, herald the coming of three end-time redeeming-figures: a prophet, a priest and a king. These have been interpreted to refer back to the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18:18-20, the priest like Elijah of Malachi 3:23-24, and the Anointed one of the Lord of Isaiah 61:1-3. Whatever the case may be, the Qumran texts witness to an important development within the tradition of the “prophet like Moses”. Whilst initially Deuteronomy 18:15-20 might have been seen to refer to a series or line of prophets, during the Second Temple period, this was developed into a promise of the coming of a future eschatological prophet.

5.12 Conclusion

In conclusion we can say that Deuteronomy 18:9-22 is the deuteronomistic promotion of what we can call the “Prophetic Project”, within the program of the great return into the land after the Exile. Deuteronomy 18:9-22 was authored late during the Exile, most probably in the context of the first return. The source or tradition which the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 seems to build upon is Amos 2:11 “And I raised up some of your sons for prophets, and some of your young men for Nazirites”.

Indeed, the office of the prophet proved to be the most important one. It is apparent that after the great disaster of 586 B.C.E. the scribes of the Deuteronomistic School realized that the disaster had been foreseen by the prophets. If the return into the land was to ever be successful, the prophets were to be given primary importance.

---


311 BROOKE, “Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls”, 39.
The prophets thus became the champions of the Deuteronomistic School, especially the prophet Jeremiah, whose book, as we have seen, underwent extensive deuteronomistic editing. Upon studying the parallels between Deuteronomy 18:18; Jeremiah 1:4-9 and Exodus 3–4, it became evident that these parallels were the product of a deuteronomistic redaction that aimed at portraying Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses”, who like him, was active for 40 years from the thirteenth year of Josiah (626 B.C.E.) to the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E. Since Jeremiah was the one to have intuitively foreseen the Exile, the Deuteronomistic School laid huge emphasis on this prophet, especially in redacting his book. Jeremiah could also be deemed, in a way, “the last prophet of the Deuteronomistic History”.\(^{315}\)

Within this understanding, this School redacted Deuteronomy 18:9-22 and Jeremiah 1:4-10 to delimit a continuous tradition of prophets sent by YHWH to a people who refused to obey the laws. This tradition started with Moses on Horeb and ended with Jeremiah with the Exile. Prophecy is for the Deuteronomists an overarching theme running from Moses to Jeremiah, with all the prophets towing the line. Moses and Jeremiah constitute thus the great prophetic inclusio of what Römer would call “the Deuteronomistic Library”.\(^{316}\)

This study shows that the Deuteronomistic School sought to promote the prophetic project which proved throughout the so-called Deuteronomistic History to be the most authentic office, especially in the criterion of fidelity to the Torah. Moses was being fossilized as the central figure within the nascent Judaism of the early post-exilic and the Persian periods. Since Moses became such a central figure, the Deuteronomistic School, wanting to give authority and ever-increasing importance to the prophets, sought to make of Moses the proto-prophet. This is evident in the deuteronomistic redactional work found in Exodus 3–4. Once Moses became invested with the prophetic garb, all the rest of the prophets could be considered “prophets like Moses”. Moses was the one to have the greatest intimacy with YHWH, so much so that on the prophetic level he is declared incomparable (Num 12 and Deut 34:10-12). The rest of the prophets would prove essential, however, in applying the Torah to the ever evolving life situations, and therefore, though such prophets could never be equal


to Moses, they were, like Moses, important leaders who would guide the people as the situation required. As we have seen in chapter 4, both the syntax as well as the context imply that the author/redactor of Deut 18:15, 18, clearly intended to refer to a line of prophets rather than a single prophet. However, we have to admit that the parallels studied in this chapter also makes it evident that the author/redactor had the prophet Jeremiah in mind, when conferring prophecy on Moses. Moses was the first unequalled prophet, and for the Deuteronomistic School, Jeremiah was the unequalled “prophet like Moses”. I conclude that the author wanted to present Moses and Jeremiah as a great inclusio, marking the central role that prophecy has within Israelite religious leadership. The rest of the prophets were also “prophets like Moses”, for they all faithfully continued Moses’ work.

Again, the issue of “prophetic fulfilment” of Deuteronomy 18:21-22 is nothing but prophetic propaganda. As we have seen in chapter 4, its use as a criterion to distinguish true from false prophecy is quite futile. However, it does serve as great propaganda to promote Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses”. Indeed, Jeremiah was the prophet to foresee the Exile, much like Moses did in Deuteronomy 32. Not only did Jeremiah’s word come to be, his prophetic word was sealed by YHWH himself as necessarily occurring, as the first vision of Jeremiah attests in Jeremiah 1:11-12. There YHWH himself affirms Jeremiah’s prophecies because he himself declares: YHWH is watching over his word, the word he himself placed in the mouth of Jeremiah, to do it. The redactor is thus laying stress on the theology of the accomplishment of the word as demanded of the true prophet in Deuteronomy 18:21-22.

Moses will forever be unequalled, however, because the central place will always be held by the Torah. Whilst the first and last prophets are Moses and Jeremiah, as one overarching theme from the Exodus to the Exile, the central overarching theme will always be the Torah, at least as exemplified within Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomistic History. This is expressed by the formula of incomparability

---

317 The yiqtol in this phrase is usually considered to have an iterative value, which implies that YHWH will continue raising prophets in the future. See GESENIUS, Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar, 107i. Consequently, the “affected object” זב does not refer to a single prophet, but should be rather considered as a singular noun of category. See JOON – MURAOKA, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, §135c.

318 In the end, the surest and most practical criterion for authentic prophecy will always be fidelity to the Torah, as outlined in the Law of Deuteronomy 13:1-5. Apart from this, Ska argues that
expressed for Moses in Deuteronomy 34:10 and for King Josiah in 2 Kings 23:25. Both showed the same zeal with respect to the Torah. Moses commanded that it should be read “to the ears of Israel” (Deut 31:11) and Josiah to read it “to the ears of all Israel” (2 Kings 23:2).

In the end, the Torah will always be the criterion to follow as the fullness of revelation that YHWH gave to Israel through his intimate relationship with Moses. Moses, will thus remain the central figure. As Vogt concludes:

“The significance of Torah is further seen in the fact that there is no single successor of Moses. Rather, Torah itself emerges as the successor to Moses, because it provides for the offices that will partly fill Moses’ various roles. No single person, office, or institutional arrangement is absolutely essential to living in relationship to Yahweh. Rather the people of Yahweh must seek to live their lives in accordance with Torah as it is revealed and interpreted by Yahweh-sanctioned interpreters.”

These “Yahweh-sanctioned interpreters” are clearly the prophets like Moses promised in Deuteronomy 18:15, who have the essential role of helping the people live according to the requirements of the Torah. Although Jeremiah was the exemplar, however, within this criterion, every single prophet of Israel was indeed a “prophet like Moses” in this sense.

Deuteronomy, being the “testament of Moses”, and having great parallels with the Assyrian vassal treaties, aimed at presenting the Torah as the authentic successor of Moses. Ska concludes: “A partire da un confronto con il trattato di vassallaggio di Esarhaddon, ci è sembrato di cogliere in modo nitido il decisivo imporsi di un’idea: la vera eredità di Mosè è l’autentico successore di Mosè è la Torah. In poche parole, il Deuteronomio è il testamento di Mosè che, prima della sua dipartita, chiede insistentemente al popolo d’Israele la lealtà all’alleanza, e in particolare di restare fedele alla Torah, che sarà il suo unico vero erede e successore”.


Summary and Conclusions
As we have seen throughout this work, especially in chapter 1, it is quite evident that there is a language and a vocabulary that can be called deuteronomistic within the corpus running from Genesis to 2 Kings. This literature, finalised during the Persian Period, started being compiled before the Babylonian Exile, presumably to explain the disaster of the north. This task was further embellished during the Babylonian Exile to try and address the crises of identity that the exile had brought with it. The destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem had brought a major blow to every religious and political institution, and to the identity of the people in general. This literature, which we might call a history, was meant to address these problems by consolidating the identity of the people and instilling a sense of optimism for the future. As we have seen, this literature contains narratives and laws that are programmatic for the political and religious reformation that the people would have to undergo upon re-entering the Promised Land. Many of the protagonists of this history thus became paradigmatic models of the ideal Israelite. The traditions of the patriarchs, for example, became invaluable for this historian. Thus the exiles, like Abraham, had to be men of faith. As Abela notes, YHWH’s command to Abraham to leave the comfort of his native land to go and live in a land yet to be revealed to him “could not but strike a bell for the Jews of the exile”.

It is within this context that I date the Deuteronomic Laws of Offices running from Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22. Though these laws fall within Deuteronomy 11–26, and therefore part of Urdeuteronomium, I conclude that these laws were written in their final form as a project of restoration for the return from the exile. This is primarily because the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17:14-20 erodes the power of the king extensively. Indeed, the king is presented as a mere titular figurehead with the only positive law being that of ordering a copy of the Torah, and from that, read all the days of his life. Whilst this law could have originated from the northern kingdom, after the disastrous experience of the monarchy there, I seriously doubt that any king in the south would have promulgated such a law, which would have eroded his power so much. So whilst the Deuteronomist would have used older material to formulate these

2 As we have seen, the discovery of the book of the law was a literary genre within the ancient Near East that was used to legitimise the promulgation of new laws. See BERND J. DIEBNER – CLAUDIA NAUERTH, “Die Inventio des Sepher Hattorah in 2 Kön 22: Struktur, Intention und Funktion von Auffindungslegenden”, Diehlheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament 18 (1984) 95-118.
Laws of Offices, his main concern was that of distributing the functions of power within the new Israel. This reform for the return to the Promised Land gave prominence of place to the prophets, the reason being that the prophets always preached fidelity to the Torah, and as such, they were foretelling the disaster of the exile, as a direct consequence of the people’s transgressions. Whilst Deuteronomy 18:9-22 contains older elements that could have been part of Urdeuteronomium, especially the first part from vv9-14, the second part can be considered as the “Prophetic Project” within the programme of the great return into the Land after the exile. At this point, the Deuteronomist most probably devised the “mosaic fiction” that Deuteronomy is Moses’ last speech before Israel’s entry into the Promised Land. This “mosaic fiction” would help the exiles identify with their ancestors just before entering the Promised Land, since the return from the exile marked a remarkable parallelism with Israel’s entry into the land after the Exodus. At this point, the book of Deuteronomy became an important tool for the propaganda of the return from the exile. Within this Sitz im Leben, prophecy had to gain primary importance. The Deuteronomist, therefore, sought to underline that it was prophecy that kept the Torah, and that it was prophecy that had foreseen the Exile. If the disaster was never to occur again, the prophets were to be heeded.

In chapter 2, I sought to distinguish between the historical and the literary Moses. This chapter is in no way to be considered as a quest for the historical Moses. My intention was that of concluding whether Moses was a historical figure or not, and therefore to see, at a second stage of analysis, whether he was a prophet on the historical level or the literary level. From the study conducted, I concluded that Moses was indeed a historical figure who led the Exodus from Egypt. However, as such a figure, the historical Moses was embellished with layers upon layers of tradition, and as such, it is very difficult to arrive at an original historical portrait of Moses. From the way that he is depicted within these texts, we can infer that the historical Moses was a good charismatic, political and religious leader. The literary Moses, on the other hand, is the product of religious historiography which expanded upon the historical Moses. Studying the texts, it became quite evident that all the other epithets and roles

---

that are applicable to him came from the various layers of traditions that evolved along the years. I concluded that the epithet “Moses the prophet” is a late literary construction of deuteronomistic origins.\(^4\) The Pentateuch, in fact, never explicitly calls Moses a prophet, even though as the greatest mediator and intercessor of Israel, he had every credential to be called so. The Pentateuch only implicitly implies that Moses was a prophet, and it is very significant that critical scholarship concludes that these texts are late, the earliest being from the time of the exile. The earliest allusion to Moses being a prophet comes from outside the Pentateuch, in Hosea 12:14, where the leader of the Exodus is called “a prophet”. Again, it is very strange that the leader of the Exodus remains unnamed. It is also significant that this leader is considered as a mere prophet like any other, since the substantive “prophet” lacks the definite article. Hosea is apparently using the old tradition of the Exodus and the authority of the leader to give authority to himself as a prophet. Hosea 12:14 and Amos 2:11 (אַנְשָׁה) in my opinion serve as the earliest sources for the text of Deuteronomy 18:9-22.

Within this study it became evident that as the years went by, Moses gained ever increasing importance, especially during the exile. Moses was the one to receive the fullness of revelation on Mount Horeb and therefore, to give further authority to the prophets, he was vested with the prophetic garb. It was at this point that the author of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 worked on the aetiology of prophecy, tracing its mediatory origins back to the covenant at Horeb. Moses as the mediator received and passed on the Torah to the people. However, situations would always arise when the people would want to consult YHWH’s will. As opposed to the surrounding nations, who referred to diviners (see Deut 18:9-14), Israel was to exclusively consult the “prophet like Moses” who would always be bound to the dictates of the Torah (see Deut 13:1-5). Just as the people would, from time to time, go to Moses for matters of judgement and the consultation of YHWH in the face of certain situations, once Moses died, they were bound to likewise refer to the “prophet like Moses” to inquire the will of YHWH in new situations. Ultimately, as the one receiving the Torah directly from YHWH, speaking with Him face to face (Ex 33:11) and mouth to mouth (Num 12:8), Moses became the definite unequalled prophet of Deuteronomy 34:10-12. The prophets, in

\(^4\) If we are to keep the layer model of the Göttingen School, the prophecy of Moses would be a construction of DtrP.
turn, would be like Moses, but not equal to him, in their interpreting and applying the Torah.

Chapters 4 and 5 constitute the core of this thesis. Chapter 4 dealt with the close study of Deuteronomy 18:9-22. First and foremost, this text seeks to explain the origins of prophecy, stipulating at least three main reasons as to why prophecy was instituted. Prophecy was to be the only legitimate means of consulting the will of YHWH as opposed to the divinatory offices listed in the to‘eba law of vv9-13. The text also underlines that prophecy was instituted as a result of what the people specifically asked for during the covenant at Sinai/Horeb, when they asked for Moses to mediate for them (Deut 18:16). Such a mediation could only continue in the future through the “prophet like Moses” whom YHWH would raise from time to time as necessity would dictate. Deuteronomy 18:17 underlines that prophecy was instituted by YHWH because he deemed that the people’s request for this mediation was “good”. Within this context it logically follows that the term “prophet like Moses” does not refer to a single prophet, but rather to a series of prophets, whom YHWH would appoint. This has also been confirmed by the syntax of the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15, especially when considering the יָקִים of v15 as iterative, and the substantive נָבִיא, within the same verse, as distributive. In this sense, the late-exilic author of these verses looked back at the prophets and concluded that those who were authentic were all “prophets like Moses”.

In chapter 5 it became evident that, to a certain extent, each and every authentic prophet within Israel’s tradition could be considered a “prophet like Moses”. Prophecy was thus being promoted as the most authoritative role of the post-exilic community. On analysing the main prophetic figures, it emerged that the Deuteronomistic School worked extensively at promoting each and every prophet as a “prophet like Moses”. From the figures studied and the parallelisms that each exhibits with Moses, it is clear that tradition worked at presenting these persons as “prophets like Moses”. Joshua, though not a prophet in the strict sense of the word, was presented as a “prophet like Moses” by the Hexateuchal tradition seeking to unite the book of Joshua with the Pentateuch. Deborah and Huldah also present parallels amongst themselves and with Moses. The case of Huldah as a prophetess in the Mosaic line was most probably used by the Deuteronomist to give more importance to king Josiah, who in fact, was the one to read from the Torah and to seek advice from this prophetess. This further underlined
the prophetic propaganda, namely that if the king is ever to be successful, he was required to be humble enough to ask for, and follow the guidance of the “prophet like Moses”.

This study also made clear how Samuel’s leadership was very similar to Moses’ in that it was the last to include both the political as well as the religious aspects. Besides the parallels discussed, Walter Dietrich’s observation underlines the fact that the deuteronomist wanted to present Samuel as a “prophet like Moses”. According to him “DtrP makes sure that Samuel meets the requirements of the law of the prophets. He is clearly an Israelite (‘from among your brothers’). Furthermore, he embodies a severe rejection of fortune telling and necromancy as becomes obvious in 1 Samuel 28”.\(^5\) The Deuteronomists worked on the parallels that existed between the two during the late exilic/early post-exilic period with the aim of investing prophecy with ever increasing authority and credibility.

We have also seen how Elijah, as a prophetic figure, presents the strongest parallels to Moses in his life events. To mention just a few, both are led into the desert, both ask for their lives to be taken by YHWH, both of them are linked with Horeb, and both are provided with food by YHWH in the wilderness. There are further parallels, all of which are thoroughly examined by Dharamraj who concludes that the authors of the Elijah cycle must have clearly aimed at creating such parallels to present Elijah as the “prophet like Moses”.\(^6\) Whilst I most certainly agree that the author of the Elijah cycle enriched it with Mosaic motifs with a clear intention at drawing parallelisms, I retain that the aim was that of evoking the major themes of the Exodus, rather than simply focusing on the person of Moses. In my opinion, the author, writing in the pre-exilic period, wanted to create an allusion to the themes of the Exodus as well as the leadership of Moses to make a theological statement and invite the people of his era to choose YHWH over Baal. Much like the Exodus generation had to break free from Pharaoh’s tyranny, the people at the time of Elijah had to free itself from the Omrid tyranny, particularly as regards the cult.


In the case of Amos, we have seen that, though Amos 2:11 constitutes a source for Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, there is no strong evidence that there is a redaction within the book that is aiming at presenting Amos as a “prophet like Moses”. Hosea is maybe one of the more important of the latter prophets when it comes to studies on Moses. This is due to the fact that, as we have seen above, in Hosea 12:14 he attributes the leadership of the Exodus from Egypt to a prophet. Does this mean that Hosea considered Moses a prophet? It is impossible to know what Hosea’s real intentions were from the text. What I could infer is that if Hosea 12:14 are the prophet’s *ipsissima verba*, he is apparently seeking to legitimise his authority as a prophet since it was through a prophet that the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt. The fact that *נביא* lacks the article seems to hint that Hosea merely wanted to evoke the authority of the leader of the Exodus, rather than focus on the fact that Moses was a prophet, in which case he would have used the definite article. If, as some scholars contend, Hosea 12:14 comes from a late deuteronomistic redaction, the intention of the redactor would have been that of legitimising Hosea’s role of continuing the work of the leader of the Exodus, which is that of preserving Israel.

This study has evidenced how the call narratives of the classical prophets offer clearly noticeable parallels with the call of Moses in Exodus 3–4. Such parallelism cannot be simply attributed to coincidence, or to the simple reason that the author is using a typical *Gattung*. This is especially the case for the highly evident parallels that exist in Moses’ and Jeremiah’s calls. Isaiah’s call narrative has affinities with that of Moses, especially as concerns the uncleanliness of lips and inability to speak properly (Isa 5:5; Ex 6:30). The strongest parallel in Isaiah’s case is however that of Isaiah 1:2-3, that exhibits a strong resonance with the song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32:4b-5. An more evident parallel which I think clearly betrays a deuteronomistic hand is between Deuteronomy 31:30-32:44 and 2 Kings 21. What is predicted by Moses in Deuteronomy is actually fulfilled in 2 Kings 21. It is interesting to note that 2 Kings 17 and 2 Kings 21 form the inclusio enclosing Isaiah’s mission. Indeed, Hezekiah is presented as the ideal king in 2 Kings 18, who obeys both Moses (2 Kings 18:6) and

---

7 The only exception would be that noted by Dijkstra, where Amos professes that he was not a prophet by profession but “a simple herdsman and a dresser of sycamore”, which according to Dijkstra is a parallel with Moses’ identity as a shepherd, prior to his call. See MEINDERT DIJKSTRA, “I am neither a Prophet nor a Prophet’s Pupil”: Amos 7:9-17 as the Presentation of a Prophet Like Moses”, in The Elusive Prophet, Johannes C. De Moor (ed.), Leiden: Brill 2001, 123.
Isaiah (2 Kings 20:19). I retain that the above parallels are enough to enable us to conclude that at one point in time, the Deuteronomist compiled his material in such a way as to portray Isaiah in Mosaic terms, thus underlining his importance and authority as a prophet. In this study, I also explored the various parallels that exist between Moses and Isaiah’s suffering servant, with the most evident parallel being that of recurrent rejection by the people, something that Moses suffered in Exodus 17:2; Numbers 14:10; 20:3. Even the way that the servant suffers and is buried with the wicked, seems to evoke Moses’ way of being treated by the people and the fact that he had to die because of them outside of the land. One could therefore conclude that the author of Deutero Isaiah is presenting the Suffering Servant with strong Mosaic overtones. However I doubt that the author’s intention was specifically that of presenting the Suffering Servant as the “prophet like Moses”. It cannot be stressed enough that Deutero Isaiah is replete with imagery from the Exodus. It is quite evident that Deutero Isaiah presents the return from the exile into the Promised Land as the second exodus. I therefore agree with von Rad who concludes that the theme of the second exodus demands some sort of identification of the servant of the Lord with a second Moses figure.

In our analysis, Ezekiel’s case emerged as being quite peculiar. It is quite evident that this prophet was well acquainted with both priestly and deuteronomistic language. The prophet’s retelling of Israel’s history in Ezekiel 20 shows him to be well versed in the sources that made up the redacted Torah. Yet from our analysis it became apparent that the author did not simply imitate the Deuteronomistic and Priestly material. These were rather integrated and used in a way to create evident parallels with Moses. We have studied the parallels that exist between Ezekiel 16 and Deuteronomy 32, and it became quite evident that Ezekiel 16 depicts a creative transformation of Deuteronomy 32. What is particularly noteworthy is the fact that Ezekiel emerges as a legislator, who promulgates laws that Moses never promulgated. A late traditions appears to be modelling Ezekiel on the ancient lawgiver Moses, depicting him as issuing laws anticipating the second exodus and the resettling into

---


the Promised Land. McKeating’s conclusion is quite fitting: “Whether these organisers connected him specifically with Deuteronomy 18:15 and with the “prophet like Moses” who is mentioned there we cannot say. That they saw him as a “prophet like Moses” seems very certain”.

From the above excursus, it is evident that many of the former and the latter prophets fit into the role of the “prophet like Moses”. Indeed, from what we have concluded, it is quite clear that each and every authentic prophet in Israel was in fact a “prophet like Moses”. Having said that, however, this study has also shown that the strict connection between Deuteronomy 18:18 and Jeremiah 1:7, 9, point at Jeremiah as being the “prophet like Moses”. Indeed, Jeremiah 1:7, 9 appear as the fulfilment of the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18. This study has shown that these verses come from the same hand, and most probably evolved together. The source for both texts, as we have seen, was Jeremiah 5:14, an oracle of judgement, which the Deuteronomists reworked according to the context of the promise of Deuteronomy 18:18. I also retain that the textual correspondences with these texts in Exodus 3–4 also come from the same hand. It is evident that Exodus 3–4, if not authored, were redacted by the Deuteronomistic School. All this is enough evidence to suggest that the Deuteronomists wanted to invest Moses with the prophetic garb in Exodus 3–4. Deuteronomy 18:9-22 then enabled the Deuteronomists to place Moses as the criterion against whom the other prophets would be measured for their worth. The above-mentioned textual parallels make it evident that, whilst the authors of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 saw every authentic prophet of Israel as a “prophet like Moses”, the authors considered Jeremiah as the “prophet like Moses” par excellence. This is further corroborated by the so-called criterion of verification of true and false prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:21-22. There is almost unanimity among scholars that such a criterion is not very practical. In my opinion, Deuteronomy 18:21-22 was not intended as a criterion of verifiability, but is rather propaganda to aggrandise the figure of Jeremiah. Jeremiah was, in fact, the prophet who foresaw the exile, and what he had predicted actually occurred. In this, Jeremiah was proven authentic, over and against Hananiah in Jeremiah 28, who was proven to be false. Jeremiah’s first vision in

---

Jeremiah 1:11-12, appears to be a strange one indeed. However, the strong pun\textsuperscript{11} created in this vision coupled with the criterion of prophetic verifiability of Deuteronomy 18:21-22 attest that YHWH himself is confirming Jeremiah as his true, authentic prophet, for YHWH himself is ‘watching over his word to do it’.

In all this, the Deuteronomists sought to place fidelity to the Torah as a very important overarching theme within their compiled history. The prophets were the ones to help the people live out the dictates of the Torah, admonishing, teaching, and judging. The Deuteronomists sought to give authority to the prophets by placing Moses as the “first” and “unequalled” prophet, and Jeremiah as the “last” and most important “prophet like Moses” of the Deuteronomistic Library. The rest of the authentic prophets would all be the “prophet like Moses” of their own time, towing the line in guiding the people in the observance of the Torah. The Deuteronomists were full of hope for the future and, therefore, in Deuteronomy 18:9-22 they set out to compose some basic guidelines and rules which the people upon the return were to follow. The propaganda message is clear: the Exile could have been averted had the people given heed to the prophets, especially Jeremiah. Indeed, Jeremiah was the authentic prophet who was worth his penny since what he predicted had occurred. If Judah is ever to be successful upon the return to the Promised Land, everyone must listen to the prophet whom the Lord would set forth at that time.

\textsuperscript{11} The pun here is created by the assonance of the words rather than the meaning. The words as we have seen are שָקֵד (almond tree) and קֵד (watching over).
Appendix
In this Appendix I present a list of “deuteronomisms” which can be found in Cortese’s book.¹ I modified the list by presenting the original Hebrew expression and extended it with a concordance offering the references where the expression can be found.

- “love the Lord your God” - דָּבֵא אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Deut 6:5; 11:1, 13; 13:3; 30:6; Josh 22:5; 23:11).

- “to serve, to walk behind, turn to other gods;” - הֵלָכוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵים אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים (Ex 20:3; 23:13; Deut 7:4; 8:19; 11:6; 13:2, 6, 13; 28:14, 36, 64; 30:17; 31:20; Josh 23:16; 24:16; 1 Sam 26:19; 1 Kings 9:6; 2 Kings 17:35).²

- “so that you might live and obtain length of days” - לְהַשְמִיחְךָ לְרָבָּתָךְ וְלֹּא אָבֵא (Deut 5:33; 11:9; 22:7; 30:18; 32:47; 1 Kings 3:14).

- “land/gate/city which the Lord your God gives/is giving you as an inheritance” - נַחֲלָה תֶּן לְךָ (Num 34:2; 36:2; Deut 4:21, 38; 12:9; 15:4; 19:10; 20:16; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19, 26; Josh 1:6; 13:6, 7, 8, 33; Judg 2:6; 1 Kings 8:36).

- Egypt as “house of slavery” - מִצְרַיִם מֵבֵית עֲבָדִים (Ex 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12, 21; 7:8; 8:14; 13:6, 11; Jos 24:17, Judg 6:8; Jer 34:13).³

- Israel as “special/holy people” - עַם קָוש (Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19; 28:9; Isa 62:12; 63:18).

- “the thing which today I command you” - מִי מְצַָר אָנָאָש (Gen 3:11, 17; Ex 32:8; Deut 4:2; 6:6; 11:13, 27, 28; 12:11; 19:9; 27:1, 4, 28:14; Josh 7:11, Judg 2:20; 1 Sam 2:29; 2 Kings 17:13; Jer 11:4, 8; 13:6, 26; Zec 1:6).

- “to guard yourselves from” - הִשָמְּרוּ לָכֶּם (Ex 23:13; 34:12; Num 28:2; Deut 2:4; 4:15, 23; 11:16; 12:13, 19, 30; 27:9; Josh 6:18; 23:11; 1 Kings 2:4; 8:25; 2 Kings 10:31; Jer 17:21);

- “with a powerful hand and outstretched arm” - עַ נְּויָה בְיָד חֲזָקָהּוּבִזְר (Ex 6:6; Deut 4:34; 5:15; 11:2; 26:8; Josh 4:24; Jer 21:5; 27:5; Ezek 20:33, 34).

¹ This summarised list of deuteronomic expressions in English is presented by CORTESE, Deuteronomistic Work, 9-10. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to give an exhaustive list. For such a list see MOSHE WEINFELD, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, 320-365. Whilst Weinfeld’s list is very useful for redaction criticism it has to be stressed that it cannot be posited as the only criterion for a text to be labelled deuteronomistic. I present this list here only as an indication of the common links and an indication to such a redaction.

² This expression is also very common in Jeremiah. Jeremiah 11:10; 13:10; 16:13; 25:6; 35:15; 44:3.

³ See also Jeremiah 34:13 and Micah 6:4.


The verb “chosen” with God as subject and Israel, the Levites or the king as objects - (Deut 7:6; 12:21; 14:2; 16:11; 18:5; 21:5; 1 Sam 10:24; 20:30; 1 Kings 3:8; 8:44, 48; 11:13, 32, 36; 2 Kings 21:7; 23:27).

The expressions: “God might/will bless you” - (Deut 1:11; 7:13; 14:29; 15:4, 6, 10, 18; 16:15; 23:20; 24:13, 19; 28:8; 30:16; 1 Sam 15:13; 23:21; 25:33; 2 Sam 2:5; 6:11, 12; 1 Kings 2:45).

“to walk in the ways of the Lord” - (Deut 5:33; 13:5; Judges 2:22; 1 Kings 2:4; 8:36; 2 Kings 21:22; Jer 6:16; 7:22).

“remember that you were slaves in Egypt” - (Deut 5:5; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22).

“take courage and be strong!” - (Deut 31:6, 7, 23; Josh 1:9, 18; 10:25; 2 Sam 10:12).

Other expressions which are typical of the deuteronomistic style are:


“all the days of” - (Deut 4:9, 10; 6:2; 12:1; 16:3; 17:19; Josh 1:5; 4:14; 24:31; Judges 2:7, 18; 1 Sam 1:11; 7:13, 15; 1 Sam 14:52; 1 Kings 4:21, 25; 8:40; 11:25, 34; 15:5; 2 Kings 13:22; 23:22).

“you shall fear God” - (Deut 6:2, 13, 24; 10:12, 20; 14:23; 17:19; 31:12, 13; Josh 4:24; 24:14; 1 Sam 12:14, 24; 2 Kings 17:25, 18, 34, 36, 39).

---

4 This expression is used extensively in the book of Jeremiah where it also features as a direct command (שִמְּו בְֹולִי) by God to his people through the prophet. See Jeremiah 7:23; 11:4, 7.

5 This theme of inheriting/taking possession of the land is used extensively in Deut.

- “to do what is right in the eyes of the Lord” - שָר בְעֵינֵי יְהוָה (1 Kings 15:5, 11:2 Kings 12:2; 14:3; 15:3, 34; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2).

- “to do that which is evil in the sight of the Lord” - דּוֹאָש הָרַע בְעֵינֵי יְהוָה (Deut 4:25; 17:2; 31:29; 2 Sam 12:9; 1 Kings 21:20; 2 Kings 21:15).

- “the Levitical priests” - הַלְוִיִם הַכִּיָּבָא (Deut 18:1; 24:8; 27:9; Josh 3:3; 8:33; Jer 33:18, 21, 22; Ezek 43:19; 44:15).

- “with all your heart and with all your soul” - כָל־נַפְשֵׁךָ בְכָל־לְבָבְךָ (Deut 4:29; 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:3; 26:16; 28:47; 30:2, 6, 10; Josh 22:5; 1 Sam 7:3; 12:20, 24; 2 Sam 3:21; 7:3; 17:10; 1 Kings 2:4; 9:4).

- “do not turn away neither to the right nor to the left” - אל תִסּוֹב יָמִיןְךָ שְמֹרְךָ (Num 20:17; 22:26; Deut 2:27; 5:32; 17:11, 21; 28:14; Josh 1:7; 23:6; 1 Sam 6:12; 2 Sam 2:19; 14:19; 2 Kings 22:2; Isa 20:21; 54:3).


- “for this I command you this day” - תִּמְצַיא יְהוָה אִשֶּכֶךָ תֵּן בַּיּוֹם הַךָּו (Ex 34:11; Deut 4:40; 6:6; 7:11; 8:1, 11; 10:13; 11:8; 13:19; 15:5; 19:9; 27:10; 28:1, 13, 15; 30:2, 8, 11, 16; Jer 7:23).

- “your eyes have seen everything which YHWH has done” - תִּמְצַיא יְהוָה אִשֶּכֶךָ תֵּן בַּיּוֹם הַךָּו (Deut 3:21; 4:3, 9; 10:21; 11:7; 29:2; 1 Sam 24:10).

\(^6\) It is interesting to note that this phrase outside of the Deuteronomistic History is only used extensively in 1 & 2 Chronicles.
“take heed unto yourself lest you forget” (Deut 4:9, 23; 6:12; 8:11).

“listen/hear o Israel” (Deut5:1; 6:3, 4; 9:1; 20:3; 27:9; Jer 2:4; 10:1; 19:3; 42:15; Ezek 18:25; Hos 4:1; 5:1).

“be careful to do” (Deut 5:32; 6:3, 25; 7:11; 8:1; Deut 11:22, 32; 12:1, 28, 32; 17:10; 24:8; 26:16; 28:15; 29:9; 31:12; 32:46; Josh 1:7, 8; 2 Kings 12:37; 21:8; 2 Chr 33:8).


Finally it is important to note that in the so-called Deuteronomistic History, Sinai tends to be called Horeb and Nebo is called Pisgah.

---

7 Sinai is used in Deuteronomy 33:2 and in Judges 5:5. Horeb occurs some 9 times in Deuteronomy and twice in 1 Kings.
8 Nebo is used twice in Deuteronomy 32: 49 and 34:1. Pisgah occurs three times in Deuteronomy 3: 27; 4: 49 and 34: 1.
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