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Abstract

This dissertation investigates the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why are there different reasons given for his exclusion in the two books? Can they be explained by the complex redactions of Deuteronomy?

There are four different answers to the question of Moses’ exclusion. According to Deut 1-3, divine anger is directed at Moses because he is the leader of the first exodus generation on whom the wrath of God is visited. Moses is excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the first generation of Israelites who left Egypt. Another reason is given in Deut 4, a mixture of late layers in the Deuteronomistic History. Accordingly, Moses’ exclusion is compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. The “anger-punishment pattern” of Moses’ exclusion, which is a theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History, is used to confess the sin of the Israelites. Thirdly, in the post-Priestly passages in Numbers and Deuteronomy, Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to sanctify YHWH. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. Finally, Deut 31 and 34 imply that Moses has reached the limit of life span which was set by YHWH.
This dissertation investigates the question of why Moses was not allowed to enter the Land of cis-Jordan in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why are there different reasons given for his exclusion in these two books? Can they be explained by the different editions of Deuteronomy? There are four different answers to the question of Moses’ exclusion from the Land of Canaan. According to the first three chapters of Deuteronomy, divine anger is directed at Moses because he is the leader of the Israelites on whom the wrath of God is visited. Moses is excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the people who left Egypt. Another reason is given in Deut 4. Accordingly, the death and exclusion of Moses is compared to the destruction and diaspora of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. The “anger-punishment pattern” of Moses’ exclusion, which is a theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy-Kings, is used to confess the sin of the Israelites. Thirdly, according to Num 20, 27 and Deut 32, Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to regard God as holy. He should be punished by the death penalty. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Land of Palestine. Finally, the end of Deuteronomy implies that Moses has reached the limit of life span which was set by God.
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Chapter One. The Two Versions of the Exclusion of Moses

1. The different versions of the exclusion of Moses in Numbers and Deuteronomy

This dissertation is a critical study of the exclusion of Moses as recorded in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why was Moses forbidden to enter the Land of Canaan?

In Deuteronomy, there are six passages about the exclusion of Moses from entering the Promised Land (Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21; 31:2; 32:51-52; 34:4).

Deut 1:37 is in the context of Deut 1:34-39, a saying of Moses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 1:34-39 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▲ רושם יוהי את כל העד roi cine l.</td>
<td>When YHWH heard the voice of your words,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ויקרא והכרן לאמר</td>
<td>He was angry and swore, saying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲ אס יראת אש באנשיו אתל</td>
<td>“Not one of these men shall see,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הורר הלם זה</td>
<td>this evil generation,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲ את האלים המבור</td>
<td>the good land”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Throughout this study, the term “exclusion of Moses” will refer to that Moses could not enter the Promised Land or he could not cross over the river of Jordan. This study will not be concerned with the historicity of Moses or with the motif of the death of Moses. That motif is related to the exclusion of Moses, but it is not the focus of this study.

2 In MT: “these men” is followed by the appositiveздравה להלאל (“this evil generation”) which LXX omits. McCarthy believes that the expression “this evil generation” is used to clarify that “these men” refers not just to the spies, but to the wider group, and so this clarification interrupts the flow of the sentence. See Carmel McCarthy, *Biblia Hebraica Quinta 5: Deuteronomy* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 53*. Wevers thinks that the omission improves the text. See John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SCS 39; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1995), 21.

3 Here, MT has the phrase “this good land”), but LXX translates as την έγκαθην ταύτην γῆν (“this good land”), including the demonstrative pronoun ταύτην. The fuller phraseздравה להלאל (“this good land”) occurs twice in MT in Deuteronomy (Deut 4:22b; 9:6), and is rendered accordingly by LXX and SP. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 53*.54*.
which I swore to give to your fathers.  

except Caleb the son of Jephunneh he shall see it, and to him I will give the land on which he stepped, and to his sons, because he has followed YHWH fully.

YHWH was angry with me also on your account, saying, “Even you shall not enter there.  

Joshua son of Nun, who stands before you, he shall enter there. Encourage him, for he will cause Israel to inherit it.

And your little ones

---

4 LXX, SP and Vulgate omit the הָנָתָן ("to give") of MT. Nelson suggests that the omission is used to correct the implication that the land had already been given to the patriarchs. See Richard D. Nelson, Deuteronomy: A Commentary (OTL; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 23. McCarthy thinks that here the shorter text may well be preferable because MT would be a secondary harmonisation with Josh 21:43. However, it is also possible that the shorter text is assimilation to Deut 6:18. See McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 54*.

5 LXX, Syr and Tg read third person plural: “their fathers.” Duane L. Christensen, Deuteronomy 1-11 (WBC 6A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1991), 27.

6 מְלָא לָהֶם אַתָּה אֲדֹנִי הָיָה ("except, only") is a conjunction which occurs only twice in the Pentateuch. Here it is rendered by ἀλήθεια in LXX. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 21.

7 LXX translates ἅπαξ λειτυργίας Ἰσραήλ ("has fully followed YHWH") as τὸ προσκύνησθα αὐτῶν τὰ πρὸς κύριον ("his adherence to matters concerning the Lord"). Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 22.

8 SP appears to have changed the Piel imperative of כִּי of MT to Hiphil imperative נָתַן. McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 54*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 3:23-28 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נאסר עפרהום לעב יוחיה</td>
<td>And I pleaded with YHWH at that time, saying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וה_View</td>
<td>Whom you said would become booty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואתה לא ישים והו הديث והר</td>
<td>and your sons,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יאמרו יושב שם</td>
<td>who today do not know good or evil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והלחם אשר נתנה</td>
<td>they will enter there,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והם ייששו</td>
<td>and to them I will give it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובני היהוה</td>
<td>and they will possess it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַתָּֽה מַעָֽהֶם פֶּֽנָּֽי לָכָֽם</td>
<td>But you, turn for yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והם יַעֲבְדוּ הַמִּשְׁרָה רַֽרְרּ עַל פִּֽקְעַ</td>
<td>and march to the wilderness by the way of the Reed Sea.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deut 3:26-27 belongs to the context of Deut 3:23-28:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 3:23-28 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נאסר עפרהום לעב יוחיה</td>
<td>And I pleaded with YHWH at that time, saying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לאומר</td>
<td>Whom you said would become booty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>או יאמרו יושב שם</td>
<td>and your sons,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַדְרוֹני יוהו</td>
<td>who today do not know good or evil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתה הלוחה תלרואת את עברך</td>
<td>they will enter there,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתה לאמר</td>
<td>and to them I will give it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והם ייששו</td>
<td>and they will possess it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 McCarthy points out that MT contains a main statement prefaced by two nominative absolutes (ואסר עפרהום לעב יוחיה), each of which is further clarified by a relative clause beginning with rvא. However, the first of these clauses is absent in LXX, while the second is absent in SP. McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 54*-55*. According to Lohfink, the first clause was a late expansion taken from Num 14:31. SP testifies to this harmonising addition, but LXX at this point represents a stage in the history of the text when it had not yet taken place. The absence of the second relative clause from SP can be interpreted as testifying to an earlier stage of the text. MT may represent a family of manuscripts that has combined both additions in the form of a conflation. See Norbert Lohfink, “Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1.39,” in Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis. Studies in Honour of Antony F. Campbell, SJ for his Seventieth Birthday (eds. Mark A. O’Brien and H. N. Wallace; JSOTSup 415; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 30-43. Nelson agrees that the first relative clause may be a harmonising expansion from Num 14:31. However, he thinks that the second relative clause is not an expansion because there is no obvious source for such a clause. See Nelson, Deuteronomy, 23. Wevers suggests that the LXX translator includesאמור as well as לאומר under the umbrella term כלו ("yourself"). However, in Num 14:25 and Deut 1:7 the "for yourselves" comes after the second verb: לאומר ("turn for yourselves and march"), in which "for yourselves" follows the first verb, occurs only here in the Hebrew Bible. But in Num 14:25 and Deut 1:7 the "for yourselves" comes after the second verb: לאומר. SP reads this latter form in all three places. McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 55*. LXX and Vulgate omit לאומר ("for yourselves”). See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 23.

10 The term הרבר ("servant") occurs only 22 times in Deuteronomy and is translated in LXX eight times each by παίς and οἰκετής, and once each by δοῦλος and νικός. Here it is translated as ϑεράπτου which is favoured by the Exodus LXX translator. See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 63.
your greatness and your mighty hand;\(^{12}\)

for what god is there in heaven or on earth

who can do as your works and as your mighty acts?\(^{13}\)

Let me cross over and see the good land

that is beyond the Jordan,

that good hill country and Lebanon.”

But YHWH was furious\(^{14}\) with me for your sake,

and did not listen to me,

and YHWH said to me,

“ It is enough for you.

Do not continue to speak to me of this matter again.

Go up to\(^{15}\) the top of Pisgah

---

\(^{12}\) In LXX there are four nominals: τὴν ισχὺν σου καὶ τὴν δύναμιν σου καὶ τὴν χειρα τὴν κραταίαν καὶ τὸν βραχίονα τὸν υψηλὸν. The first two are a doublet rendering for ἡ κράτας σου (“your greatness”). The LXX translator may have felt the need to interpret “greatness” as including both strength and power. For the latter two MT has only ἡ κράτας σου (“and your mighty hand”). The fuller expression “a mighty hand and an outstretched arm” occurs at Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 11:2 and 26:8, with some slight variations. In MT of Deut 3:24; 6:21; 7:8; 9:26 and 34:12, the expression contains only the first half, “a mighty hand.” See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60*.

\(^{13}\) In MT the two are both prepositional phrases, ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποτίσεων καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱστοριῶν. LXX translates the first one by καθὰ οὓς ἐποίησας, and the second one literally by καὶ κατὰ τὴν ισχὺν σου. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 63.

\(^{14}\) The Hebrew verb ḫרָעֶת is usually understood as derived from a root meaning “be carried away by passion,” thus here, “be infuriated with,” that is, YHWH was furious with Moses. But LXX considers the more common root meaning “to pass by,” and translates as ὑπορέησεν (“disregarded”) which is contextually sensible as well. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 64.

\(^{15}\) MT has no preposition. 4QDeut\(^{4}\) and LXX read לעל and ἐπι (“unto”) respectively. Nelson believes that it is probably caused by a dittography of בָּלע (“go up”). This preposition became לְבָל in SP. See Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 51. However, McCarthy thinks that the Vorlage of LXX may contain either לְבָל or לְבָל. The twenty-four occurrences of the Qal form of לְבָל in Deuteronomy are consistently rendered with the verb ἐπιρρέων in LXX, with variations in the preposition used (or not used) according to the different contexts. In the three occurrences (Deut 10:1; 17:8 and 34:1) where MT follows the verb with the preposition, LXX used πρὸς, εἰς, and ἐπὶ respectively, while in the unique occurrence of לְבָל followed by ל in Deut 28:43, LXX uses ἐπὶ. Here, in Deut 3:27, the inclusion of ἐπὶ in LXX would suggest the presence of either לְבָל or לְבָל in its Vorlage. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60*.

\(^{16}\) In MT the place name “Pisgah” is present, while in LXX πίσγα is translated by Ἡλλαξαμένου. It is not clear why the mountain name is translated by a perfect passive participle of Ἡλλαξέω. Perhaps it is inspired by the physical appearance of the mountain which looked as though it were carved in stone, thus a stony mountain. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 64; McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60-61*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hebrew</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ימעע</td>
<td>and lift up your eyes&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מנהל ל넓יה</td>
<td>to the west and north and south and east,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ברח מתנית</td>
<td>and see with your eyes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כי לא תעמר את הגוחם</td>
<td>for you shall not cross over this Jordan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וצון אט הרוה</td>
<td>And charge Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וה.LOGIN</td>
<td>and encourage him and strengthen him,&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כי לא תעמר לפלס העום</td>
<td>for he shall cross before this people,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה ה.NonNull אוותאת את הארץ</td>
<td>and he will give them as an inheritance the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר הראה</td>
<td>which you will see.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deut 4:21-22, with its context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 4:21-28 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ויהוה הקדושך את עלו דבריכם 21</td>
<td>Now YHWH was angry with me because of your words,&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וה期間</td>
<td>and swore&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ולכלל עבדי את הדות</td>
<td>(that) I would not cross the Jordan,&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והכלליי אל הארץ המובחר</td>
<td>and I would not enter the good land&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר הוזה אלהיך נחל לפני נחלת</td>
<td>which YHWH your God&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt; is giving you as an inheritance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כי לא נכם את הארץ הוזה</td>
<td>For I will die in this land,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אנתנ עבך את הגודך</td>
<td>I shall not cross the Jordan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואכת עביס</td>
<td>but you shall cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>17</sup> The occasional omission of a possessive pronoun in LXX for a corresponding Hebrew suffix is a characteristic of LXX which occurs with reasonable frequency, particularly in relation to parts of the body. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 61*.

<sup>18</sup> MT contains two imperatives וה.Len which both mean “strengthen, make strong.” LXX has distinguished the two by κατέσχονυν κινήσει και παρεκάλεσαν κινήσει (“strengthen him and encourage him”) which also fits the context. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 65.

<sup>19</sup> Wevers thinks that LXX amplifies the phrase כי לא נכם inserted as περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ὑπ‘ ὑμῶν (“because of the words being said by you”), a direct reference to the people’s murmuring at Deut 1:27-28. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

<sup>20</sup> SP and some Hebrew manuscripts omitSuffix.

<sup>21</sup> LXX adds a demonstrative pronoun תּוּכּוֹן after תָּוחוּלַנְךָ over against MT here as well as in verse 22. Wevers suggests that this may be due to the influence of Deut 3:27 where MT has יש נוחה תָּוחוּל ("this Jordan"). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

<sup>22</sup> LXX differs from MT’s designation of the land as המובחר ("the good land") in its תָּוחוּל. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

<sup>23</sup> LXX reads ὁ θεὸς which does not render the suffix of אלכייך. The collocation ὁ θεὸς occurs 193 times in Deuteronomy and only five times does LXX have only κύριος ὁ θεὸς (also at Deut 19:2, 8; 21:5; 24:9), which does not render the suffix. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.
and take possession of this good land.

So keep yourselves,

that you do not forget the covenant of YHWH your God

which he made with you,

and make for yourselves a graven image in the form of anything

which YHWH your God has commanded you.

For YHWH your God is a consuming fire,

He is a jealous El.

When you bear sons and sons’ sons and have remained long in the land,

and act corruptly,

and make an idol in the form of anything,

and do the evil in the eyes of YHWH your God

to provoke him to anger

I call the heaven and the earth to witness against you today,

that you will surely perish quickly from the land

where you are going over

the Jordan to possess it.

You shall not lengthen days on it,

LXX renders the clause as a conditional εαν type. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 80.

LXX adds a possessive pronoun to by rendering as τοις των υιων σου (“your sons’ sons”). Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 80.

Wevers thinks that the choice of χρονιστε in LXX to render מנה is peculiar, because it simply means “to spend time,” but the Hebrew means “to grow old.” See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 80.

LXX disregards the adverb מחר (“quickly”) in MT. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 81. Of the eight occurrences of the adverbial use of מחר in Deuteronomy, there are two other instances (Deut 9:3, 16) where it is omitted in a significant part of the Greek textual tradition. McCarthy thinks that the reasons for these omissions are puzzling. See McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 63*. Nelson suggests that the omission in here may be either as a correction because the perishing took some time or due to homoiarchonton of מחר. See Nelson, Deuteronomy, 60.

LXX has created a neologism πολυχρονιτε based on the adjective πολυχρόνος for the Hebrew לא תאריכי יימ (“you shall not lengthen days”). Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 82.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידהו יוהי אלהים בנים</td>
<td>YHWH will scatter you among the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peoples,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יתנ俄军 יוהי אלהים בנים</td>
<td>and you will be left few in number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>among the nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יתנ俄军 יוהי אלהים בנים</td>
<td>where YHWH drives you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עבדות אלהים אלוהים</td>
<td>There you will serve gods,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the work of man’s hands, wood and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stone,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which neither see nor hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nor eat nor smell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 LXX has ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς θεοῖς (“among all the nations”), MT does not have an equivalent for πᾶσιν, but it is supported by Vulgate. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82.

30 The verb in the relative clause in MT is יִגְנָה (“he drives”), LXX softens the active force of the verb by using εἰλαξίζει (“will bring you in”). See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82.

31 LXX translates ἄλλους θεούς by θεοῖς ἕξοροις (“other gods”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82. Syr also expands to “other gods.” Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 60. In Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch, a phrase “the people, worshippers of idols” is added to insist that it was the nations, not the idols, that the Israelites served in exile. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 63*. 
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Deut 31:2 is in the context of Deut 31:1-6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 31:1-6 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ויהי משה</td>
<td>And Moses went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ודברת און הדבים ואלה</td>
<td>and spoke these words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לאל שיאל</td>
<td>to all Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And he said to them,

בַּמִּית וְעַשְׂרִים שָנָה אֶנֶרֶךְ חֹדֶשׁ

“I am a hundred and twenty years old today,

לֹא אָכְלָה עַד לְצָאת הָצָהָל

and YHWH has said to me,

רְאוֹדֵה אַבְּרָהָם

‘You will not cross over this Jordan.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>1QDeut(^b) Frag.13ii</th>
<th>MT Deut 31:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| καὶ συνετέλεσεν Μωσής | ויהי משה | וירבד און פל ...
| λαλῶν πάντας ... | לֹא אָכְלָה עַד לְצָאת הָצָהָל | וירבד און פל ...
| And Moses finished    | And Moses finished | And Moses went |
| speaking all ...       | speaking all ...    | and spoke ... |

32 There are textual differences between MT, 1QDeut\(^b\) (Fragment 13ii) and LXX in Deut 31:1.

The textual differences involve the transposition of two consonants (כ and ל), forming ויהי משה (“and he went”) in MT and וירבד (“and he finished”) 1QDeut\(^b\) Frag.13ii, in which we also find לֹא אָכְלָה (“all”), and לֹא אָכְלָה (“speaking”) rather than רְאוֹדֵה אַבְּרָהָם (“and he spoke”). The MT reading “and he went and spoke” means “and he began to say.” It can be used to introduce a new discourse which follows Deut 31:1. On the contrary, the reading “and Moses finished speaking all these words…” in the Qumran and LXX means that the sayings before Deut 31:1 are completed and finished. See Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible D’Alexandrie: Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 312; Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 490. There are opinions that LXX and 1QDeut\(^b\) do preserve the better reading of the two, for instance, Mayes thinks that a deliberate change from the MT to the text presupposed by LXX and offered by the Dead Sea Scrolls is less credible than a deliberate change in the other direction. See A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 372-3. In addition, Levinson suggests that the reading of 1QDeut\(^b\) “may make more sense since it creates an exact parallel” between this verse and Deut 32:45, each of which marks a transition between two sections of text, and is continued by (“and he said to them...”) (Deut 31:2; 32:46). See Bernard M. Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler, 2d ed; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 416. However, according to the principle of *Difficilior lectio potior* ("the more difficult reading is preferable"), the MT reading, which is more difficult, is preferable. Thus, both the readings “and he went” and “and he finished” may be possible. For more discussion of this issue, see McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 134*.

33 LXX has πάντας τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς (“all these words”).

34 LXX reads υἱοὶ Ισραήλ (“children of Israel”).

35 LXX gives a different order of the two infinitives: εἰσπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐκπορεύεσθαι (“to come in and go out”).
YHWH your God Himself will cross over before you.

He will destroy these nations before you, and you will possess them.

Joshua, he will cross over before you, as YHWH has spoken.

YHWH will do to them as he did to Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, and to their land, whom He destroyed them.

YHWH will give them over to you, and you will do to them according to all the commands which I have commanded you.

Be strong and courageous, do not fear and do not tremble because of them, for YHWH your God He goes with you.

He will not fail you and will not forsake you.”

---

36 MT has וַיֵּמָר, while SP has וַיֵּעָמָר, and LXX has an article before the participle: ὁ προσπεραλαμάνον (who goes). McCarthy thinks that MT is more likely to be the lectio difficilior here, while SP could be seen to assimilate to both Deut 9:3 and the quasi-parallels of Deut 31:6, 8. See McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 135*.

37 In MT this part of the verse is asyndetic, but LXX renders smoothly by καὶ Ἰησοῦς (“And Iesous”). See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 491.

38 LXX has τοὶ δυοι βασιλεύσιν ("the two kings").

39 LXX gives a καθότι clause “even as he destroyed them,” which is exegetical in nature. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 491.

40 LXX has an aorist παρέδωκεν (“he has delivered”), while MT has παρέδωκεν (“and he will deliver them”).

41 LXX has a shorter reading and does not have “all the commands.” MT may be a secondarily expanded reading. McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 135*.

42 MT has only two negative commands, but LXX has three: μὴ φοβοῦ μὴ δειλινὸς μὴ πταίσῃς (“fear not, neither be frightened, neither be terrified”). It is not clear that which one renders מַהֲרֹת מְנָחָם. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 492.

43 LXX has μετείχεσαν ἐν μετείχεσαν (“with you among you”). Possibly the ἐν μετείχεσαν was added to show that, though YHWH was going with you, He was at the same time among you, in your midst. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 493.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 32:48-52 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 And YHWH spoke to Moses on the same day, saying,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 &quot;Ascend this mountain of the Abarim, Mount Nebo,&quot; which is in the land of Moab, which is across Jericho, and see the land of Canaan, which I, I am giving to the Israelites for a possession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 And die on the mountain that you ascend there, and be gathered to your people, as Aaron your brother died on Mount Hor and was gathered to his people,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me in the midst of the Israelites at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, (in) the wilderness of Zin, because you did not regard me as holy in the midst of the Israelites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 MT has נָבְיָה ("Nebo"); SP reads נָבָא. LXX reads Naβαυ.
45 SP reads נְבֵא ("your people," singular) rather than נְבֵי ("your people," plural). LXX has λαόν σου ("your people," singular). Syr and Tg also have a singular reading. The idiom "to be gathered unto one’s people" occurs ten times in the Pentateuch (Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:29. 33; Num 20:24; 27:13; 31:2; Deut 32:50[2x]). In nine of these occurrences, MT attests a plural noun [נְבֵי or נבֵי], and only once as a singular form (Gen 49:29, in which Jacob, who is about to die, is the speaker). By contrast, SP usually writes a singular noun. See McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 154*.
46 SP reads נְבֵי ("his people," singular) rather than the plural in MT: נבֵי. LXX has λαόν αὐτοῦ ("his people," singular). Syr and Tg also have a singular reading.
47 MT makes this an act of rebellion, but LXX translates as ἡπειθήσετε τῷ ῥήματί μου ("you disobeyed my word"). LXX softens the direct rebellion against YHWH by interpreting ήμι ("against me") by τῷ ῥήματί μου. See McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 154*; Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 537.
48 LXX translate as τοῦ ἰδίου ἀντιλαγής Καδής ("the waters of dispute at Kadesh"), it seems that the translator did not understand יִרְמֵי קַדָּש ("waters of Meribath") as a place name. See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 537.
Deut 34:4-5 with its narrative context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 34:1-6 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלֶדֶן מַשָּׁהּ מִמְּנָהּ גָוָּאֶהְנָ הַרְבּוֹבָּא</td>
<td>And Moses ascended from the plains of Moab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַל הָר נָבֻּ רָאֵשׁ הָפְסָנָה</td>
<td>to Mount Nebo, to the top of Pisgah,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַשְּרֵא על פְּרָיו יִרְוָּח</td>
<td>which is opposite Jericho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְיֵרֹאֲהִו רוֹדָה אֶל כָּל הָאָרָתִים</td>
<td>And YHWH showed him all the land,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַתָּא הָנִילָרֵע דֶּע דוֹר</td>
<td>Gilead as far as Dan,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת כָל נַפְתָּלִי</td>
<td>and all Naphtali50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת אַרְמִי אֶפְרָאִים</td>
<td>and the land of Ephraim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וּמְנַשֵּׁה</td>
<td>and Manasseh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת כָּל אָרְמִי יְוּדוּד</td>
<td>and all the land of Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֹלֶה חִיָּמִל הַיָּמיֹה</td>
<td>as far as the Western Sea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת חָרָב</td>
<td>and the Negev51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת הָמַכְּר בְּקַעְתָּה גִּרְוָּח</td>
<td>and the region in the valley of Jericho,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֹלֶה הַמִּנְעָר</td>
<td>the city of palm trees,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֹלֶה צוֹאָר</td>
<td>as far as Zoar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְּרִמֶפֶר יָדָּה אלהִי</td>
<td>Then YHWH said to him,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵאוּת הָאָרָתִים</td>
<td>“This is the land.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 The text of SP for Deut 34:1-3 is considerably shorter than MT. According to SP, the land shown to Moses is described in very general terms as extending “from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, and as far as the Western Sea.” SP omits most of verse 2, apart from “as far as the Western Sea.” For a discussion of the motives for SP’s description, see McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 168*.

50 LXX reads πάσαν τῆν γῆν Νεφθαλίν ("all the land of Nephthali"). MT does not have “the land.”

51 LXX translates יבָנָה ("Negev") to τῆν ἔρημον ("the desert") because the Negev is the desert of south Judah. See Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 558.

52 MT identifies בְּקַעְתָּה גִּרְוָּח ("the environs of Iericho") as the Negev, while LXX disregarded בְּקַעְתָּה entirely, it only has τα περίχωρα Ἰεριχώ ("the environs of Iericho"). Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 558.

53 MT uses a pronoun (“him”) for Moses, but LXX has Μωυσῆν ("Moses").
In Numbers, there are two passages about the exclusion of Moses: Num 20:12 and Num 27:12-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num 20:12 (MT)</td>
<td>And YHWH said to Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 27:12-14</td>
<td>and Aaron,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54 LXX reads καὶ Ἰσαὰκ (“and Isaak”), but MT does not have a conjunction before ליאוים.  
55 MT has a singular pronominal suffix in ליאוים, but this singular pronoun does not agree with the three patriarchs whom YHWH was addressing. Therefore, LXX “corrects” it to plural, μὴ λαμάς.  
56 Instead of “I have made you see,” LXX has ἐθείσα (”I have showed”) modified by the dative τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου (“your eyes”), thus “I have showed it to your eyes,” or simply “I have made you see.” Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 558.  
57 LXX has οὐκ εἰσελθόντι (“will not enter”).  
58 LXX has διὰ ρήματος κυρίου (“by the word of the Lord”).  
59 According to MT, the subject is not clear. LXX uses a plural verb ἐθάψαν (“they buried”) in order to avoid the direct statement that YHWH buried Moses. Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 559. However, the midrashic expansion of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch clearly illustrates the tradition that it was none other than God who buried Moses, and accordingly retains a singular verb. McCarthy, Deuteronomy, 168*.  
60 LXX takes μέν (“in the valley”) as a proper name, as ἐν Γαί (“in Gai”). Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 559.  
61 “Beth-peor” is translated by LXX as οἶκος Φογώρ (“the house of Phogor”).  
62 The context is in the narrative of Num 20:1-13.
Because you have not believed in me, to regard me as holy before the eyes of the Israelites, therefore you will not bring this assembly into the land which I have given to them.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:12-14 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| עָנָיָה אַל אֲמַכְּתָם | "Because you have not believed in me," 63 to regard me as holy before the eyes of the Israelites, therefore you will not bring this assembly into the land which I have given to them.”
| יָשָׁם | "Ascend this mountain of the Abarim," 65 and see the land 66 which I have given 67 to the Israelites.
| "When you have seen it, 68 you will be gathered to your people," 69 you too as Aaron your brother was gathered. 70
| לָא יְצַלְצַל | for you rebelled against my word in the wilderness of Zin,
| מַדְבָּר זִין | during the strife of the congregation,

63 MT has אל אֲמַכְּתָם בִּקְרֵצֵי ("you did not believe in me"), but LXX has οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε, it omits "in me." Wevers thinks that it is because the modifier 

64 MT has לָא יְצַלְצַל ("to sanctify me") also has a first singular pronominal modifier, which LXX translates as ἀγιάζει με ("to sanctify me"). LXX absolutes the verb. It is not "believe in me," but "did not have faith, trust." See John William Wevers, Notes on the Greek text of Numbers (SCS 46; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1998), 327.

65 Here, LXX has οὐκ εἶδετε ὑμεῖς τὴν συνάγωγὴν ταύτην ("you yourselves shall not lead this congregation"). MT has no equivalent for ὑμεῖς ("yourselfs"), which is unnecessary to the sense. It was added by the translator to give the sense that it is not you, but someone else, who will lead the Israelites into the Promised Land. See Wevers, Greek text of Numbers, 328.

66 LXX has οὕτως ἐπέστην εἰς τὸ ὅρος τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ ὅρος Ναβαν ("go up into the mountain that [is] on the other side, this mountain Nabau"). The locative ἐν τῷ πέραν ("on the other side") presumably refers to the other side of the Jordan. There is no counterpart in MT for τοῦ ὅρος Ναβαν ("this mountain Nabau"). LXX may take Deut 32:49 as a reference. See Wevers, Greek text of Numbers, 462-463.

67 LXX has τὸν γῆν Χαναάν ("the land of Chanaan"). MT does not have the modifier "of Canaan."

68 LXX has changed the tense of the verb in the relative clause. MT reads יָשָׁם ("I gave"), but LXX translates it as ἐγὼ δίδωμι ("I am giving," a pronoun with a participle). LXX might understand the conquest of the land was still future, thus the translator changed the tense. See Wevers, Greek text of Numbers, 463.

69 SP reads οὖς ("your people," singular) rather than οἱ οὖς ("your people," plural). LXX also has οἱ αὐτοῖς ("your people," singular).

70 LXX has inserted ἐν οὐραίῳ ὅροι ("in the mountain Hor").
Six of them give the *reasons* for Moses’ exclusion, and the other two passages (Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5) do not indicate any reason for the ban from entering the land. Although Moses’ ban from entering the Promised Land are mentioned three times in his same speech (Deut 1-4), their immediate contexts are different. The first of them (Deut 1:37) occurs in the retelling of the spy story.\(^1\) The second one (Deut 3:26-27) is retold in Moses’ retrospective dialogue between YHWH and him. In Deut 4:21, Moses retells his denial in the context of an exhortation to the Israelites.

Regarding Num 20:12; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52.\(^2\) All these three passages are not told by Moses, but by the narrators of Numbers and Deuteronomy. The immediate contexts of these three passages are very different. In Num 20:1-13, the first announcement of Moses’ exclusion occurs in YHWH’s words of judgment after the miracle of the waters of Meribah. In Num 27:12-14 God’s command is placed in the introduction of the theme of new leadership. Joshua will be the new leader after Moses died. The succession of Joshua (Num 27:15-23) occurs *after* the command of going up the mountain. In Deuteronomy, however, the ordination of Joshua to

---

\(^1\) Another version of the spy story is told in Num 13-14, but the Numeri version does not have a record that YHWH was angry with Moses or that he was forbidden to enter Canaan.

\(^2\) They are traditionally classified as relating to the Priestly traditions, for example: S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy* (3d ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 26-27; Carl Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua* (HKAT 3; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), 122; Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 518.
become the new leader occurs before the command of God to Moses in Deut 32:48-52. Joshua has already been encouraged by Moses (Deut 31:7-8), and by YHWH (Deut 32:23).

It seems that Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 do not give any explicit explanation to Moses’ exclusion. In the final form of Deuteronomy, Deut 31:1-6 follows the covenant made in Moab (Deut 29-30), while the narrative of Deut 34:1-6 records the last action of Moses and the saying of YHWH to Moses before he died.

2. Review of recent studies on the different versions

The above passages present at least two different versions of Moses’ exclusion from the Promised Land. The differences are not merely in the vocabulary and style of the language. One of the differences had been spotted by Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette: Deut 1:37 reports that at Kadesh Barnea the angry YHWH had already denied to Moses the hope of entering the Land of Canaan, an event which in fact Num 20:12-13 and 27:14 report finally occurred at the waters of striving (or waters of Meribah) at Kadesh in the Wilderness of Sin. Hence, Deut 1:37 points to

---

the spy narrative which was 38 years\textsuperscript{74} earlier than the incident in the waters of Meribah (Num 20:1-13).

How do the scholars deal with these two versions of the exclusion of Moses? A broad overview of the research about the denial of Moses’ entry in Deuteronomy is that in Deut 1:37 (3:26 and 4:21),\textsuperscript{75} the most discussed issues are the meaning of “on your account,” and whether Moses was innocent in the spy story.\textsuperscript{76} As regards the

\textsuperscript{74} or 37 years.

\textsuperscript{75} They are traditionally classified as relating to the Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic traditions, for example: Ian Cairns, \textit{Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy} (ITC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992), 291; Driver, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 27; George A. Smith, \textit{The Book of Deuteronomy} (CBS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1918), 25.

other version of Moses exclusion reported in Deut 32:48-52, most scholars explain that this passage belongs to the Priestly tradition,\textsuperscript{77} and the focus is on the sin of Moses. Although there are many works devoted to the sin of Moses, not many studies aim to investigate the two versions of the exclusion of Moses. Here, six works are selected to discuss because they have attempted to explain the tension of the two versions of Moses’ exclusion in detail. These six works can be divided into two main categories. In the first place, two of them (Paul Kissling and Jean-Pierre Sonnet) adopt a “narrative approach” or a synchronic approach, and take only the final form of Deuteronomy into consideration. The works in the second category (Thomas W. Mann, William H. C. Propp, Johnson T. K. Lim and Won Lee), which take a diachronic approach, do not carry out a holistic reading of the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, nor smooth out the differences between the layers in the books, rather they emphasise the differences between the Deuteronomic tradition and the Priestly tradition. We will first deal with the synchronic approach.

The Synchronic Approach

Paul J. Kissling

The aim of Paul Kissling’s book[^78] is to assess the reliability of four biblical characters in the Primary History.[^79] Moses is one of the four characters under his examination. Kissling selects Moses’ exclusion from Canaan as the evidence for divergence in point of view between Moses and the narrator of the Primary History. Kissling does not assign the different versions of Moses’ ban as D or P traditions, but as Moses’ version (Deut 1:37; 3:26; 4:21), YHWH’s version (Deut 32:48-52) and the narrator’s version (Num 20:1-13). He compares Moses’ version with the narrator’s, and observes that Moses told a different story about the cause of his denial of entry.[^80] In addition, in Deut 32:48-52, YHWH and the narrator attribute that the real reason for Moses’ denial is his own actions and words at Kadesh.[^81] Moses’ fault was not YHWH’s anger at Israel in the spy story as Moses claimed. According to Kissling, this divergence shows that Moses is not reliable as regards his exclusion from Canaan.[^82]

Kissling states that the narrator never gives an independent account of the conversation between Moses and YHWH as recorded in Deut 3:23-29.[^83] Therefore, the reader cannot confirm that Moses’ sayings are accurate and the conversation.

[^78]: Paul J. Kissling, Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha (JSOTSup 224; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
[^79]: Kissling refers to D. N. Freedman’s definition of “Primary History”: from Genesis to Kings. See D. N. Freedman, “Deuteronomistic History,” IDBSup: 226.
[^80]: Kissling, Reliable Characters, 46.
[^81]: Kissling, Reliable Characters, 50.
[^82]: Kissling, Reliable Characters, 51.
[^83]: Kissling, Reliable Characters, 48-49.
actually took place. But, where does this information, which the reader cannot confirm, come from? In fact, all the sayings of Moses are retold by the narrator. The reader can only read the word of Moses as portrayed by the narrator. In fact, Kissling is comparing Moses’ explanations, which are portrayed by the narrator, with another explanation given by the narrator himself. The reader cannot confirm that all the information given by the narrator is correct if the reader is not sure that the narrator is reliable. However, is the narrator reliable?

Although Kissling has already assumed that the narrator is reliable, one may question Kissling’s assumption. The reliability of the narrator can also be assessed by using Kissling’s own principle: comparing the narrator’s former statements with his latter statements. If an internal consistency can be observed, the narrator is said to be reliable. However, some internal contradictions can be found from the report of the narrator in the so-called Primary History. These examples are: in Gen 1:25-26 the narrator tells the reader that the animals were created before the human beings, but in Gen 2:19 the narrator states that the animals were formed after the man; in Gen 37:36 the narrator depicts that Joseph was sold to Potiphar by the Midianites, while in Gen 39:1 it is said that Joseph was sold by the Ishmaelites; in Exod 33:7-11, the tent of meeting has been already built, while in Exod 35:21 it is said that the people started to contribute the materials for the building of the tent of meeting, and all the

---

84 Kissling, Reliable Characters, 49.
85 Kissling, Reliable Characters, 26.
work of the tent of meeting was finished until Exod 39:32; the narrator also tells
different versions of the conqueror(s) of Hebron: Joshua and all Israel (Josh 10:36),
Caleb (Josh 15:14), and the people of Judah (Judg 1:10). These discrepancies show
that the narrator is not as reliable as Kissling assumed.

Jean-Pierre Sonnet

Jean-Pierre Sonnet also believes that Deuteronomy can be read as a narrative. He argues that Moses betrays his human point of view in the way he tells the story in Deut 1-4. Moses presents his fate as originating in the fault of the people. In Deut 32:48-52 the narrator’s final account reports how God educates Moses. YHWH reminds Moses what he pretends to have forgotten. Such account corrects the data that Moses has distorted.

The narrative approach used by Sonnet has at least two assumptions. First, there
is only one narrator in the book of Deuteronomy. Second, the human character in the

88 For more discussion of the two tents of meeting, see Israel Knohl, “Two Aspects of the ‘Tent of
Meeting’,” in Tehillah le Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg (ed. M.
Cogan et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 73-79.
89 J. Maxwell Miller and John H. Hayes, A History of Ancient Israel and Judah (2d ed.; Louisville,
90 Perhaps another way to look at the problem of the assumption is that Kissling assumes that there is
one narrator only. If it is assumed that there are several narrators, the internal contradictions quoted
above can be explained by the fact that different narrators are presenting their own stories. Jean-L.
Ska also points out that “it is difficult to maintain that the Pentateuch or the Deuteronomistic History
were written at one go by one author. Several hands were at work and we have enough proof of this.”
See Jean-Louis Ska, “Narrator or Narrators,” in The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies
and Basic Questions (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 226.
91 Jean-Pierre Sonnet, The book within the book: Writing in Deuteronomy (BIS 14; Leiden: Brill,
l’intrigue du Deutéronome (Dt 1-4 et Dt 31-34),” NRTh 123 (2001): 353-372.
narrative represents the limited and fallible point of view, while the narrator’s point of view is omniscient and authoritative. These two assumptions may not be correct. We can look at the first assumption. Is there only one narrator in the book of Deuteronomy? Although Deuteronomy is a book, it cannot be taken for granted that one book must have only one narrator. Rather, as we shall see in Chapter Three, the stylistic, factual and theological evidence can establish that Deut 32:48-52 is not written by the same author/school who wrote the main part of Deuteronomy. If there are several narrators in the same book, it is natural that there are different points of view.

In regard to the second assumption, we may ask the question: is the point of view of the narrator necessarily omniscient and authoritative? It is doubtful that the narrator’s description is always accurate. According to the narrator’s record, in Deut 34:1, Moses went up Mount Nebo, the top of Pisgah. However, Mount Nebo is different from the summit of Pisgah. This summit refers to Ras es-Siyaghah, which is slightly lower than the top of Mount Nebo and separated from it by a saddle. There are about eight kms distance between these two summits. Therefore, it is impossible for Moses to go up the top of Mount Nebo and the summit of Pisgah at the same time. This geographical fact can show that the narrator is not as authoritative as Sonnet assumed. The most probable explanation to the juxtaposition

---

98 Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 871.
of these two mountain names is that Deut 34:1 is the work of a redactor who would
like to harmonize the two commands to Moses to ascend different mountains.

According to Deut 3:27, YHWH orders Moses to ascend the summit of Pisgah, while
in Deut 32:49, YHWH commands him to go up Mount Nebo.

Hence, the holistic reading used by Kissling and Sonnet cannot give a
satisfactory answer to the tension of the two versions in Deuteronomy.

The Diachronic Approach

Thomas Mann and Johnson T. K. Lim

The conclusions of Thomas Mann and those of Johnson Lim are so similar that
we may review their interpretations together. We first look at Mann’s study. In his
article, Mann interprets the denial of Moses in Deut 1:37, 3:26-27 as a reassessment
within the Deuteronomic School itself regarding the understanding of the corporate
relationship between the leader and people, while the other version (in Num 20:1-13;
Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) provides an opposite view proposed by the
Priestly School.99

Building on F. M. Cross’ “block-model” of the Deuteronomistic History,100
Mann argues that the first Deuteronomic historian (Dtr1) understood that the people

---

100 F. M. Cross uses the term “Deuteronomistic” in his essay “The Themes of the Book of Kings and
the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History,” see F. M. Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic:
274-289. However, Mann always use the term “Deuteronomic” instead. For a summary of Cross’
“block-model,” see Walter Dietrich, “Deuteronomistic History,” RPP 3:784; Thomas Römer,
were punished because of the leader’s apostasy.\textsuperscript{101} A redactor wrestled with the relationship between leader and people after the death of king Josiah.\textsuperscript{102} He believed that the leader was punished because of the people’s lack of faith. The redactor, according to Mann, inserted Deut 1:37 and 3:26-27 in Deuteronomy to present his dissenting voice within the Deuteronomic School.\textsuperscript{103} The redactor correlated Moses with Josiah to propose that “corporate doom” would come even to the ideal leaders, Moses and Josiah.\textsuperscript{104}

In Mann’s view, the Deuteronomic School imputes “corporate responsibility” as the reason, while the Priestly School opts for the “individual responsibility” of Moses. By studying the use of the two verbs “believe” and “rebel,” Mann argues that the Priestly School knew the addition of Moses’ exclusion in Deut 1, and “was thus deliberately countering that explanation with an opposing view.”\textsuperscript{105} The Priestly School explained that Moses’ exclusion was not due to the people’s unfaithfulness, but Moses’ own.\textsuperscript{106} The Priestly School holds the view that everyone should die for his own sin. Although these two schools have different views, both of them attempt to deal with the meaning of Moses’ denial of entry for their contemporaries.\textsuperscript{107}

Johnson Lim also draws attention to the issue of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility.” After discussing seven ways of interpreting the passages

\textsuperscript{101} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 490.
\textsuperscript{102} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 492.
\textsuperscript{103} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 491.
\textsuperscript{104} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 493-494.
\textsuperscript{105} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 484.
\textsuperscript{106} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 485.
\textsuperscript{107} Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 494.
in Deut 1:37, 3:26 and 4:21, Lim solves the conflict between these three passages and Deut 32:48-52 by recognizing that they are from different traditions. Lim states that the two traditions are products of two different schools. The traditions interpret the sin of Moses from different perspectives and hence produce different interpretations. The Deuteronomic School stresses “corporate responsibility” while the Priestly School stresses “personal accountability.” According to him, “corporate responsibility” and “personal accountability” are like the two sides of a coin, they are the “two-sided” lesson.

Both Mann and Lim claim that the Deuteronomic School sides with “corporate responsibility” and the Priestly School is for “individual responsibility.” This dichotomy of one school siding with only one kind of responsibility is without solid foundation. A more thorough discussion of this issue will be given in Part III of this thesis, here, two points deserve to be mentioned. Firstly, it is not correct to state that the Deuteronomic text sides only with “corporate responsibility.” It cannot be denied that there are laws in Deuteronomy implying corporate responsibility. One such example is Deut 5:9:

“You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I YHWH your God am a jealous God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third

---

108 The seven ways include: 1) The redactional process; 2) Identification of the leader with his people; 3) Relationship between an individual and the community; 4) Divergent voices in Deuteronomy; 5) Relating two traditions; 6) Individual responsibility; 7) Literary analysis. See Johnson T. K. Lim, “The sin of Moses in Deuteronomy,” AJT 17 (2003): 250-266.
110 Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 262.
111 Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 263.
112 Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 263.
and forth generations of those who reject me…”

Should the phrase “punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third and forth generations” be read in literally? The literal sense of this phrase is that the children will be punished because of their parents’ iniquity. Then it implies a corporate punishment in the family. Andrew Mayes believes that this phrase apparently derives from the Deuteronomistic compiler of the Decalogue, and its purpose is to reconcile the old formula, according to which the whole family bears “communal responsibility” for each of its members with the later view of individual responsibility. However, Moshe Weinfeld argues that this phrase is not to be taken literally. It, according to Weinfeld, refers to a large number of descendants and actually parallels the corresponding clause, “showing steadfast love to the thousandth generation,” which designates not exactly a thousand generations. It is not my purpose to give a thorough examination of their arguments here. The point is that there is a possibility of finding the concept of “corporate responsibility” in the Deuteronomistic Decalogue, but it is controversial.

However, the idea of “individual responsibility” can also be found in Deuteronomy. For instance, in the D version of the spy story, the second generation of the Exodus could receive the land because they did not know “good and evil” (Deut 1:39). Deut 1:36 and 38 also state that Caleb and Joshua could see or enter the land because of their special character or mission. Caleb follows YHWH completely,

---

113 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 167.
114 Weinfeld, Deuteronomy 1-11, 296.
and Joshua is the one who will secure Israel’s possession of the land.

Besides, the judicial assessment of penalties in Deut 24:16, is also a clear example of “individual responsibility” in Deuteronomy:

“Parents shall not be put to death for children, nor children be put to death for parents: a person shall be put to death only for his own crime.”

Mayes states that this verse “gives no sign of being a late addition; it must … be an older law quoted by the Deuteronomic legislator.”115 Gerhard von Rad also evaluates that “a thorough study of early legal history … has shown that the conception of a general development from collective to individual liability is incorrect. The principle of personal responsibility was by no means unknown in the earlier times.”116 Furthermore, according to Deut 29:18-20, it is said that YHWH will single out the one, who go his own stubborn ways, from all the tribes of Israel for all the calamity according to the curses written in the book of law. Since the idea of “individual responsibility” can be found in a law and a curse in Deuteronomy, it is not accurate to state that Deuteronomy is only for “corporate responsibility.”

Thus, both the concept of “corporate responsibility/punishment” and “individual responsibility/punishment” can be found in Deuteronomy. The texts are more complicated than the dichotomy model suggested.

115 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 326.
116 Von Rad, Deuteronomy, 152. Some scholars may doubt whether Deut 24:16 belonged originally to Deuteronomy. For instance, Rofé says that, “the law in 24:16… conflicts with the law in 13:13-19… We thus have here a composition that comes from juridical circles and that is distinct from, and even in conflict with, the ritual law strata of Deuteronomy…” See A. Rofé, Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation (ed. David J. Reimer; London; New York: T&T Clark, 2002), 118. Some may even take Deut 24:16 as dependent on Jer 31:29 and Ezek 18. See Smith, Deuteronomy, 283. But these opinions do not exclude the concept of personal accountability from Deuteronomy.
William H. C. Propp

William Propp also holds that the two versions of the explanation of Moses’ denial came from the Deuteronomic source and the Priestly source.¹¹⁷ According to Propp, the Deuteronomic source “likes Moses very much,” and Moses was innocent but was punished for the people’s sin.¹¹⁸ Moses, by paying the price of being an intercessor, identifies himself with the guilty party he represents.¹¹⁹

However, the Priestly writing has a different attitude towards Moses. The Moses of the Priestly source is “innately flawed.”¹²⁰ In the Priestly writing, Moses was ordered to take Aaron’s rod for display only. It was supposed to be a silent rebuke to the rebels, not supposed to be used for striking. But Moses struck the rock with the rod. According to Propp, Aaron is completely innocent. There might be a sort of guilt by association, because it is Aaron’s rod.¹²¹ Propp thinks that in the Priestly writing, Moses represents the Levites and the prophets, while Aaron represents the priests.¹²² To the Priestly tradition, the Levites and the prophets were rivals.¹²³ Propp suggests that the tense relationship between the priests, the Levites and the prophets provides the key to understanding P’s claims on Moses’ fault.¹²⁴

Thus, Propp explains the tension between the two traditions by showing the different

attitudes of the Deuteronomic and the Priestly writing toward Moses. Consequently, he proposes that there was a conflict among the priest, the Levites and the prophets.

Is there enough evidence for Propp’s reconstruction of the tension between the different social groups? On the one hand, Propp states that Moses represents the Levites and the prophets in the Priestly source. On the other hand, Propp quotes Num 16-17 to illustrate that the Levites had sought priestly status for the Levites. However, according to Num 16:3, 19 (two Priestly verses) the Levites are not only against Aaron, but also Moses. If Moses is the Levites’ representative, will they confront him? Besides, it is Moses who responds to the Levites, not Aaron (Num 16:5-11). In the Priestly portrayal of the rebellion of the Levites, Moses is facing the conflict face to face. It seems that the Levites do not think that Moses is their representative. Hence, the basis for the reconstruction of the tension is not strong enough, and this reconstruction cannot be used to explain the two versions of Moses’ exclusion.

---

127 Propp says that the Priestly source consider the Levites and prophets are rivals, see Propp, “Why Moses,” 39. Do the Deuteronomic texts also see the priests as rivals? There are a few examples to show that the priest has an eminent role in Deuteronomy. For instance, when the people want to give the first of all the fruit of the ground to YHWH, they should go to the priest (not the Levites), speak to him, and hand their baskets to him. Then the priest would take the basket from their hands and set it down before YHWH’s altar (Deut 26:1-4). Before the Israelites go out to war, the priest (not the Levites or prophets) will come forward and speak words of exhortation to the troops (Deut 20:1-4). In Deut 31:9, the priests were one of the groups who received the law from Moses. In several instances, it is depicted that the priest works with the judge and the Levites to minister to the people (Deut 17:9, 12; 19:17; 21:5; 24:8). The people are told to obey the priest(s) (Deut 17:12; 24:8). Furthermore, according to Deut 18:1-8, the priest is mentioned first to receive part of the offerings, then the Levites. Only the priest is said to be chosen by YHWH in that context. These examples show that the book of Deuteronomy does not consider the priests as rivals. Hence, there is no solid foundation to support that there is a tension between the priest(s) and the Deuteronomic school in the period when Deuteronomy was formed.
Won Lee

Won Lee’s article aims to introduce “conceptual analysis,” and to illustrate how the method works in the exegesis of Num 20:1-13. Lee argues that the three concepts found in the Priestly passage Num 20:1-13 are: i) The justifiable complaint of the people; ii) The unjustifiable responses of Moses and Aaron; and iii) The justifiable punishment of YHWH. According to Lee, Moses is the representative of God to the people in the Priestly tradition. Such tradition stresses the leaders’ representing God’s intention to the people. However, in the incident of the waters of Meribah, Moses and Aaron misrepresented God’s intention and mischaracterized God. Since Moses and Aaron were not good leaders, their leadership was taken away.

Lee’s treatment of the Deuteronomic texts is quite brief. He asserts that Moses is the leader for the people in the Deuteronomic tradition. Lee argues that the “you” in the key term “because of you” in Deut 1:37 refers to the “spies” rather than the Israelites. He observes that Deut 1:35-38 “focus particularly on leaders”

---

128 “Concepts,” according to Lee, are “inexplicit textual information located foundationally underneath the surface expression of a text.” The first step of “conceptual analysis” is to put both “explicit statements” and “implicit presuppositions” of a text through a rigorous analysis. The second step is to investigate the relationship between the two. A conceptual analysis must be done of the final form of the text and also any stage of the text in its literary growth. See Won Lee, “The exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land: a conceptual approach,” in Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century (ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2003), 220-222.
133 Lee gives his interpretation on the Deuteronomic passages in two paragraphs, but he has devoted 24 paragraphs to the Priestly texts.
because Caleb (Deut 1:36) and Joshua (Deut 1:38) are spy and leader respectively.  

Therefore, according to Lee, Deut 1:37-38 is not a case of personal tragedy for
Moses, but instead his “leadership cannot be completed” because of YHWH’s anger
with the chosen “spies.”

In Deut 1:23, Moses agrees to the people’s proposal of sending spies and also
selects the spies. Lee thinks that this is the “poor judgment” of Moses as a leader.

Moses misused his leadership in compromising his integrity by approving the plan of
the spy mission and by appointing the twelve men. Lee also admits that in the
Deuteronomic texts, although the focus of Moses’ exclusion is on his leadership, the
cause is the sin of the people. The Deuteronomic tradition focuses on Moses’
guiding role for the people as he faced the “corporate doom” against which even
Moses was “pulled down” with them. Lee emphasizes that the Priestly and
Deuteronomic traditions are standing side by side, though each is making its own
theological claim. It is not advisable to choose one, or harmonize or collapse the two
into one.

Lee’s suggestion, that the “you” in “because of you” (Deut 1:37) refers to the
spies, is open to challenge for the following reasons: (i) In Deut 1:34 Moses said
that YHWH heard “your (the Israelites) words,” it will be natural that the “you” in

“because of you” (Deut 1:37) refers to the Israelites. (ii) Lee’s suggestion that “these men” (Deut 1:35) can refer to “exclusively the spies”\(^{143}\) assumes that verse 35 and verse 36 are contrasting the fates of the ten spies with Caleb. However, this is not the only possibility. If verse 35 and verse 36 represent a contrast between an evil generation (the people) with one man (Caleb) who followed YHWH completely, then “these men” (Deut 1:35) can refer to the people. (iii) According to Deut 2:14, the soldiers of the first generation had already died. Since the ten spies belonged to the first generation, they should also have been dead. It will be awkward if Moses spoke these words to the ten spies who could not be the listeners at that time. (iv) The similar phrases “for your sake” and “because of you” or “because of your words” also occur in Deut 3:26 and Deut 4:21, but their contexts will not allow the “you” in these phrases to be interpreted as the ten spies. In these contexts, Moses was speaking to the people. Hence, Lee’s suggestion that Moses should bear the punishment with the spies is not likely to be correct.

\(^{143}\) Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.
Are Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 Priestly writings?¹⁴⁴

Mann, Lim, Propp and Lee all classify Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 as “Priestly” text.¹⁴⁵ Their classification is based on the consensus of the Documentary Hypothesis at the time when Mann’s article was published. However, the Priestly nature of these texts is under revision. Lothar Perlitt denies that there is solid ground for hypothesizing a Priestly redaction of Deuteronomy.¹⁴⁶ Rather, Deut 1:3; 32:48-52 and 34:1a, 7-9 were composed by scribal redactors who mixed the Deuteronomic with the Priestly language. In addition, the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 is also under question when other scholars search for the end of the Priestly writing. Thomas Pola suggests that the end of the Priestly writing is in Exodus 40, and therefore, Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 are not Priestly texts.¹⁴⁷ The

ending of Priestly tradition is still under discussion, but without a consensus.  

Scholars such as Eckart Otto, Erich Zenger, M. Köckert and Christophe Nihan, Norbert Lohfink, Horst Seebass, and Christian Frevel all have different opinions on this issue. Consequently, the Priestly nature of these three passages should be re-examined carefully.

In sum, it is commonly believed that on the one hand, the Deuteronomic tradition presents that Moses is not sinful in the spy story; the people are sinful, and Moses is punished because he is the leader of the people. On the other hand, the Priestly tradition presents Moses and Aaron to have sinned in the incident of waters of Meribah; the people are not sinful, and Moses is punished because of his own actions. The binary opposition of individual responsibility and corporate punishment is simplistic and needs to be reassessed. In the past it has been most usual to assume that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are Priestly writings, however, the recent observations and theories call for a new examination of the passages’ Priestly nature.

149 For E. Otto, the ending of P is Exod 29:42-46, see Eckart Otto, “Pentateuch,” RPP 9:688.
151 M. Köckert and C. Nihan propose that P ends in Lev 16, see Zenger and Frevel, Einleitung, 199.
152 N. Lohfink thinks that the ending of P is Jos 18:1 and 19:51, see Norbert Lohfink, Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy (trans. L. M. Maloney; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 145, n. 29.
154 According to C. Frevel, the ending of P is Deut 32:48-50, 52 and 34: 1*, 5*, 7a, 8, see Zenger and Frevel, Einleitung, 202.
3. Approach and the plan of the present study

This study is a criticism of the passages of Moses’ exclusion. It should be stressed that this study will not carry out a holistic reading of the book of Deuteronomy because the book was not formed within one short period by one hand. In addition, this study will not insist on the authority of the final canonical form because we believe that the meaning of a text is found in its original historical context, but not in its new canonical context within the book of Deuteronomy. Thus, it will be different from the canonical approach whose object is the final form of the text. As we shall see, there is sufficient evidence to analyse the passages dealing with the exclusion of Moses into different strata.

The exegetical approach used in this study will be diachronic. First, the original form of the text will be determined with the operation of textual criticism. Second, the Hebrew text will then be translated according to the putative original version(s) of the text. Third, the demarcation of the passages will be determined.

---

156 However, this study know that it is difficult to strictly separate the diachronic approach from the synchronic approach because traditional historical criticism is never purely diachronic. The historical critic starts from the evidence of the existing text and uses the synchronic evidence for the preferability of a reading. Also, strictly synchronic study is available only for a contemporary text, but even fully contemporary synchronic description is dependent on much information given by diachronic study. For the Hebrew Bible an absolute synchronous analysis would be impossible. James Barr also argues that the synchronic aspect in F. de Saussures’s linguistics does not provide sufficient arguments in favour of a synchronous approach to biblical exegesis or against a diachronic one. See James Barr, “The Synchronous, the Diachronic and the Historical: A Triangular Relationship?,” in *Bible and Interpretation: The Collected Essays of James Barr. Vol. II: Biblical Studies* (ed. J. Barton; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 151-163. Barr’s essay first published in *Synchronous or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (ed. Johannes C. de Moor; OTS 34; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1-14.
Fourth, the structure, the literary genre and redactional context of the text will be detected by textual analysis. This study also presupposes that the hypothetical original text would have been internally coherent. In such an approach, the literary integrity of the text will be investigated. Fifth, different textual layers will be separated if necessary. It will neither smooth out all differences between the layers in Deuteronomy nor entail a kind of harmonisation. How can the later layers be detected? Similar words, styles, and phrases can be the grounds for identification of the same author. But there will be some uncertainties because the later redactors can try to reproduce the “phraseological colouring” of their models. Ideas, social background, and historical allusions can help to detect the work of redactors. Thus a younger layer will consist of a different idea or theology although it uses the same phraseology and style. This study will look for the evidence and weigh the probabilities of different options. The literary growth of the text will be traced only if it is judged to be important and relevant to the understanding of the text. The questions of dating and related historical events will be clarified as necessary, but they are not the aim of this study.

Plan of the dissertation

There are nine chapters in this dissertation. The next chapter will deal with the

---

158 T. K. Cheyne, “Prophetic Literature,” EncBib: 3899. Although Cheyne’s article is related to prophetic literature, his principle can also be applied to the Pentateuch.
159 Cheyne, “Prophetic Literature,” 3899.
diachronic order of the texts. Although the scholarly consensus is that Deut 4* and Deut 32:48-52 are later than Deut 1-3*, we will still carry out an investigation of the chronological order of the passages in order to avoid from bringing a predetermined system into the texts. We will examine the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion to the book of Deuteronomy, and that for Deut 4* as an addition to Deut 1-3*. The order of Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 will also be determined. In the second part of Chapter Two, we will argue that there is an uniting of traditions of (Num 20:12 and Num 20:24) in Num 27:12-14. In addition, we will look at the evidence for the reworking of Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52.

Chapter Three will be reviews of scholarship. First we will look at the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. The post-Priestly tradition of these three passages can clarify their sources. Then, there will be reviews on the main studies of divine anger, and of sanctifying God. This order is placed according to the order that we found related to the exclusion of Moses. In Deut 1-4* we first observe divine anger is connected to the ban of Moses from the Promised Land. Then in Deut 32:48-52 we find that the sin of failing to sanctify God is linked to Moses’ exclusion.

Chapter Four will argue that Moses was innocent in the spy story of Deut 1. The reason for anger of YHWH on Moses in Deut 1-3* will be compared with that in the whole book of Deuteronomy. Could divine anger also be understood in the reference frame of the Deuteronomistic work? It will be worthy of attempting to explore in this
Chapter Five will attempt to understand the anger of YHWH in Deut 4* with reference to the frame of the Deuteronomistic History. We will discuss how the Deuteronomists use the exclusion of Moses to compare to the destruction and scattering of the Israelites with the theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History.

Chapter Six will investigate the sin of Moses in Num 20 and 27. The rewriting in Duet 32:48-52 is discussed in Chapter Seven but not in Chapter Six because it belongs to a stage which is different from that of Num 20 and Num 27, and also because of its emphasis on “sanctifying God.” We will look at how the sin of Moses is rewritten in Deut 32:48-52 and also observe the relational dimension of regarding God as holy in Deut 32.

Then, Chapter Eight will discuss the two passages (Deut 31:2; 34:4-5) which do not give any explicit explanation to the exclusion of Moses. Finally, Chapter Nine will conclude this dissertation by summarizing the results of this study.
Chapter Two The Diachronic Order of the Texts

1. The Diachronic Order of the Deuteronomic Texts

In this section the relative chronology of the Deuteronomic texts will be determined. It will begin with the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as a later supplement to the book of Deuteronomy.¹ Next, it will turn to an examination of the relationship between Deut 1-3* and the main part of Deut 5-26.² The chronological relationship between these two passages (Deut 1-3 and Deut 32:48-52) will be constructed. Then, the relative chronology of the other three chapters (Deut 4, Deut 31 and Deut 34) will be estimated. Finally we can arrange the chronological order of the Deuteronomic texts. But before the determination of the chronological order, we will first have a look at a summary of scholars’ proposals which illustrate that Deuteronomy is formed as the result of a cumulative process in which different layers of traditions were added into it.

Scholars’ observations and proposals on the editions of Deuteronomy

The structure of Deuteronomy may imply that it has several editions. In his

¹ I begin with the discussion of Deut 32:48-52 rather than that of Deut 1-3 because the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion are clearer.
² The expression “main part of Deut 5-26” does admit the possibility that there are numerous later additions and redactions in the core of the book. Martin Noth sees the law core formed by accumulation of various additions. See Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 32.
doctoral thesis,\(^3\) de Wette showed that Deuteronomy deviated in form and content from the books of Genesis to Numbers in so many respects that it could only derive from another, later period.\(^4\) Since the main focus of the Deuteronomistic law is about a centralization of the cult, and the historical context of the attempt to centralize the cult was the time of king Josiah,\(^5\) de Wette fixes the date of composition of the book of Deuteronomy at the time of Josiah.\(^6\) But this original form of Deuteronomy is different from our Deuteronomy in its present form and extent.\(^7\) Therefore, from the original form of the book at the time of Josiah to the final form of the book at the time of canonization of the Pentateuch,\(^8\) there is a development of the book of

\(^3\) De Wette, Dissertatio.

\(^4\) De Wette observes that Deuteronomy repeats Lev 26 in a different style, then he draws the conclusion that Deuteronomy stems from a different author. He also lists a number of words and expressions that do not appear in the Tetrateuch. See Thomas Römer, “‘Higher Criticism’: The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch,” in Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation Vol. III/1 From Modernism to Post-Modernism, The Nineteenth Century – a Century of Modernism and Historicism (ed. Magne Sæbo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 395; Smend, Astruc, 48.


\(^6\) Smend, Astruc, 48. There are scholars who disagree with de Wette. For instance, Griffits argues that the linguistic and archaeological evidence revealed that the vast majority of laws found in Deuteronomy could not have stemmed from the time of King Josiah. See J. S. Griffits, The Problem of Deuteronomy (London: SPCK, 1911). Östreicher contests the idea that the work restricted the liturgy to a single location. See Theodor Östreicher, Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Gütersloh: Der Rufer, 1923). Welch ascribes the Deuteronomistic law to the time of Samuel. See Adam C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy (London: James Clarke & Co., 1924). Hölscher argues that the Deuteronomic law would have been unworkable in Josiah’s time. He dates it to the post-exilic period. See Gustav Hölscher, “Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums,” ZAW 40 (1922), 161-225. See T. C. Vrienze and A. S. van der Woude, Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature (trans. B. Doyle; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005), 153.


\(^8\) The biblical text had largely stabilized by the second century CE. This is reflected in the textual evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the development of early rabbinic midrash, much of which presupposes a stable text. See Marc Zvi Brettler, “The Canonization of the Bible,” in The Jewish Study Bible (ed. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler; 2d ed; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 2157; Timothy H. Lim, The Formation of the Jewish Canon (AYBRL; New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013), 179-80.
Later, Deut 32:48-51(52) is identified as a Priestly text in the outer frame of Deuteronomy by Theodor Nöldeke.\textsuperscript{9} After that Kleinert recognizes the difference between the narrative framework (Deut 1-11) and the legal core (Deut 12-26).\textsuperscript{10} Julius Wellhausen follows Graf’s opinion, and argues that Deuteronomy was older than the Priestly Code.\textsuperscript{11} In connection with Nöldeke’s previous view, it implies that the P verses in the outer-frame of Deuteronomy were later additions to the book. Based on these above opinions and the classical documentary hypothesis,\textsuperscript{12} biblical scholars suggest that Deuteronomy was formed either as an addition of two “editions,” or as a gradual development in different stages over different periods of time.\textsuperscript{13}

Martin Noth gives a new understanding of the editions of Deuteronomy. His thesis is that the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy to Kings) was written by an


\textsuperscript{12} Vrienze expresses the classical documentary hypothesis concisely: the hypothesis proposes the existence of a Yahwistic document (J) stemming from Judah, which was later combined by a redactor with fragments of an Elohistic source (E) stemming from the Northern Kingdom. Deuteronomy (D) was added at a later stage and the thus created JED was finally combined with a once independent Priestly code (P). See Vrienze, \textit{Jewish Literature}, 171.

\textsuperscript{13} For the discussion, see A. Weiser, \textit{Introduction}, 130. Some scholars, for instance, Abraham Kuenen, Samuel Driver and Alfred Bertholet all propose that Deut was formed in several editions. See Abraham Kuenen, \textit{An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch} (trans. P. H. Wicksteed; London: Macmillan, 1886), 102, 123, 269-270, 313-314, 319, 337; Driver, \textit{Deuteronomy}, lxxvii; A. Bertholet, \textit{Deuteronomium} (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899), xxiv-xxv.
author who brought material from highly varied traditions together, and arranged them according to a carefully conceived plan.\textsuperscript{14} The book of Deuteronomy, according to Noth, is not originally connected to Genesis-Numbers before the exile, but is the beginning of the Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{15} Noth observes that Deut 1-3(4) has nothing particular in common with the Deuteronomic law,\textsuperscript{16} and the history of the Mosaic period does not seem intended to illustrate various admonitions and warnings, but rather is obviously narrated out of interest in the reported events themselves.\textsuperscript{17} Hence, Noth claims that Deut 1-3(4) was written as the introduction of the Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{18}

Noth hypothesizes that the book of Deuteronomy was formed in three stages: Firstly, Deut 4:44-30:20 (\textit{Urdeuteronomium}) was first formed between the eighth to seventh century BCE.\textsuperscript{19} Secondly, the Deuteronomistic work was formed around the middle of the sixth century BCE.\textsuperscript{20} Deut 1-3(4) was written as the introduction of the whole history. In addition, the narrative part of Deut 31-34 was also formed in this stage.\textsuperscript{21} Finally, the Priestly redactors appended Deuteronomy to the Tetrateuch to

\textsuperscript{15} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 28.
\textsuperscript{16} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 29.
\textsuperscript{17} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 29.
\textsuperscript{18} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 29, 33. Noth is not sure about the time of formation of 4:1-40. Part of Deut 4 can be attributed to the Deuteronomist, and part can be seen as a later addition. See Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 57-59.
\textsuperscript{20} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 27.
\textsuperscript{21} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 60.
form the Pentateuch with Deuteronomy as its conclusion in the postexilic period,\textsuperscript{22} at that time Deut 31:14, 15 and 23 were added.\textsuperscript{23} For Noth, there is no trace of the original P narrative between Num 27:12-23 and Deut 34:1a.\textsuperscript{24} Deut 32:48-52 is a “secondary repetition” of Num 27:12-14 (for Noth, it is a Priestly text).\textsuperscript{25} This repetition is necessary because the account of the death of Moses in Deut 34 is “so widely separated” from the announcement of his death in Num 27:12-14 by numerous passages between them.\textsuperscript{26} Thus, Noth’s three-stage hypothesis of the formation of the book of Deuteronomy is very clear.

Noth’s model is widely accepted by scholars.\textsuperscript{27} Some of them modify his model in various aspects. For instance, Thomas Römer suggests that the book of Deuteronomy develops into its present shape after the “threefold editions” of the whole Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{28}

According to Römer, Deut 1-3, Deut 4 and Deut

\footnotesize{22} Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 359; Braulik, Deuteronomium II, 13.


\footnotesize{25} Noth, Chronicler’s History, 121, 147.

\footnotesize{26} Noth, Chronicler’s History, 121.

\footnotesize{27} For the reactions to Noth’s hypothesis, see Gary N. Knoppers, “Theories of the Redaction(s) of Kings,” in The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception (ed. André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 69-88; Steven L. McKenzie, The Trouble with Kings: the Composition of the book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 1-18; Thomas Römer, “Deuteronomistic History,” EBR 6:648-653; idem, ed., The Future of the Deuteronomistic History (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000); Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research (JSOTS 306; Sheffield Academic Press, 2000). There is no lack of divergent views, for instance, Auld reads Joshua and Judges as individual works, and Samuel-Kings as a single narrative of monarchical period. He observes that Joshua finished unproblematically, while the opening of 1 Samuel offers a good introduction to everything that follows. Judges may be read as a secondary link between Joshua and Samuel-Kings. See A. Graeme Auld, Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives (OTS; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 149.

\footnotesize{28} The threefold editions are: First edition: around 600 BCE in the period of Josiah; Second edition:
32:48-52 are products of different periods. Other scholars such as Andrew Mayes,\(^{29}\)

William Moran,\(^{30}\) Richard Nelson\(^{31}\) all agree that Deuteronomy was formed in the framework of the Deuteronomistic work, but they explain the formation of the book of Deuteronomy in more intricate details.\(^{32}\) For the scholars who do not agree with the model of the Deuteronomistic History, they also propose “multi-stages” formation model of Deuteronomy, such as Karin Finsterbusch suggests a “three main stages” model,\(^{33}\) and Eckart Otto a “five stages” model.\(^{34}\) Although they propose

early exilic; Third edition: early post-exilic period. The first Josianic edition contains Deut 6-28*, Josh 5-12*, 1 Sam 1-2 Sam 8*, 1 Kgs 3-11* and a relatively brief chronicles of the Israelites and Judean kings in 1 Kgs 12:1-2 Kgs 23:15*. The second edition can be read as the first continuous Deuteronomistic History work. It is a crisis literature which records and explains the downfall of Jerusalem. The passages with the theme of the conquest of the land and the loss of the land were inserted to the Josianic version. Deut 1-3 and other passages (Deut 5; 17-18; 31:1-8; 34:1-6*; Josh 1; 3-4; 6-7; 10-11*; 23; Judg 2-11*; 1 Sam 7-8; 10:17-27; 12; 15; 1 Kgs 2:1-4; 3:1-15; 8:1-9-9; 11*; 16:23-34; 21*; 22:39-54; 2 Kgs 1:1-2, 17-18*; 3:1-3; 8:16-29; 9:1-10:36; 11-12*; 17; 21-25*) were formed in this version. In the third post-exilic edition, three main themes are introduced. Firstly, the people of YHWH were asked to separate from their neighbours. Secondly, the idea of monotheism was formed. Thirdly, the horizon was extended over and beyond the Babylonian Gola when the Jewish Diaspora spread. Deut 4 and other passages (Deut 7; 10:14-22; 12:20-28; 14*; 23:1-9; 30:1-14; Josh 22:9-34; 23:4-12; 1 Kgs 8*; 2 Kgs 25:27-30) were added in this edition. Later, when Deuteronomy was cut off from the books of the former prophets, and was attached to the Tetateuch to form the Torah (Pentateuch), Deut 32-34* and other passages (Josh 2; 24; Judg 1:1-2-5; 13-16; 17-21; 1 Sam 2*; 4-6; 2 Sam 21-24; 1 Kgs 13; 17-2 Kgs 7*) were added. Römer called this transformation of the book of Deuteronomy as the end of the Deuteronomistic History. See Römer, So-Called, 45-182. A summary of Thomas Römer’s “threefold editions” can be found in Walter Dietrich, “Historiography in the Old Testament,” in Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, Vol. III: From Modernism to Post-Modernism, Part 2: The Twentieth Century- From Modernism to Post-Modernism (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 484-85.


31 Nelson, Deuteronomy, 4.

32 Another similar but much simplified three-stages formation can be found in Bernard Levinson who suggests that in the first stage (pre-exilic), Deut 12-26, 28 was framed by a simple introduction and conclusion. In the second stage (exilic), when Deuteronomy was incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History, Deut 1:1-4:40; 31-34 and some passages (Deut 4:25-31; 28:47-47; 30:1-10) were added. In the last stage (post-exilic), the Priestly editors appended Deuteronomy to the newly formed Pentateuch to serve as its conclusion. The Priestly section in Deut 32:48-52 was also added in this last period. See Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” OEBT 1: 196.


34 Otto’s model will be discussed in more detail in part three of this dissertation. Otto does not follow Noth’s hypothesis because he thinks that the two revised models (the “layer-model” and the “block-model”) of Deuteronomistic History have not succeeded in correlating the literary layers of
different models with the former scholars, they also agree that the book of Deuteronomy reached its final form by means of various redactional activities. Therefore our present study will also follow this main stream consensus and investigate the passages of the exclusion of Moses in the perspectives of several main editions. Deut 4 and Deut 32:48-52 are later than Deut 1-3 in their understandings.

The evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion to the book of Deuteronomy

Is there any internal evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as a late text? When we look at the context of Deut 32:48-52, we find that there is no direct relationship between Deut 32:48-52 and the song of Moses (Deut 32:1-43). The song is mentioned in Deut 31:19, 21, 22; introduced in Deut 31:30; and concluded in Deut 32:44. According to Deut 32:45-47, it is said that Moses has finished speaking all the words to all Israel.

It is a conclusion which echoes both Deut 31:1 and Deut 1:1 by similar phraseology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Deut 1:1</th>
<th>Deut 31:1</th>
<th>Deut 32:45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אלֹלֶךְ מַשֵּׁא בָּאָרָה אַלָּלְּכֶּם הָאֵל אַלָּלְּכֶּם לָיָהְמֶלֶל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִוְּלָה מַשֵּׁא בָּאָרָה אַלָּלְּכֶּם הָאֵל אַלָּלְּכֶּם לָיָהְמֶלֶל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deuteronomy with those of Deuteronomistic History. He points out that Deuteronomy has firm links to the Book of Joshua but not to 1 Samuel to 2 Kings. See Eckart Otto, “The Pentateuch in Synchronical and Diachronical Perspectives: Protorabbinic Scribal Erudition Mediating Between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code,” in Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk (ed. R. Achenbach and E. Otto; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 25. Otto claims that there was already a pre-exilic Deuteronomistic History in 1 Samuel to 2 Kings. Besides, the basic literary layer of Deut1-3 was closely connected with Book of Joshua, but not with other books of the Former Prophets. This observation contradicts the assumption that Deut 1-3 was the introduction to an exilic DtrH from Deut 1 to 2 Kgs 25. See Eckart Otto, “Deuteronomy Between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History: Some Remarks about Thomas Römer, The So-called Deuteronomistic History,” JHS 9 (2009): 22-27. Otto mentions that it became increasingly obvious that Deut 1-3 could not be the Deuteronomistic introduction for a DtrH. See Otto, “Integration,” 334.
The name Moses (מֹשֶׁה), the verb (רָבָר), the direct object (הָלוֹדוֹת), and the preposition with the indirect object (אֶלָּא לְ) all occur in these three verses.

Hence, the main speeches of Moses are concluded in Deut 32:45-47. Regarding Deut 32:48-52, it does not mention either “the song” or “these words” of Moses, but it introduces the motif of “the death of Moses” which is related to the blessings of Moses (Deut 33) and the burial of Moses (Deut 34).

Textual evidence

Although there are thirty four or thirty five manuscripts of Deuteronomy found in the Judaean Desert, the passage Deut 32:48-52 is absent in all these texts. 4QDeut contains Deut 32:1-43 only, without its narrative conclusion (Deut 43:44) and the words of YHWH to Moses (Deut 32:48-52). But the majority of Qumran manuscripts of Deuteronomy are fragmentary and some only contain a few words or

---


37 Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 128.
verses, the absence of Deut 32:48-52 in the Dead Sea Scrolls does not form a
strong argument in supporting that it is a later insertion. Furthermore, other important
textual traditions of Deuteronomy such as the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex
Alexandrinus, the Aleppo Codex, and the Leningrad Codex contain Deut 32:48-52. Therefore Deut 32:48-52 can be regarded as an integral part of the final form of the
book of Deuteronomy.

However, Deut 32:48-52 does contain features that suggest that it may not be by
the same hand as the Deuteronomists. There are three considerations which support
that Deut 32:48-52 is a secondary addition to the book of Deuteronomy: stylistic,
factual and theological differences, and to these we now turn.

Stylistic evidence

1) “the land of Canaan” (Deut 32:49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אָרֵ֖ם כָּנָ֣ן</td>
<td>Gen 17:8; 45:25; Exod 6:4; 16:35; Lev 14:34; 18:3; 25:38; Num 13:2, 17; 32:32; 33:51; 34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָרֵ֖ם מָנְאָ֣ן</td>
<td>Deut 32:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָרֵ֖ם הָבָ֔נָי</td>
<td>Deut 1:7; 11:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Deut 32:49 the land is called the “land of Canaan,” while in Deut 1:7 and 11:30,
the land is called the “land of the Canaanites.” This term “land of Canaan,” however,

38 For instance, the largest segment (4QDeut) is only 34 verses. See Crawford, “Deuteronomy and
the Oxford Hebrew Bible project,” 316.
39 David N. Freedman, Astrid B. Beck and James A. Sanders, eds., The Leningrad Codex: a facsimile
Mystery of the oldest Hebrew Bible Codex (Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society, 2010), 116;
Würthwein, Text of the Old Testament, 36.
occurs twelve times in Gen-Num. Thus Deut 32:49 contains a term which is
commonly used in the Tetrateuch but not in Deuteronomy.

2) “(the land) that I, I am giving” (Deut 32:49, 52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֵשֶׁר וּמִשְׁבַּתְתִי</td>
<td>Deut 10:11; 31:21, 23; 34:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶשֶׁר אֵצֵא נַחֲנוּ</td>
<td>Deut 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 24:4; 26:1; 27:2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶשֶׁר רֹדֵה אֶלְדָּהֵמָה נַחֲנוּ</td>
<td>Deut 3:20; 11:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶשֶׁר רֹדֵה</td>
<td>Deut 1:25; 2:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Deut 32:49 and 52 the land is modified by “that I, I am giving.” However, in other
direct speeches of YHWH in Deuteronomy, such as Deut 10:11; 31:21, 23; and 34:4,
the verb which follows the “that” is not נַחֲנוּ (“I am giving”), but נֶשָּׁבָהּ (“I swore”).
The Qal participle of נַחֲנוּ can be found only when YHWH is depicted as a third
person, i.e. not in God’s direct speech, in the book of Deuteronomy. The same
relative clause “which I, I am giving” can be found in Lev 23:10; 25:2. Therefore,
Deut 32:49 and 52 may have a greater affinity to Lev 23:10; 25:2 than to the book of
Deuteronomy.

3) “for a possession” (Deut 32:49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לְאֵלֹהֵינוּ</td>
<td>Lev 14:34; Num 32:5, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְאֵלֹהֵינוּ</td>
<td>Deut 32:49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Promised Land in Deuteronomy is never further modified by the phrase “for a possession” except in Deut 32:49. But this modifier can be found in Lev 14:34; Num 32:5, 22. Hence, Deut 32:49 uses a style more similar in Leviticus and Numbers than Deuteronomy.\(^{40}\)

4) “you will be gathered to your people” and “and he was gathered to his people” (Deut 32:50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁם עַמִּי אֶתְכֶם</td>
<td>Deut 32:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָׁם עַמִּי אֶתְכֶם</td>
<td>Deut 31:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When YHWH commanded Moses to die, according to Deut 32:50, the clause used is “and be gathered to your people” which is different from “you will lie down with your fathers” in Deut 31:16. When the narrator said that Aaron was dead, according to Deut 32:50, the clause is “and he was gathered to his people.” However, in Deut 10:6, the verbs “died” and “was buried” are used; it is not said that Aaron “was

\(^{40}\) The word פֶּן (‘possession’) occurs 38 times in Genesis-Numbers, but only once in Deuteronomy: Gen 17:8; 23:4, 9, 20; 36:43; 47:11; 48:4; 49:30; 50:13; Lev 14:34 (2×); 25:10, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33 (2×), 34, 41, 45, 46; 27:16, 21, 22, 24, 28; Num 27:4, 7; 32:5, 22, 29, 32; 35:2, 8, 28; Deut 32:49.

\(^{41}\) In Gen 49:29, we can find אני למדך אֵלִי (‘I am to be gathered to my people’).
gathered to his people.” The clause “and he was gathered to his people” can be found in Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33, which depicts the death of Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, and Jacob. Thus the same “formula” is used to depict Aaron’s death. The phrase “gathered to your/ his people” occurs only two times in Deuteronomy (2× in Deut 32:50). This phrase is different from the phrase “lie down with your/ his fathers” (e.g. in Deut 31:16) which occurs many times in the book of Kings, but never in the Tetrateuch.

5) “in the midst of the Israelites” (Deut 32:51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידהו בן יראה</td>
<td>Exod 29:45; Lev 22:32; 24:10; 25:33; Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20, 24; 26:62(2×); 35:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידהו בן יראה</td>
<td>Deut 32:51(2×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לעני על יראה</td>
<td>Deut 31:7; 34:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Deut 32:51, we have “in the midst of the Israelites,” while in Deut 31:7; 34:12, we have “before the eyes of all Israel.” The phrase “in the midst of the Israelites” can be found in Exod 29:45; Lev 22:32; 24:10; 25:33; Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20, 24; 26:62(2×); 35:34. This case also shows that Deut 32:51 contains a style which is similar to Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, but not Deuteronomy.

---

6) “the waters of Meribath-Kadesh” (Deut 32:51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Occurrence in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מֶרְבָּת קְדֵשָׁה</td>
<td>Num 27:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֶרְבָּת קְדֵשָׁה</td>
<td>Deut 32:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֶרְבָּת קְדֵשָׁה</td>
<td>Deut 33:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deut 32:51 has the only occurrence of the name “Meribath-Kadesh” in Deuteronomy.

In Deut 33:8, the location is called “the waters of Meribah.” The name “Meribath-Kadesh” can also be found in Num 27:14. Thus, Deut 32:51 may have a greater affinity with Num 27:14 than Deuteronomy.

7) “because” (Deut 32:51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction “because”</th>
<th>Occurrence in the divine sayings in the Pentateuch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לֹא אָסַר</td>
<td>Num 20:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא אָסַר</td>
<td>Deut 32:51 (2×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָסַר</td>
<td>Deut 1: 38, 42; 2:5, 9, 19; 3:2, 27, 28; 5:9; 9:12; 31:23; 32:20, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are twenty-nine divine sayings in the book of Deuteronomy. In these sayings when YHWH explains something or gives the reason for something, He usually uses the conjunction אָסַר (“because,” which occurs thirteen times). The conjunction לֹא אָסַר (“because”) only occurs in Deut 32:51 and Num 20:24.

---

8) Rare words in Deuteronomy

Phrases such as "the mountain of the Abarim" (Deut 32:49) and "the wilderness of Zin" (Deut 32:51) do not appear elsewhere in Deuteronomy. There are references to "the mountain of the Abarim" in Num 27:12; 33:47, 48. "The wilderness of Zin" occurs six times in the book of Numbers (Num 13:21; 20:1; 27:14[2×]; 33:36; 34:3). Thus Deut 32: 49 and 51 refer to places which are more familiar in the book of Numbers than in Deuteronomy. The following table summarises the above discussions. It can be seen that Deut 32:48-52 has a greater affinity with the book of Numbers and Leviticus than to Deuteronomy itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Deut 32</th>
<th>Phrase/ Clause</th>
<th>Affinity with other books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>v. 49</td>
<td>אֶרֶץ צֵנֶים</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>vv. 49 &amp; 52</td>
<td>אֵשֶׁר אֵין נַח</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>v. 49</td>
<td>לַאֲמָהוֹת</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>v. 50</td>
<td>רָאוֹס קָאָל הָעָבָר</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>v. 51</td>
<td>בָּהָרָה בֵּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>v. 51</td>
<td>מִי מְרוּבָה קָדָש</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>v. 51</td>
<td>נַלּוֹ הָאָשֶׁר</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>vv. 49 &amp; 51</td>
<td>הָרָה הַעְבָּרוֹת</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factual and theological evidence

There is a remarkable disagreement in the geographic locations between Deut 32:48-52 and the body of Deuteronomy. According to Deut 3:27, YHWH commands...
Moses to ascend to the top of Pisgah; while in Deut 32:49, YHWH orders him to go up to the mountain of Abarim which is also called Mount Nebo. Since Mount Pisgah and Mount Nebo are two different places, this discrepancy is also evidence that Deut 3:27 and Deut 32:49 are independent to each other. Besides, according to Deut 32:50, Aaron died on הר החרס "Mount Hor." This information matches the record in Num 20:23-29, but contradicts the death report of Aaron in Deut 10:6-7, according to which Aaron died at מosaic "Moses."\footnote{Finsterbusch, Deuteronomium, 192.} In addition, according to Deut 32:51 the punishment of Moses was caused by the incident at the waters of Meribath, while in Deut 1:37 Moses was punished in the spy story, which is about 38 years before the incident at the waters of Meribath.

A still weightier consideration is that Deut 32:48-52 has a different theology from that which preceded it. According to Deut 32:51, YHWH said that Moses and Aaron “did not regard (God) as holy.” This is the only case where the verb שֵךָ (“to sanctify”) is applied to YHWH as the object in Deuteronomy. The verb שֵךָ occurs four times in Deuteronomy.\footnote{All are with human subjects.} The objects of this verb are: the Sabbath day (Deut 5:12), every firstborn male of the herd and flock (Deut 15:19), and the fruit of the vineyard (Deut 22:9). Deut 32:51 is the only text in which the verb שֵךָ is used with a divine object in the book. The adjective “holy”\footnote{The adjective שָׁפֶר ("holy," see HALOT 2:1066.) occurs seven times in Deuteronomy. Five of them are applied to the people of Israel (Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19; 28:9). One is applied to the camp (Deut 23:15; ET 23:14). The remainder in Deut 33:3 is usually translated as “the holy ones,” which can be understood as either a reference to “the holy ones” (the angels) in Deut 33:2 or stands parallel to “his people” in Deut 33:3. See: Mayes, Deuteronomy, 399. For a treatment on the “holy people” in}
neither applied to God in Deuteronomy. Therefore, Deut 32:51 first introduces the concept of sanctifying God in the book.

The above accumulative stylistic, factual, and theological considerations are sufficient to establish that Deut 32:48-52 was not written by the Deuteronomists.

The diachronic relationship between Deut 1-3 and the main body of Deuteronomy

Textual and stylistic evidence

From textual evidence, the book of Deuteronomy was never circulated without Deut 1-3. These three chapters can be found in the Codex Alexandrinus and the Leningrad Codex. Most of Deut 1-3 can also be found in the Qumran manuscripts. Therefore even if it can be argued that Deut 1-3 is an addendum, this addition did not occur after the book of Deuteronomy had reached the first stage of


47 The noun ἁγιός (“holiness,” see HALOT 2:1077.) occurs four times in Deuteronomy. In Deut 12:26, it is used for “the consecrated things.” In Deut 26:13, it is used for “the tithe of the produce in the third year.” In Deut 26:15, it is used for “the holy dwelling place from the heavens.” Finally, “the holy ones” in Deut 33:2 can be interpreted either as the angels or as a place name, “Ribeboth-Kodesh.” Tigay suggests that it may mean “Ribeboth at, or near, Kadesh.” He also mentions that the name could be a variant form of “Meribat-kadesh” in Deut 32:51. See Tigay, Deuteronomy, 320.

48 In this section, “Deut 1-3” just means the main part of Deut 1-3 for the sake of convenience. This does not exclude the possibility that there are insertions in the first three chapters of Deuteronomy.


the formation of its final form;\textsuperscript{51} also the question must be raised whether it was composed by the same hand or school of Deut 5-26 or by some other.

The style of Deut 1-3 suggests that it was written by the same school as the Deuteronomic law.\textsuperscript{52} Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 have the same purpose, same urgency

\textsuperscript{51} Emanuel Tov states that theoretically we can divide the formation of the biblical books into two stages: a first stage in which the books were composed, and a second stage during which the text was copied and transmitted. The first stage was completed with the emergence of the finished literary works that are similar to the biblical books now known to us. The second stage began at this point. The biblical books underwent different stages of writing and revision, and these involved a process of copying as well. See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 199-200.

\textsuperscript{52} Some typical expressions of Deut 5-26 can be found in Deut 1-3. For instance, when speaking about YHWH, the two sections use same expressions: “YHWH our God” or “YHWH your (plural) God” or “YHWH your (singular) God” or “YHWH God of your (singular) father.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>YHWH our God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:6, 19, 20, 25, 41; 2:29, 33, 36, 37; 3:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>5:2, 24, 25, 27 (2\times); 6:4, 20, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>YHWH your (plural) God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:10, 26, 30; 3:18, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>YHWH your (singular) God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:21, 31; 2:7 (2\times), 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>5:6, 9, 11, 12, 15 (2\times), 16 (2\times); 6:2, 5, 10, 13, 15 (2\times); 7:1, 2, 6, 9, 12, 16, 18, 19 (2\times), 20, 21, 22, 23, 25; 8:2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19, 9:3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 10:9, 12 (3\times), 20, 22; 11:1, 12 (2\times), 29; 12:7, 9, 15, 18 (3\times), 20, 21, 27 (2\times), 28, 29, 13:6, 11, 13, 19 (2\times); 14:23 (2\times), 24 (2\times), 25, 26, 29; 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20; 16:1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11 (2\times), 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22; 17:1, 2 (2\times), 8, 12, 14, 15; 18:5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; 19:1 (2\times), 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 14; 20:1, 13, 14, 16, 17; 21:1, 5, 10, 23; 22:5; 23:6 (3\times), 15, 19 (2\times), 21, 22; 24:4, 9, 13, 18, 19; 25:15, 16, 19 (2\times); 26:1, 2 (2\times), 4, 5, 10 (2\times), 11, 13, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>YHWH of your (singular) father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>6:3; 12:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When speaking about the land, the two sections also use same expressions: “the land which YHWH our/your God gives to us/you” or “the good land.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>the land which YHWH our/your God gives to us/you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:25; 2:29; 3:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>5:16; 11:31; 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 24:4; 25:15; 26:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Aramaic</th>
<th>the good land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and spiritual thoroughness, same directions of religion and ethical emphasis, and
same style (such as distinctive prose rhythm, love of hyperbole, and repetition).\textsuperscript{53}

The first two speeches of Moses also agree in details such as characteristic place
names, formulae, phrases, and single terms.\textsuperscript{54} Nevertheless, the stylistic evidence
alone cannot prove that Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 are written by the same hand. It
should be admitted that unity of style does not prove oneness of authorship because
the Deuteronomic style is highly imitable.\textsuperscript{55} Conversely, is there any evidence for an
imitation in Deut 1-3? If there is such evidence, Deut 1-3 can be classified as later
than the main part of the book of Deuteronomy. Since the possibility of imitation
itself cannot be used as a proof that the style of Deut 1-3 was secondary, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1:35; 3:25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>9:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phrase “YHWH your God who goes” can be found in both sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>יוהי אלהים הלך</th>
<th>YHWH your God who goes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:30; 32-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>20:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative clause which begins with “which YHWH swore” can be found in both sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>אשר נשבע יהוה</th>
<th>which YHWH swore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1-3</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 5-26</td>
<td>6:18; 8:1; 9:5; 11:9; 21; 26:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar wordings can be found in Deut 3:21 and 11:7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>על עיניך הראה את כל אשר נשבע יהוה אלהים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 3:21</td>
<td>תעני לך הראה את כל אשר נשבע יהוה אלהים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{53} Smith, \textit{Deuteronomy}, lii-liii. In Deut 1:28 the remark of the people corresponds to the holy war
injunction in Deut 20:8 in which it does not permit anyone to participate in battle who will cause his
kinsmen’s heart to melt. Also, in Deut 1:29 the exhortation is a regular Deuteronomic theme (Deut
7:21; 20:3). See John van Seters, \textit{The Life of Moses: the Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers}

\textsuperscript{54} Smith, \textit{Deuteronomy}, lii-liv.

\textsuperscript{55} Smith, \textit{Deuteronomy}, xlvi.
similarity between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 can be stated as a result of imitation only if there are great factual and theological differences between them. There are five reasons to see that Deut 1-3 is later than the main part of the book of Deuteronomy. However, not all of them are conclusive. We shall look at them one by one.

The first reason is an expression in 2 Kgs 22-23. It is widely believed that the book found by Hilkiah during the reign of king Josiah was the core of Deuteronomy (Deut 12-26 or Deut 5-26) or Deuteronomy in some form, such book might not contain Deut 1-3. According to 2 Kgs 22:8, the book is called הַמֵּשֶׁר הַחֵדֶר (“book of the law” or “the law book”). This expression presupposes less narrative materials than Deut 1-3. However, it is doubtful that the occurrence of one single expression, as an external evidence, can give a sufficient reason for excluding Deut 1-3 from the main body of the book. The text of Deuteronomy itself should first give primary evidence for a later addition. Moreover, current research suggests that the reform account of king Josiah consists completely of Deuteronomistic fiction, and consequently such account does not fit as a basis for a critical historiography.

Therefore, the nature of the book found by Hilkiah (as a law code only) should also

---

57 This expression occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 31:26; Josh 1:8; 2 Kgs 22:8, 11; 2 Chr 34:15 and Neh 8:3. The definite article (“the” law book) is used and may indicate that the book was a very familiar document, which had been lost for some time, and now rediscovered; since the law book and its history was so well known, it is natural to use the definite article. See Gwilym H. Jones, I and 2 Kings (2 vols; NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984), 2:611.
be assessed carefully. This “external evidence” is not a proof that the original Deuteronomy did not contain Deut 1-3.

Second, there is a contradiction on the view of the Israelites between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. The author of Deut 5-26 wishes to identify the second Exodus generation, whom Moses is addressing, with the first Exodus generation who witnessed the Exodus and the miracles in the wilderness (c.f. Deut 5:2-3; 11:2-7). However, Deut 1-3 is particularly anxious to distinguish these two generations. According to Deut 2:14-16, the entire generation of warriors had perished. This contradiction can be explained in that the difference on the view of Israelites is not of “fact” but of “purpose.” Deut 2:14 belongs to the first speech of Moses, the purpose of which is to relate fact; while Deut 5:2-3 and 11:2-7 belong to the second speech in which Israel is treated as a moral whole. In addition, the dead people of Deut 2:14-16 are limited to the “warriors” (the male adults); and a fair proportion of those under twenty in the second year of the Exodus would be still alive 38 years afterward. Moreover, Deuteronomy has a practice to comprehend the past, the present, and the future generations of Israel as an ideal unity. Furthermore, there are some cases where the second Exodus generation is identified with the first

---

60 The discovery report (2 Kgs 22:8, 10, 13*, 16-18, 19*, 20*; 23:1-3) may be inserted by a post-exilic redactor because the book-finding motif is a common concept in ancient literature, and the construction of 2 Kgs 22 is most probably based on this ancient Near Eastern motif. See Römer, So-Called, 51.
61 Kuenen, Hexateuch, 121-122.
62 Kuenen, Hexateuch, 122.
63 Smith, Deuteronomy, lvi.
64 Smith, Deuteronomy, lvi.
65 Driver, Deuteronomy, lxix.
66 Driver, Deuteronomy, lxix.
Exodus generation in Deut 1 (see Deut 1:9, 19, 20, 22, 26, 46). Such identification is common in Deut 5-26. Consequently, there is no contradiction on the view of the Israelites.

Third, one more discrepancy can be found between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. They provide different comments on the action of the Moabites. According to Deut 2:28-29, the Moabites had sold food and water to the Israelites. In Deut 23:5 (4 ET) they did not meet the Israelites with food and water on their way out of Exodus.

There are three ways to look at this problem. Firstly, the two subordinate clauses in Deut 23:5 refer to the Ammonites and Moabites respectively, rather than to the two of them together. The two clauses have different subjects. The subject of the first clause “because they did not meet you with food and water on the way…” is the Ammonites, while the Moabite is the subject of the second clause “because he hired against you Balaam… to curse you.” These two clauses can be treated differently because the first clause is a second person plural form address, and the other one is a second person singular form, with third person singular main verb ("he hired").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>asher la karmo achatam kelach bvim hefahim beshachmah mofaros</th>
<th>Deut 23:5a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>veeshar shem elolah am baleem bn buhr mofhor ahr benorim lokhalim</td>
<td>Deut 23:5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second way to look at the discrepancy is that Deut 23:5 can be read as a later insertion, which reflects a variant tradition about Israel’s encounters in

---

67 Driver, Deuteronomy, lxix; Smith, Deuteronomy, lvii.
68 Kuenen, Hexateuch, 121-122.
69 Craigie, Deuteronomy, 297; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 316.
70 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 386, n. 35.
Transjordan.\textsuperscript{72} The perspective of the clause “when you came forth out of Egypt” in Deut 23:5a is a time long after when the whole forty years’ passage from Egypt was foreshortened.\textsuperscript{73} The secondary addition reinterprets Deut 2:28-29.\textsuperscript{74} Moreover, Deut 2:29 may not aim at giving a true picture of the action of the Moabites. According to the context of Deut 2:26-29, this was a saying of the messengers who were sent by Moses to King Sihon of Heshbon. The implication that Moab actually helped Israel may simply be the rhetoric of war.\textsuperscript{75} Hence, the contradictory comments on the Moabites can be solved by the above three ways of reading.

Fourth, a more crucial reason is the so-called double headings or prologues (Deut 1:1-5 and Deut 4:44-49) and the double introductions (Deut 1:6-4:40 and Deut 5-11). Deut 1-3 can be read as an introduction to the book of Deuteronomy. However, it has already been observed that the Deuteronomic law (Deut 12-26) has its own introduction (Deut 5-11).\textsuperscript{76} Would an author write two introductions for the main part of a book? Deut 5-11 and the Deuteronomic law are written together as the second speech of Moses with Deut 4:44-49 as its prologue; while Deut 1-3 is written as the first speech of Moses also with its superscription in Deut 1:1-5. It does not seem that an author would write two headings and two introductions for the Deuteronomic law (Deut 12-26). Such double headings and introductions may indicate that Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 are from different hands. Yet, are there really

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} Tigay, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 211.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Smith, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 270.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Bultmann, “Deuteronomy,” 207-8.
\item \textsuperscript{75} McConville, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 349.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Kuenen, \textit{Hexateuch}, 112-113.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
double headings and introductions?

Regarding the headings, no one will deny that there are many similarities between them. They are, however, not the same. One of the differences is the usage of the phrase הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים ("the statutes and the ordinances"). According to Deut 4:45, Moses spoke the decrees, the statutes, and the ordinances to the Israelites. The phrase "the statutes and the ordinances" cannot be found in Deut 1-3 (and so the first heading Deut 1:1-5), but occurs frequently in Deut 5-26. Such frequent occurrence shows that "the statutes and the ordinances" is a main theme in Deut 5-26. Therefore, Deut 4:44-49 does not repeat Deut 1:1-5, rather it introduces "the statutes and the ordinances" as the nature of the sayings of Moses in Deut 5-26. Deut 1:1-5 does not contain the words "the statutes and the ordinances," and it cannot be used as an adequate introduction of Deut 5-26. Consequently, Deut 1:1-5 and Deut 4:44-49 are not the same and not interchangeable. Strictly speaking, they are not "double" headings.

With regard to the problem of the double introductions (Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-11), it can be solved by seeing that they have different functions. Deut 1-3 contrasts the first and the second generations of the Israelites on the issue of their obedience to YHWH. The first generation who left Egypt did not believe in God (Deut 1:32) or listen to the words of YHWH (Deut 1:43), then they lost the chance to

77 הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 6:1; 12:1; 12:1; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 4:45; 5:31; 6:20; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 6:1; 12:1; 12:1; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 5:1; 7:11; 11:32; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 26:16; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 26:17; הָלוָּתִים דְּרֶנֶא לְאֵי הָלוָּתִים in Deut 26:17.
enter the Promised Land. On the other hand, the second generation obeyed God’s words, and they were given the land of King Sihon and King Og. “Believing in” and “listening to” God is a main theme in Deut 1-3. “Loving God,” however, is a new theme brought out by Deut 5-11, according to which the Israelites were told to love YHWH their God (Deut 6:5; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22). The word “love” does not occur in Deut 1-3, but becomes a vital theme in Deut 5-11. It is the foundation of obeying God’s statutes and ordinances (Deut 11:1). Hence there is a difference between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-11; they cannot be classified as “double” introductions.

The fifth reason is about the hypothesis of Martin Noth who claims that Deut 1-3 has nothing particular in common with the Deuteronomic law but is directly related to the Deuteronomistic History.78 Deut 1-3 is the introduction of the whole historical work, but not the Deuteronomistic law.79 The history of the period of wilderness wandering in Deut 1-3 is selected because such history is necessary for the reader to understand the accounts in the Deuteronomistic History.80 For example, the spy story in Deut 1:19-46 can provide several functions. First, it anticipates the theme of the conquest of the land which the Deuteronomist propose to treat later in detail.81 Second, it helps to explain why the wanderings in the wilderness lasted forty years and hence to justify the Deuteronomist’s chronology. Third, it provides a

---

78 Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29.
79 Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29, 32, 33.
80 Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29-30.
81 The spy story is placed at the very beginning of Moses’ historical recapitulation, and provides a paradigm of themes of conquest and loss of the land which run from the book of Joshua to the book of Kings. See Römer, *So-Called*, 125.
motivation for Caleb’s special role in the conquest (Josh 14:6-14).\textsuperscript{82}

Although in Deut 1-3 there is no explicit allusion to the law in Deut 5-26,\textsuperscript{83} we can find implicit linkage between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. The exclusion of Moses is not told in Deut 5-26, but in Deut 1-3. However, Deut 5-26 presupposes the fact that Moses would leave the people before they enter the Promised Land. In Deut 8:1 Moses said that “… you enter and occupy the land,” but not “… we enter and occupy the land.” Moses has distinguished himself from the Israelites who will enter and take the land. Similar instances can be found in Deut 11:8, 31. These sayings are intelligible only if the context of Moses’ exclusion from the Promised Land is known.

In addition, Moses never claimed that he brought the Israelites into the land, but always said that “YHWH your God” brought them into the land. It is very clear that Moses would not continue to be the leader who could bring the Israelites into the land. Such consciousness of divine leading can also be found in Deut 6:10; 7:1; 8:7; 9:4; 11:29. It is fair to say that these sayings presuppose the exclusion of Moses as depicted in Deut 1-3.

Furthermore, we have discussed that the style of Deut 1-3 matches that of the main part of the book. Hence, there is no denying that Deut 1-3 can still perform as an introduction of the book of Deuteronomy.\textsuperscript{84} This dissertation will take the view

\textsuperscript{82} Noth, \textit{Deuteronomistic History}, 50.
\textsuperscript{83} Veijola, “Principal Observations,” 143.
\textsuperscript{84} For a different view on the function of Deut 1-3, see Jan Christian Gertz, “The Partial Composition,” in \textit{T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature},
that Deut 1-3, providing the background information for both the Deuteronomic law
and the Deuteronomistic History, performs the two roles together, and it is the
introduction to these two parts.85

The argument of the parallel structure to the ancient Near Eastern vassal
treaty

In defense of the idea that Deuteronomy is a unity, it has been argued that the
structure of Deuteronomy can be outlined as the major component parts of the
ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty:86

1. Preamble (Deut 1:1-5)

2. Historical Prologue (Deut 1:6-4:49)

3. General Stipulations (Deut 5-11)

4. Specific Stipulations (Deut 12-26)

5. Curses and Blessings with exhortation (Deut 27-30)

---

85 It is also possible that the prior insertion of Deut 1-3 before Deut 5-26 can contribute to the
demarcation of the books. The fiction of the retrospect in Deut 1-3 creates the presupposition for
regarding Deuteronomy in Deuteronomy itself and in Joshua-Kings as an independent normative book
of law. See Kratz, Composition, 128.
86 Craigie, Deuteronomy, 24.
6. Witnesses and Provisions for the continuity of covenant and a successor for Moses (Deut 30:19; 31:19; 32:1-43)

It was said that the adaptation of the treaty form for the Israelites’ use in order to express the nature of their relationship to God. The Israelites were in effect vassals to Egypt, but that old bondage was brought to an end in the Exodus from Egypt. After the Israelites were liberated from bondage to an earthly power, they submitted themselves in the Sinai covenant to become vassals of YHWH, who had liberated them from Egypt. Hence, such overall structure of the book of Deuteronomy suggests that it can be regarded essentially as a unity.

Even though such parallel structure is constructed, numerous details are questionable. For instance, Deut 4:44-49 should not be classified as the “Historical Prologue.” It is a heading to the second speech of Moses. In addition, the retelling of the story of the Golden Calf in Deut 9-10 is more than the “General Stipulations” because of its narrative style. Furthermore, the fact that the different parts of the book can be constructed as a treaty does not mean that such different parts were written at the same time. It is also possible that the parts were formed in different periods, but were grouped into the treaty structure later.

The view that a treaty structure can prove the unity of Deuteronomy has also been challenged by others who have expressed skepticism about the parallel to

---

87 Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 23.
88 Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 23.
Deuteronomy. For instance, Andrew Mayes indicates the considerable lack of clarity which exists on the precise nature of the relationship between Deuteronomy and the treaties.\textsuperscript{90} It should be emphasised that Deuteronomy is not a treaty document, nor is it presented as a treaty.\textsuperscript{91} Rather, Deuteronomy is presented as speeches of Moses before his death; the book of Deuteronomy is in effect his testament.\textsuperscript{92} The last three chapters of the book cannot be included in a treaty form, and Deuteronomy cannot be taken as a “literary imitation” of the treaties.\textsuperscript{93} Therefore, the arguments for the unity of Deuteronomy which are based on its supposed treaty form are inadmissible.\textsuperscript{94}

It has been noticed that the Deuteronomist not only enriched the covenant theme by introducing all the elements of the vassal treaty, but also blurred the covenantal pattern by putting it into a homiletic setting.\textsuperscript{95} Moshe Weinfeld rightly points out that Deuteronomy is not a legal document but an oration.\textsuperscript{96} This distinguishes Deuteronomy from the treaty. The structure of the speeches of Moses follow the legal pattern, but their style is that of a sermon.\textsuperscript{97} It is undeniable that there are relationships between Deuteronomy and the ancient Near Eastern treaties,\textsuperscript{98} but such

\begin{itemize}
  \item Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 33.
  \item Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 33-34.
  \item Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 34.
  \item Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 34.
  \item Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 34.
  \item Weinfeld, \textit{Deuteronomic School}, 157.
  \item Weinfeld, \textit{Deuteronomic School}, 157.
\end{itemize}
relationships do not form an argument for the unity of Deuteronomy.

In sum, all the reasons that perceive Deut 1-3 as later than Deut 5-26 are not conclusive. There are more reasons to believe that they are composed by the same school. The above discussion of textual witness, stylistic evidence, and factual evidence should be enough to state that Deut 1-3 is written by the same school as the main part of Deuteronomy. In the previous sections it has been argued that Deut 32:48-52 is a later addition to the main body of Deuteronomy; while Deut 1-3 is not. Therefore, it can be deduced that Deut 32:48-52 is later than Deut 1-3.

Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History

Deut 4 is a composite text

When we talk about Deut 4, can we assume that it is a unity? The chapter follows a clear line of flow to give an impression that a unity can be found. It gives the teachings that the Israelites should keep after they entered the land: YHWH is the only God and there is no other beside him. The statutes and commandments

99 For the sake of convenience, the term “Deut 4” refers to “Deut 4:1-40” in this section.
of their God would give life (Deut 4:3-4) and wisdom (Deut 4:5-8). Moses commands the Israelites not to make idols. He explains that their God is without form, therefore they saw no form from the fire even during the revelation of YHWH (Deut 4:9-20). It emphasises that YHWH is “without form with the various physical images.” The third mention of the exclusion of Moses (Deut 4:21-22) contrasts with the fact that the Israelites would cross the Jordan and take possession of the Promised Land. However, Moses predicts that after the Israelites have settled down, the future generations will provoke YHWH in anger (Deut 4:25), they will quickly perish and will be scattered. Finally they will return to the merciful YHWH (Deut 4:29-31), who is the one and only God as illustrated in the history of His chosen people (Deut 4:32-40).

However, there are clear signs that Deut 4 is a composite text. We can find three internal evidences. First, the change of singular and plural form of address (Numeruswechsel) occurs in at least two levels. On the one hand, we can find the change of number appears at the transition of one paragraph to the other paragraph. For instance, 4:1-28 are mainly plural, while 4:29-40 are mainly singular. On the
other hand, there is change of number within a sentence. For our present study, we just examine two examples. In Deut 4:21, Moses said,

“YHWH was angry with me because of your words (ברר UNKNOWN, plural) and he swore that ... I should not enter the good land that YHWH your God (אלהים, singular) is giving you (לך, singular) for an inheritance.”

A mere stylistic change cannot account for this inconsistency. Moreover, in Deut 4:25 Moses said,

“When you beget (הוליד, singular) children and children’s children, and have lived (יונתן, plural) in the land a long time, if you become corrupt ( '~txvhw, plural) by making ( '~tnsh, plural) a carved image in the form of anything, and by doing ( '~tnfhw, plural) what is evil in the eyes of YHWH your God ( אלהים, singular), so as to provoke Him to anger…”

The first singular verb “beget” does not combine well with the other four plural verbs (“live,” “corrupt,” “make/ do” and “make/ do”). Also, the singular pronominal suffix in the expression אלהים (“your God”) does not match the plural verbs well.

Second, there are internal contradictions. For example, it is not easy to understand why YHWH speaks from the middle of a fire (4:12) and at the same time also from the height of heaven (4:36). In addition, it is suspected how a single author could write a chapter in which the same nations who are to be dispossessed by the Israelites (4:38) admire peacefully the wisdom of the Israelites (4:6).

Third, changes of theme can be detected in Deut 4. The theme “keeping the decrees and laws” (4:1-2, 5-8, 13-14, 40) competes with the other theme “not making

---

104 Cazelles, “Passages,” 214.
105 Cazelles, “Passages,” 214.
an image” (4:9-12, 15-19, 23-28) though out this chapter. One further issue is in one case, “the word of YHWH from fire” is a prohibition of making an image (4:15-16); in the other case, such “word from fire” is used to let the Israelites know that YHWH alone is God (4:35). According to these previous observations, it is hard to maintain the unity of Deut 4 and over-look the internal evidence for the composite character of Deut 4.

**Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3**

Since the introduction of the second speech of Moses occurs in Deut 4:44-49, it is clear that Deut 4:1-40 belongs to the last main section of the first speech of Moses in Deut 1-4. Can we, then, take Deut 1-4 as a unity? There are four arguments against the continuity between Deut 1-3 and Deut 4. (i) Deut 1-3 are historical narrative and Deut 4 is parenesis. 106 (ii) Deut 4 exhibits a covenant form, but Deut 1-3 do not. 107 (iii) There is no substantial connection between the events in Deut 1-3 and the exhortations in Deut 4. 108 (iv) Deut 1-3 are anticipating future development in the Deuteronomistic History. These accounts contrast with the freighted theological rhetoric of Deut 4. 109

If Deut 4 can be separated from Deut 1-3, which one is later? There are three
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107 MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 207.
observations that can lead us to believe that Deut 4 is later. In the first place, Deut 3:29 connects smoothly to Deut 31:1, and this fact implies that Deut 4 is a later insertion.

Secondly, Deut 4 shares similar themes with Second Isaiah (Isa 40-55), which is probably an exilic or post-exilic product. Both have typical anti-idolatry polemic sayings (Deut 4:28; Isa 40:19-20; 42:17; 44:9-20; 45:20), both link the unique vocation of Israel with the uniqueness of YHWH by using exodus language (Deut 4:34, 37; Isa 43:16-17; 48:20-21; 51:10), they have confessions of faith declaring that there is only one God (Deut 4:35, 39; Isa 43:11; 44:6; 45:5, 6, 18, 21, 22; 46:9), and both use the verb בָּרָא (“to create,” Deut 4:32; Isa 45:12, 18).

Finally, Deut 4:27 speaks about the “scattering” of the Israelites among the peoples and the nations. The explicit reference to the “scattering” of the Israelites suggests that this unit is very late. Some have suggested that this is a sign for the time of Babylonia exile. However, the usage of the verb בָּרָא (“to scatter”) is different from the usual understanding of the exile. Usually, the verb הָלַךְ (“to take into exile”/ “to deport”) will be used for the action of carrying the people into exile. Furthermore, the “peoples” and “nations” in Deut 4:27 are plural rather than singular. Such descriptions match the dispersion of the Jews throughout the nations, a phenomenon that has its first peak in the Hellenistic period, two or three centuries

100 MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 208.
113 Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 98; Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 352. There is also opinion that Deut 4 is an addition from the Persian Period, see Römer, So-Called, 124, n. 30.
after the Babylonian exile. Therefore, part of Deut 4 would be very late.

To say that Deut 4* is exilic or even post-exilic does not assert that different parts of Deut 4 were formed in the same period, rather, there are two indications of development of Deut 4 over time. First, the *switching of thematic focus*: from theophany and Decalogue (Deut 4:9-14) to a denunciation of images (Deut 4:15-24), then to a consideration of Israel’s future fate (Deut 4:25-31), and finally to uniqueness of YHWH (Deut 4:32-39). Second, the *changing definition of “covenant”*: “covenant” means the whole Decalogue (Deut 4:13), the prohibition of images (Deut 4:23), and the promise to the ancestors (Deut 4:31). Hence, Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3, and different layers of it were inserted into the first speech of Moses in different periods.

Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History

Martin Noth is not sure whether Deut 4:1-40 is to be attributed to the Deuteronomist or seen as a later addition. Although he claims that Deut 4:1-2, 5-8, 10-14, 22-23a and 25-28 fit the context of the Deuteronomistic History perfectly, he does not explain how they fit such context. Others believe that Deut 4 was a
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115 Nelson, Deuteronomy, 62.
116 Nelson, Deuteronomy, 62.
117 Matthias Köckert suggests that Deut 4 is related to the prohibition of cult image which was developed after the exile. Hence, according to Köckert, Deut 4 is post exilic. See Matthias Köckert, “Die Entstehung des Bilderverbots,” in Die Welt der Götterbilder (ed. Brigitte Groneberg et al; BZAW 376; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2007), 272-290.
118 Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 57.
119 Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 57-59.
secondary Deuteronomist addition, and was compiled by one or several later redactors of the Deuteronomistic History.

It is true that the style of Deut 4 is more correlated with other blocks or layers of later materials in the Deuteronomistic History. There are two stylistic evidences for the connection between the unit Deut 4:21-28 and the Deuteronomistic work. First, in Deut 4:25 we find the clause “you do what is evil in the eyes of YHWH.” Similar clauses which contain the combination of the verb נשתת (“to do”), the adjective רע (“evil”) or the noun רעה (“evil”), and the phrase בעיני יהוה (“in the eyes of YHWH”) occur forty-one times in the Deuteronomistic History. In the Pentateuch, this clause only occurs five times (once in Numbers, four times in Deuteronomy). Thus, Deut 4:25 contains a clause which is frequently used in the Deuteronomistic work. If the verb נשתת (“to provoke [God] to anger”) is also counted, we can find four similar occurrences in the books of Kings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“you do what is evil in the eyes of YHWH to provoke Him to anger”</th>
<th>Occurrence in Deut 4 and DtrH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דנשתת הורע בֵּעַיִן יהוה אלוהינו להמשיכו</td>
<td>Deut 4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כל הראש אֵשֶׁר רֹאשְׁנֶג בֵּעַיִן יהוה להמשיכו</td>
<td>1 Kgs 16:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>להמשיכו הורע בֵּעַיִן יהוה להמשיכו</td>
<td>2 Kgs 17:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

120 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 148.
123 MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 208.
124 For our present study, we just look at the unit Deut 4:21-28 rather than Deut 4, whose scale will be too much to be discussed here.
126 Num 32:13; Deut 4:25; 9:18; 17:2; 31:29.
The first occurrence is in 1 Kgs 16:7, the context of which is that Baasha did all the evil in the eyes of YHWH to provoke Him to anger with the work of his hands. The phrase “the works of his hands,” as we shall see later, implies the idol he had made.

The second occurrence can be found in 2 Kgs 17:17. The background of 2 Kgs 17 is a detailed explanation of the fall of Samaria which the king of Assyria had captured (2 Kgs 17:6). The Deuteronomists explain that the Israelites had sinned against YHWH by listing out a series of transgressions which the Israelites had committed.\(^{127}\) Such actions were evil in the eyes of YHWH, and provoked Him to anger. In 2 Kgs 21:6 we find the third occurrence of the clause. 2 Kgs 21:2-6 are about the works of Manasseh who did a series of sins which were evil in the eyes of YHWH. The last occurrence of the clause can be found in 2 Kgs 21:15 in which there are a few variations. This is a saying of YHWH, so we find “evil in my eyes” rather than “evil in the eyes of YHWH.” Also, it is “provoking Me to anger” rather than “provoke Him to anger.” What is the subject of the clause? Who did the evil? It can be found in the previous verse (2 Kgs 21:14), that is הַגָּדָה ("my inheritance").

According to the usage of the noun הַגָּדָה in 1 Kgs 8:51 and 53, the Israelites are YHWH’s inheritance which He brought out of Egypt. In 2 Kgs 21:15, here, the

---

\(^{127}\) Recently, Knoppers observes that there are two different views of post-exilic Samaritan in 2 Kgs 17. Thus 2 Kgs 17 is probably a redacted unit. Current scholarship understands the Samaritan to be Northern Israelites rather than foreigners as one of the layers of 2 Kgs 17 claims. See Gray N. Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob? The Issue of Samaritan Origins in 2 Kings 17,” in Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld (ed. R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 223-39.
Deuteronomists emphasise on the continuity of their sin, the Israelites have continued to do the evil in the eyes of YHWH from the day of exodus to his present day.

We can see the usage of these four occurrences of the clause. The first (1 Kgs 16:7) and third (2 Kgs 21:6) are used on the king of the Northern Kingdom and Southern Kingdom respectively. The second (2 Kgs 17:17) is applied on the people of the Israelites after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. The last one (2 Kgs 21:15) depicts all the Israelites from the day of exodus to that present day. Thus, Moses’ prediction in Deut 4:25 is fulfilled in the final part of the Deuteronomistic History.

The second stylistic similarity is the distinctive modifier מָצְוָה יְהֹוָה עֵצֶת עֹן אָבוֹן (“made of hands of man, wood and stone”) which occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made of hands of man, wood and stone</th>
<th>Occurrence in Deut 4 and DtrH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מָצְוָה יְהֹוָה עֵצֶת עֹן אָבוֹן</td>
<td>Deut 4:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָצְוָה יְהֹוָה עֵצֶת עֹן אָבוֹן</td>
<td>2 Kgs 19:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Deut 4:28 this phrase is used to modify the אלהים (“gods”) which the Israelites would serve. In 2 Kgs 19:18 this phrase is used as a modifier of אלהים (“their gods”) which the kings of Assyria had destroyed by fire. Thus we observe that the

128 There are studies which re-consider the connection between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History. Graeme Auld proposes that the “Book of Two Houses,” a narrative focused on the house of David and the house of YHWH in Jerusalem, was the common source shared by both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. See A. Graeme Auld, “Prophets Shared-but Recycled,” in The Future of the Deuteronomistic History (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 47; Leuven: Peters, 2000), 19-28; repr. in idem, Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld (SOTSMS; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004), 127-34; Gray Knoppers has pointed out the significant differences between Deuteronomy and the book of Kings. See Gray N. Knoppers, “Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings,” CBQ 63 (2001): 393-415.
unique phrase has the same function in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History.

Since the usage of the verb וּלְקָה ("to scatter") in Deut 4 shows that Deut 4 can be very late, and Deut 4 itself contains different layers, so we may conclude that Deut 4 is a mixture of young layers in the Deuteronomistic work.

The relative order of Deut 31 and Deut 1-3

Deut 31 can be read as a continuation of Deut 3 because the language used is repeated largely from Deut 1-3. So it was assigned as Deuteronomic. One may think that it was formed by the same hand of Deut 1-3. However, there is extensive evidence for a complex history of development of Deut 31. Firstly, Deut 31:16-22 interrupts the connection of 31:14-15 to verse 23. Deut 31:14-15 break into the narrative abruptly. Secondly, the act of Moses in writing the law (Deut 31:9-13 and 24) is interrupted by the sections about Joshua (31:13-14, 23) and the song (31:16-22). Thirdly, in the “song” tradition, Israel’s future apostasy is already a foregone conclusion (Deut 31:16-22, 28-29). However, in the covenant making tradition, there is yet hope that Israel might avoid catastrophe (Deut 31:9-13). Thus, there is a tension between the traditions. Fourthly, there are at least six doublets: (a) announcement of the imminent mortality of Moses (Deut 31:1

129 Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 107; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 372; Miller, Deuteronomy, 217; Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 29, 59; von Rad, Deuteronomy, 188.
130 Driver, Deuteronomy, 333.
131 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 372; Smith, Deuteronomy, 332; G. E. Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 511.
132 Smith, Deuteronomy, 332.
133 Nelson, Deuteronomy, 355.
134 Nelson, Deuteronomy, 355.
and 14-15);\(^{136}\) (b) appointment of Joshua (Deut 31:7-8 and 14-15, 23);\(^{137}\) (c) double traditions concerning what Moses writes (the law in Deut 31:24; the song in 31:19);\(^{138}\) (d) handing over the law (Deut 31:9 and 25-26);\(^{139}\) (e) teaching of the song (Deut 31:22 and 30);\(^{140}\) and (f) the identity of the future witness (the song in Deut 31:19, but the law in 31:26).\(^{141}\)

Hence, Deut 31 is quite complex and contains many layers of tradition or redaction.\(^ {142}\) Nelson proposes that Deut 31 is the result of successive processes of supplementation. Deut 31:1-13 are the Deuteronomistic layer; 31:14-15 and 23 belong to the JE level (or a non-Priestly level); 31:16-22 belong to the “Song as witness” stratum and 31:24-29 are the layer of “Law as witness.”\(^ {143}\) Nelson’s proposal is persuasive, and we will concur with him that Deut 31:1-6 is mainly Deuteronomistic.

**Deut 34 and the Pentateuch Redaction**

We shall begin with the observation that Deut 34:4 and 5 are in the same cohesive section. Otto suggests that the structure of Deut 34 is related to the form of the main verbs in the passage, and can be presented as the following.\(^ {144}\)

\(^{136}\) Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.


\(^{138}\) Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

\(^{139}\) Nelson, Deuteronomy, 355.

\(^{140}\) Nelson, Deuteronomy, 355.

\(^{141}\) Nelson, Deuteronomy, 355.

\(^{142}\) Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

\(^{143}\) Nelson, Deuteronomy, 356.

\(^{144}\) Eckart Otto, Deuteronomium 23,16-34,12 (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2017), 2271.
In Deut 34:1-6a and 8, the two short narratives consist of the main verbs in the form of waw + Imperfect. In both verses 6b and 10-12, the sentences have the main verbs in Perfect, each begins with ḥwalla. Lastly, 34:7 and 9 begins with the names Moses and Joshua respectively, followed by comments on them. Our focus will be in Deut 34:4-5, which is in the first section (Deut 34:1-6a).

There are five waw + Imperfect (or wayyiqtol) in the first section of Deut 34, each with a subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 34:</th>
<th>waw + Imperfect</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>יְעָלֶה</td>
<td>משה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>רָאָה</td>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>רֹאָה</td>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>רֱפָח</td>
<td>משה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>יְרֵכָב</td>
<td>(יְהוָה)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the waw + Imperfect have Moses as their subject (Deut 34:1a, 5); another two consist of YHWH as their specific subject (Deut 34:1b, 4). The fifth waw + Imperfect in Deut 34:6a lacks an explicit subject, so that it can be interpreted as YHWH or as an indeterminate subject.\(^{145}\) In the phrases in which YHWH is the

---

\(^{145}\) López, “Deut 34”, 52.
subject, Moses functions as the direct or indirect object, thus making the section cohesive in the whole.  

Although Deut 34:4 and 5 are in the same cohesive section, do they belong to the same redaction layer? Now, it is beyond our scope of the present chapter to work out the whole complex history of the composition of the chapter of Deut 34. Therefore, we shall focus on the relationship between verses 4 and 5 after we have a brief review of the studies on the composition of Deut 34.

Traditional source analysis takes Deut 34 as a composite. It is thought that the old historical source, JE, was first expanded by the Deuteronomist, and then was edited by the Priestly editor. JE is credited with 34:1b-5a, 6 and 10; D contains verses 11-12; and P has 34:1a, (5b), 7-9. But there is no absolute agreement on the specific verses to be attributed to the different sources.

Perlitt questions the work of a Priestly redactor in Deut 34. He argues that Deut 34:1a, 7-9 do not belong to the Priestly source, rather they are the blend of D and P at the end of the redactional process. Although attempts have been made to defend the presence of different sources in Deut 34, such attempts have not gone

146 López, “Deut 34”, 52.
148 For a table of comparison of different views on the sources of Deut 34, see Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 112. Lux offers another view on the Priestly composition in Deut 34, see Rüdiger Lux, “Der Tod des Mose als ›besprochene und erzählte Welt‹,” ZThK 84 (1987), 401-409.
149 Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 76-88.
Another tendency of reading Deut 34 is to consider that this end chapter of Deuteronomy has been edited by different processes of redaction. Félix Gracia López mentions that Deut 34 can be read at three successive levels. The first level is a DtrH level which contains Deut 34:1*, 2aα, 5(*) and 6a. The second level is a KD (Die vor-priesterliche Komposition) which contains 34:2αβ-4, 10-12. The third level is a KP (Die priesterliche Komposition) which has 34:1*, 5b*, 7a and 8-9. Since our main focus is the relationship between verse 4 and 5, we will not repeat López’s detailed analysis here. How can he distinguish verse 4 from verse 5? It begins with the observation that Deut 34:1a, 5* is in parallel with Num 33:38a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 33:38a</th>
<th>Deut 34:1a, 5*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רימת פשה</td>
<td>אל הור נבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רימת פשה</td>
<td>אל הור נבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both cases, the sequence רימת פשה אל הור נבר and רימת פשה אל הור נבר coincide. Then López suggests that the narrator of Deut 34 might well have limited himself to saying “Moses went

---

153 Here, López is using the terms of Erhard Blum. See Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).
157 López, “Deut 34”, 54.
up to X and died there.” This short statement makes clear the possible independence of 34:1a, 5* from 34:1b-4. Thus, verses 1b-4 can be viewed as an insertion to 34:1a, 5*. Therefore, verses 4 and 5 belong to different layers. But which one is earlier? According to López’s suggestion of the three successive levels, 34:5* is earlier than 34:4.159

It is doubtful if there is sufficient evidence for assigning Deut 34:4 to KD. Römer and Brettler propose another way to look at 34:4 and also the formation of the whole chapter of Deut 34.160 They argue that Deut 34:4 is not Deuteronomistic on the grounds of the following observations. In the first place, the form of the Promised Land in Deut 34:4 does not agree with its typical Deuteronomistic form.161 Furthermore, Deut 34:4 names the three patriarchs rather than using the term אבות (“fathers”), which is more typical in Deuteronomy.162 Finally, Deut 34:4 uses the phrase #rah taz (“this [is] the land”), but nowhere else does Deuteronomy use such expression.163 Consequently, Römer and Brettler believe that Deut 34:4 belongs to a redactional layer which aims to strengthen the coherence of the Pentateuch.164 It belongs to (or close to) the end of the redaction of the Pentateuch.165

158 López, “Deut 34”, 54.
159 But 34:5b* is later than 34:4. However, López has not defined clear the content of Deut 34:5b*.
161 Nowhere else in Deuteronomy is the Promised Land presented as a quotation introduced by יבש. Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.
162 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.
163 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.
164 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.
How about Deut 34:5? This verse, according to Römer and Brettler, belongs to
the original Deuteronomistic version of Deut 34. This layer contains Deut 34:1*, 4a?,
5-6. The title הָעַבְדֵּן יְהוָה (“servant of YHWH”) applied to Moses is a Deuteronomistic
feature.166 This layer encourages Deuteronomy to be read in conjunction with the
book of Joshua.167 The second layer has 34:1*, 7-9. This layer reflects the effort of
the creation of a Hexateuch.168 The third stratum contains 34:1-3*, 4*, 10-12. This
layer is a Pentateuch redaction, which is decisively rejecting the potential continuity
between Deuteronomy and the book of Joshua.169 Thus, according to the
reconstructions of Römer and Brettler, Deut 34:5 is earlier than 34:4b.

Konrad Schmid, with other reasons, also proposes that Deut 34:4 is later.170
There are three arguments that support Deut 34:4 as a Pentateuch Redaction.171 First,
Deut 34:4 contains the land promise as an oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which
is strictly a Pentateuchal theme.172 Second, the notion of the land promise to
Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath already seems to presuppose P and D. Thus it
belongs to the latest literary development of the Pentateuch.173 Third, Deut 34:4
refers back to Gen 12:7 and 13:15, and thus forms an inclusio.174

---

166 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 404.
167 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 416.
168 Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 416.
170 Schmid’s thesis is that Deut 34:4, 7 and 10-12 are connected to Pentateuch redaction. 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. (ed. Oded Lipschits et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns,
171 For a discussion on the meaning of “Pentateuch Redaction,” see Schmid, “The Late Persian,”
239-241.
174 There is a quotation of Gen 12:7 (the promise of the land given) and a clear connection with Gen
The above conclusions of Schmid, Römer and Brettler are cogent, and therefore, we know that Deut 34:4 and 5 are in different layers. However, can we assume that Deut 34:5 itself is a unity? The phrase נַעֲרָ הָיָה הַיָּדָה points to the Deuteronomistic level, while the phrase נַעֲרָ הָיָה הַיָּדָה implies that it presupposes the command of YHWH to Moses in the post-Priestly level (Deut 32:48-52). Therefore we shall say that Deut 34:5a is older than Deut 34:4, but 34:5b may be later.

Summary

It has been discussed that Deut 1-3* and Deut 5-26* are composed by the same school; while Deut 32:48-52 is a supplement to the book of Deuteronomy. Therefore, Deut 32:48-52 is later than Deut 1-3*. The style of Deut 1-3* matches that of the main part of the book. Therefore, it cannot be denied that Deut 1-3 can still perform as an introduction of the book of Deuteronomy. Deut 1-3 can be the introduction to the Deuteronomistic History as well as the Deuteronomic law because it provides the background information for both parts. Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3, and belongs to a mixture of late strata of the Deuteronomistic History. Deut 31:1-6 is related to Deut 1-3, so it is older than Deut 4. Deut 34:4-5* is younger than the above texts. Hence, the order of the Deuteronomic texts are: Deut 1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.

2. The Diachronic Order of Num 20:1-13, Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

In the previous chapter, we have studied the relative chronological order of the Deuteronomic texts. The purpose of this present chapter is to determine the diachronic order of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52.

A) The contexts of Num 20:1-13, Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

This study includes Num 20:1-13 and 27:12-14, instead of paying attention only to Deut 32:48-52, because Deut 32:48-52 mentions Moses’ exclusion, but does not provide the detailed incident to illustrate how Moses broke faith with YHWH and how he did not regard YHWH as holy. Deut 32:48-52, like Num 27:12-14, alludes to the incident of Num 20:1-13. What are the contexts of these three passages? The narrative of Num 20:1-13 comes after the two chapters of law instructions which depict the responsibility of the priests and Levites (Num 18), and the instruction about the “Red Heifer” (Num 19). Thus, it seems that the narrative in Num 20 does not directly connect to its previous two chapters, but continues the conflict narrative in Num 16-17.\footnote{For a holistic reading of Numbers, see Pekka Pitkänen, \textit{A Commentary on Numbers: Narrative, Ritual, and Colonialism} (Routledge Studies in the Biblical World; London; New York: Routledge, 2017).} According to Num 16, the conflict between Moses and the Korah group is about the authority of Moses. In Num 20:1-13, the conflict between Moses
and the people is about the lack of water to drink. The exclusion of Moses and Aaron is the punishment for how they handled this conflict. After the incident of the waters of Meribah (Num 20:1-13), is the narrative that Edom refused the proposed passage for the Israelites (Num 20:14-21). Then we have the death of Aaron (Num 20:22-29), in which the sin of Moses and Aaron is mentioned again (Num 20:24).

Num 27:12-14 does not have a clear connection to Num 27:1-11, which is about the issue of the possession of the daughters of Zelophehad. The wider context of Num 27:12-14 is Num 27:12-23, of which the main theme is the appointment of Joshua as the successor of Moses. Since Moses could not enter the land (Num 27:12-14), Joshua became the new leader so that the Israelites might not be like sheep without a shepherd (Num 27:17). As such, Num 27:12-14, which recounts the reason for Moses’ exclusion from Num 20:1-13, is subordinate to the theme of succession of Joshua. Hence, the exclusion of Moses is the background for such succession.

Deut 32:48-52 is in the outer historical frame (Deut 1-3, 31-34) of the Book of Deuteronomy. Deut 31-34 can be divided into two parts. In the first part, Deut 31:1-32:47, Moses passed his leadership to Joshua, the priests, the elders and the Levites because he would die.176 YHWH foretold that the Israelites would rebel against Him, and commanded Moses to write a song to teach the Israelites as a

---

176 W. L. Moran observes that the institution of the covenant can provide a deep unity in Deut 31-32, such institution includes a written covenant document, periodic reading of the document, placing of the document in the ark, and witnesses. See Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 274.
witness of their rebellion. Moses carried out YHWH’s instruction, he wrote the song and spoke it to the people. In the second part, Deut 32:48-34:12, YHWH commands Moses to go up a mountain and to die there. Moses blessed the Israelites before he followed YHWH’s command. In Deut 34 Moses ascended a mountain and died there according to the command of YHWH. This final chapter concludes the Book of Deuteronomy and also the Pentateuch as well. Therefore, Deut 32:48-52 does not have strong a connection to the song of Moses in Deut 32:1-47. Instead, it can be an introduction to the blessings of Moses (Deut 33) before his death.

While the content of Deut 32:48-52 is very similar to that of Num 27:12-14, its context is totally different from that of Num 27:12-14. The table below shows that these two passages are in very different historical and literary contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Comparison of the context of Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 20-36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sin of Moses and Aaron, the encounter with Edom and the death of Aaron (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The encounter with the Canaanites, the copper snake, and the battles with Sihon and Og (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaam (22-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idolatry and Expiation at Baal-Poer (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second Census (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The incident of the daughters of Zelophehad (27:1-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Song of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three main contextual differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 which are related to our study. The first one is about the succession of Joshua. We have mentioned that the command to Moses to go up the mountain of the Abarim in Num 27:12-14 is placed in the introduction of the theme of new leadership.

The succession of Joshua (Num 27:15-23) occurred *after* the command of God to Moses. In Deut 31:7-8, Joshua was already encouraged by Moses, and in Deut 32:23, by YHWH. The succession of Joshua occurred *before* God’s command to Moses to
ascend the mountain of Abarim in Deut 32:48-52.

The second is about the death of Moses. In Numbers, Moses had not been told about his death before YHWH’s command to him to ascend the mountain in Num 27:12-14. However, in Deuteronomy, Moses already knew that he would die before the command of ascending the mountain in Deut 32:48-52. In Deut 4:22, Moses said that he was going to die in the land without crossing over the Jordan. In Deut 31:14, YHWH told Moses that his time to die was near. Moses mentioned his death twice in Deut 31:27, 29. In Num 27:12-14, there is no explicit statement about the exclusion of Moses. The exclusion is implied by the death of Moses. In Deut 32:48-52 we can find an explicit statement about the exclusion of Moses.

Finally, according to the book of Deuteronomy, it is possible that the three events, “the delivering of the three speeches of Moses,” “the singing of his song,” and “the receiving of the command to ascend the mountain,” occur on the same day (Deut 1:3; 31:22; 32:48). It also seems that Moses ascended Mount Nebo (Deut 34) without any delay after giving his blessings in Deut 33. However in the context of Numbers, there is the battle with Midian in Num 31. We do not know how long this battle lasted. But it is stated that after the battle, there were *seven days* for the soldiers to purify themselves by camping outside the camp (Num 31:19-20). Therefore, according to the book of Numbers Moses did not ascend the mountain immediately after he was told to do so.

Having comparing the contexts of the three passages, we now look at one of
their differences on wordings of the exclusion of Moses. The three texts can be read in parallel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 20:12</th>
<th>Num 27:14</th>
<th>Deut 32:51-52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...“Because you have not believed in me, 14 for you rebelled (against) my word. 51 because you broke faith with me in the midst of the Israelites at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin, during the strife of the congregation, because you did not regard me as holy at the waters before the eyes of the Israelites, you did not regard me as holy before their eyes.”</td>
<td>Num 27:14</td>
<td>Deut 32:48-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...“Because you have not believed in me, 14 for you rebelled (against) my word. 51 because you broke faith with me in the midst of the Israelites at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin, during the strife of the congregation, because you did not regard me as holy at the waters before the eyes of the Israelites, you did not regard me as holy before their eyes.”</td>
<td>Num 27:14</td>
<td>Deut 32:48-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...“Because you have not believed in me, 14 for you rebelled (against) my word. 51 because you broke faith with me in the midst of the Israelites at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin, during the strife of the congregation, because you did not regard me as holy at the waters before the eyes of the Israelites, you did not regard me as holy before their eyes.”</td>
<td>Num 27:14</td>
<td>Deut 32:48-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin.

52 For you may see the land at a distance. therefore you will not bring this assembly into the land into the land which I have given which I am giving to them.” to the Israelites.”

In Num 20:12, we read the Hiphil stem of הבוא (“lead”) rather than הבא in the Qal stem (“enter”) which can be found in Deut 32:52. This verb is absent in Num 27:12-14. The usage of the verb in Num 20:12 emphasises on the leadership of Moses and Aaron, while that in Deut 32:52 is about their ban from the land. Thus, in Num 20:12, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is more of the removing of their leadership than of their exclusion. Moreover, the exclusion is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people.

The ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. We will examine these differences in the following sections.

B) The uniting of traditions in Num 27:12-14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 20:12</th>
<th>Num 20:24</th>
<th>Num 27:14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...because you have not believed in me,</td>
<td>...because you rebelled (against) my word (^{177})</td>
<td>14 for you rebelled (against) my word in the wilderness of Zin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to regard me as holy</td>
<td>to regard me as holy</td>
<td>during the strife of the congregation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before the eyes of the Israelites,</td>
<td></td>
<td>before their eyes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the waters of Meribah. (^{178})</td>
<td>These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh (in) the wilderness of Zin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Num 20:24 also states the sin of Moses and Aaron, it will be relevant to examine this passage as well. Num 27:14 has the expressions of both Num 20:12 and 20:24. In Num 20:12 the sin of Aaron and Moses is "לא hoped ברי ("you have not believed in me"), while in Num 27:14 is מרים ב ("you rebelled [against] my word"), such phrase, מרים, also occurs in Num 20:24 in which a direct object marker can be found. Thus Num 27:14 has one element which is absent in Num 20:12, but common in Num 20:24. However, Num 27:14 contains an infinitive in the expression למקדישני ("to sanctify me"), which can be found in Num 20:12, but not

\(^{177}\) MT has מרים א ("you rebelled against my mouth"). The expression א ("my mouth") is metonymic for "my word," that is what comes out of my mouth. LXX has παρωξύνατε με ("you provoked me"). It is an interpretation of מרים א ("my mouth"). See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 334.

\(^{178}\) LXX has το τὸ δοκτο τῆς λοιδόρες ("the water of railing"), and it indicates that the translator did not understand מרים ב ("waters of Meribah") as a place. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 334.
in Num 20:24. Besides, the לָעַנְיָהְמִים (**before their eyes**”) in Num 27:14 is very similar to the לָעַניִּיםְיְהָוְאָל (**before the eyes of the Israelites”), but such expression is absent in Num 20:24. Hence, Num 27:14 also consists of two elements which are present in Num 20:12, but absent in Num 20:24. Therefore, Num 27:14 may be an amalgamation of Num 20:12 and Num 20:24.

In Num 20:24, where the verb “to sanctify” is absent, the phrases “before the eyes of the Israelites” or “before their eyes” are also absent. One may ask whether the absence of the phrases “before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes” in Num 20:24 is due to the absence of “to sanctify” or the change of the verb from “to believe” to “to rebel.” To answer this question, there are three points to note. Firstly, the verb “to believe” is never used in connection with “before the eyes of the Israelites” or “before their eyes” in the Hebrew Bible. Secondly, nowhere can we find any connection between “to rebel” and “before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes” in the Hebrew Bible. Thirdly, there are a number of occurrences where “be sanctified” (Niphal) is connected to the phrase “before the eyes of...” (Lev 22:32; Ezek 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 39:27). Therefore, the absence of these two phrases (“before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes”) in Num 20:24 is due to the absence of the verb “to sanctify.”

In Num 27:14, the phrase לָעַניִּיםְיְהָוְאָל (**before their eyes**”) is connected to “regard as holy.” Other terms such as לָעַניִּים (**before eyes**), לָעַניִּיםְיְהָוְאָל (**before my eyes”),¹⁷⁹ לָעַניִּים (**before our

¹⁷⁹ לָעַניִּים (**before my eyes”) occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 13:5, 6; Ezek 10:2, 19; Ps
eyes”),\textsuperscript{180} \textit{לֹא רָאִיתִי} ("before your[singular] eyes”),\textsuperscript{181} \textit{לְעֵינֵיכֶם} ("before your[plural] eyes”)\textsuperscript{182} and \textit{לְעֵינָיו} ("before his eyes")\textsuperscript{183} are not connected to the verb \textit{ךָדַשׁ}. The phrase \textit{לֹא רָאִיתִי} occurs three times in Numbers (Num 20:8; 27:14, 19), twenty-two times in the Hebrew Bible, but not even once in Deuteronomy.

The mixing of Num 20:12 with Num 20:24 in Num 27:14 may be an indicator showing that Num 27:14 is later than Num 20:12 (and also Num 20:24). The sin \textit{לֹא רָאִיתִי} ("you have not believed in me,” Num 20:12) is changed to \textit{תָּמִית} [אָתָם] מִרְדָּכָא ("you rebelled against my word,” Num 27:14 and 20:24) is probably due to the usage of the context of Num 20:24. According to Num 27:12-14, the mention of Aaron’s being gathered to his people is used to compare with Moses’ being gathered to his people. Since Num 20:24 depicts that Aaron was going to be gathered to his people, this passage is used in Num 27:12-14. When Num 27:12-14 adopts Aaron’s death, it also adopts the reason for his death: rebelling against YHWH’s word.

C) The rewriting of Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52

We can find both similarities and differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut

\textsuperscript{132:4; Job 31:1.}
\textsuperscript{180} \textit{לֹא רָאִיתִי} ("before our eyes”) occurs three times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 6:22; Josh 24:17; Ps 79:10.
\textsuperscript{181} \textit{לֹא רָאִיתִי} ("before your[singular] eyes”) occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 47:19; Lev 25:53; Deut 4:34; 25:3; 28:31; 2 Sam 12:11; Ps 50:21; Prov 6:4.
\textsuperscript{182} \textit{לְעֵינֵיכֶם} ("before your[plural] eyes”) occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 1:30; 9:17; 29:1; 1 Sam 12:16; Jer 16:9; 29:21; 51:24; Zep 3:20.
\textsuperscript{183} \textit{לְעֵינָיו} ("before his eyes”) occurs five times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 19:5; 2 Sam 13:8; 2 Kgs 25:7; Jer 39:6; 52:10.
32:48-52. There are five similarities between them: (i) both passages begin with “and YHWH spoke to Moses…”; (ii) the wordings of the first commandליולאהלארהלהכרים (“ascend this mountain of the Abarim”) is the same in Num 27:12 and Deut 32:49; (iii) the expressions of the second commandראהאתהארום (“and see the land”) are very similar, but not identical. In Num 27:12 it is just “the land,” but in Deut 32:49 the land is called “land of Canaan;” (iv) both passages use the subordinate clause “as Aaron…was gathered…” to supplement the death of Moses; (v) The place “the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin” is stated in both passages, but its syntactical location is different. In Num 27:14 the phrase is at the end of the saying of YHWH, while in Deut 32:51 the phrase is after the sin of Aaron and Moses, and is not at the end of the saying.

There are four main differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. Firstly, there are differences in syntax and in number of imperatives. The exclusion of Moses is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people. The ban from the Promised land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. Thus, the divine saying to Moses in Deut 32:48-52 consists of four imperatives (ascend, see, die, be gathered). These four commands can be clearly seen from the following literary structure of Deut 32:48-52:

---

184 However, the verb used in Num 27:12 is אמר (“say”), while the verb in Deut 32:48 is דבר (“speak”).
A. YHWH spoke to Moses (v. 48)

B. The contents of the saying (vv. 49-52)

First command: Go up [נחל] the mountain (v. 49a)

Second command: See [ראות] the land (v. 49b)

Third command: Die [מות] at the mountain (v. 50a)

Fourth command: Be gathered [אנסף] to your [= Moses] people (v. 50b)

Reasons for carrying out these commands (vv. 51-52)

The structure of Deut 32:48-52 can be divided into two parts: YHWH spoke to Moses and the contents of the saying. The saying mainly consists of four commands: “go up,” “see,” “die” and “be gathered.” These four verbs are imperatives. Then two reasons are given to explain why Moses has to die at the mountain. The syntax of Deut 32:48-52 suggests that the death of Moses is the direct punishment of failing to regard God as holy. The exclusion of Moses from the Promised land is a natural consequence of his death, not a direct penalty of failing to sanctify YHWH. However, in Num 27:12-14 there are only two imperatives (“ascend” and “see”). The command “die” is absent. Moreover, the verb “be gathered” is written in Niphal perfect, but not an imperative. So the sense of this verb is that God told Moses that he would be gathered to his people rather than commanding him to die.

Secondly, there are different sin(s) of Moses. The two versions describe the sin of Moses and Aaron in distinctively different ways. According to Num 27:12-14, Moses and Aaron מלא יא (“rebelled”) against YHWH’s word and thus (not) to regard
Him as holy. There is only one explanatory conjunction כַּאֲשֶׁר (“because”), and לִמְדוּד הוא (“because”), and first person pronominal suffix. The Deuteronomic version, however, gives two explanatory conjunctions כַּאֲשֶׁר (“because”). The first conjunction introduces their sin as “breaking faith” with YHWH; the second “failing to regard YHWH as holy” in which the verb כֹּרֶשׁ is not an infinitive, but Piel perfect. We will discuss this difference later.

Thirdly, there are mainly seven expressions which can be found in Deut 32:48-52, but not in Num 27:12-14: (a) “on the same day” (v.48); (b) “Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, which is across Jericho” (v.49); (c) “for a possession” (v.49); (d) “Die on the mountain that you ascend there” (v.50); (e) “Aaron die on Mount Hor” (v.50); (f) “in the midst of the Israelites” (v.51); (g) the whole verse in Deut 32:52.

Fourthly, there are three expressions which can be found in Num 27:12-14, but not in Deut 32:48-52: (a) “When you have seen it” (v.13); (b) “you too” (v. 13); (c) “during the strife of the congregation” (v. 14). Their differences will be discussed in more detail as follows.

(1) A comparison of Num 27:12 and Deut 32:48-49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:12</th>
<th>Deut 32:48-49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רִאָם אוֹרָה אוֹרָה אָלָּ אָלָּ</td>
<td>בָּעֵץ חֶטֶא אוֹרָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 And YHWH said to Moses, saying,

48 And YHWH spoke to Moses on the same day, saying,

“Ascend this mountain of the Abarim, Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab which is across Jericho, and see the land and see the land of Canaan, which I have given to the Israelites. which I am giving to the Israelites for a possession.

The text of Deut 32:48-49 is much longer than that of Num 27:12. It is possible that Num 27:12 is an abridged version of Deut 32:48-49. But there is a greater possibility that Deut 32:48-49 is an expansion of Num 27:12. There is information about the time of the word of YHWH to Moses in the Deuteronomistic version. The addition of (‘on the same day’) clarifies the time. “The same day” can refer to the “today” in Deut 32:46, and also the day mentioned in Deut 1:3. This reference creates an appearance that Moses delivered his three speeches, sang his song and was told to ascend the mountain on the same day. This makes the book of

---

185 Finsterbusch, Deuteronomium, 192.
186 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 101; Braulik, Deuteronomium II, 236; Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 413; Finsterbusch, Deuteronomium, 192. Mittmann, Deuteronomium, 111.
Deuteronomy the “testament” of Moses.\textsuperscript{187}

In the Deuteronomistic version, we also find modifications on the locations. First, there is further description of the mountain where Moses must ascend. The addition of הר נב ה (“Mount Nebo”), which is further modified by two relative clauses: אㅅ תל מוא (“which is in the land of Moab”) and אש רון יר (“which is across Jericho”) clarifies the location and connects this passage to Deut 34:1, (“And Moses ascended from the plains of Moab to Mount Nebo...which is across Jericho”).

Second, there is further description of the Promised Land. In Num 27:12, Moses is asked to see “the land”; while in Deut 32:49, the land is called “the land of Canaan.” The exact parallel of “the land of Canaan which I am giving...” (Deut 32:49) occurs at Num 13:2. The א (“I”) for the action of giving the land to the Israelites can be found in Lev 14:34; 23:10; 25:2; Num 13:2; 15:2 but not in Deuteronomy. The change of “I have given” to “I am giving” matches the situation just before the conquest of the land.\textsuperscript{188}

In Deut 32:49, the land is further modified by the term לאַה (“for a possession”), which occurs only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:49). In Lev 14:34, this term is attached to “the land given by God.” This shows that the term may have an origin outside Deuteronomy and this later redactor used non-Deuteronomic languages in describing “the land.”\textsuperscript{189} These additions, one about time and the others

\textsuperscript{187} Braulik, Deuteronomium II, 236.

\textsuperscript{188} Mittmann, Deuteronomium, 111.

\textsuperscript{189} For the characteristic expressions of the Book of Deuteronomy, see John William Colenso, The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined (London: Longmans Green and Co, 1878),
about *location*, may be from the redactors of Deuteronomy who connected Deut 32:48-52 to the Book of Deuteronomy. Such elaboration is an indicator that Deut 32:48-52 is later than Num 27:12-14.

(2) A comparison of Num 27:13 and Deut 32:50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:13</th>
<th>Deut 32:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>זָמַה בְּלָעוּת</td>
<td>50 And die on the mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵלָה עַל עֶפֶרְךָ</td>
<td>that you ascend there,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאִשְׁתָּךְ אָלָם</td>
<td>וְאִשְׁתָּךְ אָלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַעַשְׂךָ אָלָם נַעַשְׂךָ</td>
<td>נַעַשְׂךָ אָלָם נַעַשְׂךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בַּהֲרָה הָאָרֶץ</td>
<td>בַּהֲרָה הָאָרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רִאשְׁנָה אֲלִנֵּם</td>
<td>רִאשְׁנָה אֲלִנֵּם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 And die on the mountain that you ascend there,

13 “When you have seen it, you will be gathered to your people, and be gathered to your people, you too as Aaron your brother was gathered. as Aaron your brother died on Mount Hor and was gathered to his people,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:13</th>
<th>Deut 32:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 And die on the mountain that you ascend there,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two imperatives in the Deut 32:50, but none in the Numbers version. In Num 27:13, the command “die” is absent; the phrase used is “will be gathered to your people.” In Deut 32:50, we find two commands: “die” and “be gathered to your people.” Such two commands (die and be gathered) are followed by the retelling of

the death of Aaron, which depicts that Aaron “died,” and “was gathered to his
people.” In Num 27:13, the name of the mountain on which Aaron died is also absent.
Deut 32:50 gives the name of this mountain, “Mount Hor.” This clarification on the
name of the location connects to the traditions of the death of Aaron in the book of
Numbers (see Num 20:22-27; 33:37-41). The addition of “and you will die on the
mountain” (Deut 32:50) stresses the connection with Deut 34.

(3) A comparison of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:14</th>
<th>Deut 32:51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שהל אסר מנהלה בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל מון מיריבת קֹדֶשׁ</td>
<td>רָעָֽכְךָ בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל בּוּרָה מִירִיבֶּת הַנֶּרֶד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִירִיבֶּת הַנֶּרֶד</td>
<td>מִירִיבֶּת הַנֶּרֶד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָס בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>נָס בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לא קָרָאתָ אָדָר</td>
<td>לא קָרָאתָ אָדָר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 27:14</th>
<th>Deut 32:51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 for you rebelled against my word</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the midst of the Israelites</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the waters of Meribath Kadesh,</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the wilderness of Zin, (in) the wilderness of Zin,</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the strife of the congregation,</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>51 because you broke faith with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to regard me as holy you did not regard me as holy</td>
<td>to regard me as holy you did not regard me as holy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the waters</td>
<td>at the waters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is only one explanatory subordinate clause in Num 27:14, which begins with

"because". These differences are important because it tells us which one has improved the other.

In Num 27:13, the expression "because" has been used, but its function is comparative, with meaning of “just as,” not explanatory. However, in Num 27:14, the repeated expression is explanatory. The fact that an expression occurs twice in one sentence but with different functions and meanings may give rise to misunderstanding. In Deut 32:51 the expression is used, and it does not cause any misunderstanding. If we assume that a later version will try to improve its previous version, then this stylistic improvement can be evidence for Deut 32:51 is later than Num 27:14.

It should be noticed that Deut 32:51 does not use only one "because", but two. The meaning of the second explanatory subordinate clause is very clear: Moses and Aaron did not regard YHWH as holy. In Deut 32:51, the verb appears as

in the Piel stem and perfect form with a negation. However, according to Num 27:14, the expression ("to sanctify" or "to regard as holy") is an infinitive in the Hiphil stem with the preposition and with first person pronominal suffix. The construction of Num 27:14 is awkward,
sanctify me.” The LXX translator may have been aware of the problem, and so he added οὐχ ἡγιάσατέ με (“you did not sanctified me”) after ἡγιάσατε με (“to sanctify me”).\(^{190}\) Even if one takes the expression ἑλαττομέα as the modifier of λαττομέα, there is still a problem. David Frankel states that the phrase in it can only be: “you rebelled against my word by sanctifying me,”\(^{191}\) but this understanding is “absurd, for the verse seeks to assert that Moses and Aaron did not sanctify God.”\(^{192}\)

Siegfried Mittmann rightly says that the Deuteronomic redactor rewrote the sentence in a form of parallel causal sentence (with two “because”) in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the sentence.\(^{193}\) Thus it is possible that Deut 32:48-52 clarifies Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordinate clauses, and by changing the Hiphil infinitive form of ἑλατ to a clause with ἑλατ in Piel perfect with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses is then clarified in these modifications. Hence, it is more reasonable to believe that Deut 32:51 is later than Num 27:14.

Martin Rose believes that the saying of YHWH should end at Num 27:14a.\(^{194}\) The second half of Num 27:14b “These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin” is misunderstood, and is put into the saying of YHWH.\(^{195}\) The phrase should be understood as a gloss which is used to clarify the location that is

\(^{190}\) Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 464.
\(^{191}\) Frankel, *Murmuring*, 271.
\(^{192}\) Frankel, *Murmuring*, 271.
\(^{193}\) Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 111.
\(^{195}\) Rose, “Empoigner,” 135.
mentioned in the speech of YHWH.\textsuperscript{196} Rose claims that this gloss’ formulation corresponds exactly to that of Deut 32:51. He observes that “the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin” is an integral element in Deut 32:51, but it is only a gloss in Num 27.\textsuperscript{197} Then he concludes that Deut 32:51 is more original.\textsuperscript{198}

Rose’s observations are good, but his conclusion is not convincing. Firstly, the formulation of the phrase is not the same as that of Deut 32:51. In Num 27:14, we have \( \text{דָּבֶ 나오ֹ הֶרְבָּא קַדְשָׁ מֵרִיבָא קַדְשָׁ יִזִּנֵי } \) (“These [are] the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin”), while in Deut 32:51, we find \( \text{בָּמִי מַרְבָּא קַדְשָׁ מֵרִיבָא קַדְשָׁ יִזִּנֵי } \) (“at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin”). There is a preposition \( בּ \) before the term \( מַיָּה \) in Deut 32:51, but the term \( הוֹרְבָּא קַדְשָׁ יִזִּנֵי \) can be found in Num 27:14. Secondly, if Num 27:14 is later than Deut 32:51, there is no reason for the author of Num 27 to rewrite the two clear subordinate clauses of Deut 32:51 into one subordinate clause in Num 27:14 which is more difficult to comprehend. Rather, I will argue that Deut 32:51 is a later text. In Num 27:14, there are two occurrences of “in the wilderness of Zin.” The first “in the wilderness of Zin during the strife of the congregation” not only repeats with the second “these are the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin,” but also makes the meaning of the whole clause hard to understand. It seems that the redactor of Deut 32:51 combines the two remarks into one, and adds one more subordinate clause to clarify the meaning of the sin of Moses

\textsuperscript{196} Rose, “Empoigner,” 135.
\textsuperscript{197} Rose, “Empoigner,” 136.
\textsuperscript{198} Rose, “Empoigner,” 136, 142.
and Aaron. It is more likely that Deut 32:48-52 is not original but borrowed from Num 27:12-14, and is modified by the redactors of Deuteronomy, as Ludwig Schmidt and Siegfried Mittmann argue that Num 27:12-14 was the Vorlage for Deut 32:48-52.\textsuperscript{199} That is, Deut 32:48-52 was a later repetition of Num 27:12-14 with some “expansions” (Erweiterungen).\textsuperscript{200}

Summary

In conclusion we may review a few points which we have been discussing in this section. The first of these would be the different contexts and syntax about the exclusion of Moses in Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. In Num 20:12, the leadership of Moses and Aaron is more emphasised in the Hiphil stem of אִיבָּן (“lead”) rather than the verb אָבַּר in Qal stem (“enter”) in Deut 32:52. Thus, in Num 20:12, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is more of the removing of their leadership than of their exclusion. Moreover, the exclusion is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people. The ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. The syntax of Deut 32:48-52 suggests that the death of Moses is the direct punishment of failing to sanctify God. The exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land is a natural consequence of his

\textsuperscript{199} Schmidt, Numeri, 166; Mittmann, Deuteronomium, 111.
\textsuperscript{200} Schmidt, Numeri, 167.
death, not a direct penalty of failing to sanctify YHWH.

The second point is that the chronological order of these three passages is Num 20:1-13; then Num 27:12-14; and the last Deut 32:48-52. We propose that Num 27:12-14 is later than Num 20:1-13 because the former presupposes the content of Num 20:1-13, and it has integrated the key expressions in Num 20:12 and Num 20:24. Deut 32:48-52 is said to be later than Num 27:12-14 because of the evidence of stylistic improvements and meaning clarifications in Deut 32:48-52. It rephrases Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordination clauses. It also rewrites the infinitive of יָכָה to a clause with יָכָה in Piel perfect and with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses is then clarified in these modifications. Although Deut 32:48-52 is later than the three texts from Numbers, it does not mean that the whole book of Deuteronomy is later than the book of Numbers. It just shows that this passage of Deuteronomy is later than the three passages of Numbers. This diachronic relationship shows the possibility that Deut 32:48-52 is redacted by a later school.

Hence, the diachronic sequence of the texts are: Deut 1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Num 20:12, Num 20:24, Num 27:12-14, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.
3. Observations on the two divine factors related to Moses’ exclusion

A) Divine anger in the older texts

According to the above diachronic sequence of the texts, we find that the mentions of divine anger occur only in the older texts. Three times (Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21-22), Moses said that YHWH was angry with him. How could Moses know that YHWH was angry with him? What did Moses mean when he said that YHWH was angry with him? How should we understand “angry/ furious with me” in the context? Why did Moses say that YHWH was angry? It can be noticed that the anger of YHWH is followed by Moses’ exclusion in each of these passages. Is there any relationship between the anger of YHWH and Moses’ exclusion? It seems that it is not a coincidence that divine anger and Moses’ exclusion are found together three times. If there is a relationship, what is it? It is not likely to be a logical relation or “cause and effect” relation. In the Hebrew Bible, YHWH would get angry with different individuals, but not everyone of them will be excluded from the Promised Land. They might be punished in other ways. For instance, in Deut 9:20, Moses said that YHWH was angry enough with Aaron to destroy him. In 1 Kgs 11:9-11, it is told that YHWH was angry with Solomon, and YHWH said to him that He would tear the kingdom away from Solomon and give it to one of Solomon’s servants.

201 Different words are used: הַעֲנָה (“to be angry”) in Deut 1:37; 4:21; and הָנָב (“to be furious”) in 3:26.
202 In Deut 1:37 and 9:20, the same verb הַעֲנָה (“to be angry”) is used.
203 The same verb הָנָב is used in 1 Kgs 11:9. Other consequences of divine anger include banishment from YHWH’s presence (2 Kgs 17:18 with verb הָנָב) and destruction of the Israelites (Deut 9:8, Ezra...
Since the anger of YHWH is repeated three times, this indicates that divine anger should be an important motif for the exclusion of Moses, or it is fair to say that the concept of divine anger is related to Moses’ exclusion. This research will first find out whether there is a relationship between the anger of YHWH and the exclusion of Moses. If there is a relationship, what is it?

B) Divine holiness in the post-Priestly texts

Num 20:12, 27:12-14; Deut 32:48-52 do not refer to the spy narrative, but to the incident at the waters of Meribath Kadesh. This group states clearly that Moses had done something wrong. Has Moses sinned? The fault/ transgression of Moses in these three passages is represented by different terms: “breaking faith” with YHWH (Deut 32:51), “rebelling” against the word of YHWH (Num 27:14), and “not

9:14 with verb פָּרָה). In other cases with different Hebrew verbs of “to be angry,” the consequences include destruction of the Israelites (Deut 9:19 with verb פָּרָה), defilement of YHWH’s heritage (Isa 47:6 with verb פָּרָה), abandoning the Israelites (Deut 31:17 with the combination of פָּרָה וְלֹא), and handing the Israelites over to foes (Judg 2:14 with the combination of פָּרָה וְלֹא).

As this factor is related to God, it is described as a “divine factor” in this study.

Scholars have tried to find out the sin of Moses for such severe punishment. The works by Jacob Milgrom and Johnson Lim have already provided systematic classifications of the sin of Moses and Aaron. Milgrom summarizes the ten explanations given by the medieval Jewish commentators on the sin of Moses: 1) striking the rock instead of speaking; 2) striking the rock following his choice, but the choice of the people; 3) striking the rock twice instead of once (these three are subsumed to Moses’ action); 4) his blazing temper; 5) his cowardice; 6) his callousness (these three are under the aspect of Moses’ character); 7) asking a question which was misconstrued as doubting God; 8) doubting God actually; 9) calling the Israelites “rebels”; 10) saying “shall we draw forth...” (these last four are related to Moses’ words). See Jacob Milgrom, “Magic, Monotheism and the Sin of Moses,” in The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in honor of George E. Mendenhall (ed. H. B. Huffmon et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 251-265; idem, Numbers (JPSTC; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 448. Lim also classifies the sin of Moses under five aspects: 1) the speech of Moses; 2) the misuse of Aaron’s staff; 3) surrendering of leadership responsibility; 4) speech during the performance of a miracle; 5) striking the rock. Johnson T. K. Lim, The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1997), 109-133. But their studies are mainly confined to Num 20:1-13 only, and do not give much discussion on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 1-4.
believing” in YHWH (Num 20:12). What is the relationship between these three verbs? Do these three different verbs present one and the same fault of Moses?

Although the descriptions of the transgressions are different, all these actions are followed by: “not regarding God as holy.” The verb שָׁטַה (“to sanctify” or “to regard something/ someone as holy”) is repeated three times. What is the precise meaning of שָׁטַה? Is failing to sanctify God a consequence of the fault of Moses? Rather, is it a representation of his fault(s)/ transgression(s)?

It can be observed that there are juxtapositions of failing to sanctify God and Moses’ exclusion. Is there any relationship between “sanctifying God” and the ban of Moses? If the three-fold juxtapositions are not by accident, there may be a relationship between them. What is the relationship between failing to sanctify God and Moses’ denial? There is no indepth discussion of such sin and punishment in the previous studies.

The lack of attention given to divine anger and holiness is deemed to be a blind spot in previous scholarship. In fact, this overlooking of the divine factors is very

---

206 The verb שָׁטַה (“to sanctify”) exists in different stems: Piel in Deut 32:51; Hiphil infinitive construct in Num 20:12 and Num 27:14; Niphal in Num 20:13. The differences will be discussed in Part III of this dissertation.
207 The exclusion of Moses is implied when YHWH said that Moses would be gathered to his people in Num 27:13.
208 Moses and Aaron are the only two persons of whom are said that they did not sanctify YHWH in the Hebrew Bible, in which there are 16 occurrences where YHWH is the direct or implied object of the verb “to sanctify” (Lev 10:3; 22:32; Num 20:12, 13; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 5:16; 8:13; 29:23; Ezek 20:41; 28:22; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 38:23; 39:27). Five of these 16 occurrences are used with human subjects (Num 20:12; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 8:13; 29:23.), the rest are with divine subject, i.e.: YHWH sanctifies himself. A more detailed analysis of the usage of this verb “to sanctify” will be provided in Part IV of this study.
209 Lee has pointed out that the term “holiness” is related to YHWH’s reason for punishing Moses and Aaron in Num 20:12. He has also analyzed the usage of the verb “to sanctify” to find out the essence of Moses’ sin. But Lee does not state clearly the relationship between divine holiness and Moses’ exclusion. See Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 224, 235.
common among the major Deuteronomy commentaries. Although the anger of YHWH (Deut 1:37; 3:26) is commented, there is no attempt to investigate its possible relationship to the denial of Moses.\(^{210}\) The verb “to sanctify” in Deut 32:51 is noted, but it is merely interpreted as a “word-play” to the place name Kadesh, without asking the question of its relationship to Moses’ exclusion.\(^{211}\)

Previous research fails to take into account that there may be possible relationships between YHWH’s anger and the ban of Moses, nor does it pay enough attention to why failing to sanctify God would lead to Moses’ denial. The aim of this study is to investigate the relationships between the exclusion of Moses and divine

\(^{210}\) Cairns, Deuteronomy, 37; Christensen, Deuteronomy 1-11, 66; Craigie, Deuteronomy, 127; Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 240; Driver, Deuteronomy, 27; Lundbom, Deuteronomy, 182, 227; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 147; Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 119; Rose, Moses 1-11 and 26-34, 485; Smith, Deuteronomy, 24; Steuernagel, Deuteronomium, 6; Veijola, Deuteronomium, 41, 92-93; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy 1-11, 190; G. E. Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 339-340.

anger on the one hand, and sanctifying God on the other. Before we start our investigation, we will see a review of scholarship on these two divine themes in the next chapter.
The purpose of the present chapter is to answer two questions. First, what is the source of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52? Are they Priestly writings? We will attempt to clarify their source(s) by reviewing the current discussions on the Priestly nature of these three texts. Second, can the current scholarship of divine anger and sanctifying God provide bases for our study? In the previous chapter, by paying attention to the repeated key words in the different passages, we have arrived at an initial observation that the themes of divine anger and sanctifying God are related to Moses’ exclusion. What are the current studies on these two themes? How can we understand these themes in Deuteronomy? We will first deal with the theme of divine anger since we have observed that divine anger is connected to the ban of Moses from the Promised Land in the first four chapters of Deuteronomy. Then we will review the studies on sanctifying God at the last part of this chapter.


(1) The mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13,
27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

Thirty years ago, the dominant view among scholars is that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-32 all come from the Priestly source. According to Theodor Nöldeke, whom Wellhausen regards as the first who has traced in detail how the Priestly writing runs through the whole Hexateuch, the style of P (the Grundschrift of Nöldeke) is with frequent repetitions, but it does not have vividness

1 The expression “non-Priestly” is understood by its relation with the Priestly writing, which develops the themes on creation (Gen 1:1-2:3), covenant (Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-7:7) and cultic practice (Exod 12:1-20; 25-31; Lev) with its distinctive style. The non-Priestly writing constitutes the remainder of the Tetrateuch, containing a much more diverse body of literature with distinct themes that suggest a more complex history of composition than the Priestly writing. See Thomas B. Dozeman, *The Pentateuch: Introducing the Torah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 194-195.

2 That is before the influential essay of Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?,” *ZAW* 100 (1988): 65-88.


and warmth of language.⁵ There is no detailed characterization on the persons in the narrative, they are only drawn in outline.⁶ Alberto Soggin also says that P is the easiest to recognize because of its relatively consistent vocabulary, its solemn style, and its love of elements connected with the cult.⁷ Most parts of Num 20:1-13 are classified to be Priestly by the criteria of vocabulary, style and theology. The signs of Priestly authorship can be summarised as:⁸

i) The usage of priestly terms: דֹּבִי (“the congregation,” in vv. 1, 2, 8, 11) and כָּפַר (“perish,” in v. 3);

ii) The presence of Aaron beside Moses (vv. 2, 6, 8, 10, 12);

iii) The falling on faces of Moses and Aaron (v.6, see Num 14:5; 16:4, 22);

iv) The appearance of glory of YHWH (v.6. cf. Num 14:10; 16:19; 17:7);

v) The stress upon the power of the word of God (v.8, see Genesis 1);

vi) The importance of sanctification (vv. 12, 13);

vii) The location of the tent of meeting, which seems to be at the center of the camp (v.6).

Although there is evidence for the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13, two points should be noted. First, the fact that a Priestly passage emphasizes the power of the word of God does not prove that only Priestly texts stress this theme or that a passage with a

---

⁵ Nöeldeke, Untersuchungen, 133.
⁶ Nöeldeke, Untersuchungen, 133.
theme of the power of God must be a Priestly writing. For example, Deut 8:3 states that “…[H]e might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but man lives by every word that comes from the mouth of YHWH.” This Deuteronomistic text also stresses the power of the word of God, and it is certainly not a Priestly text. This awareness should also apply to some of the above signs of Priestly authorship, such as “presence of Aaron,” “the appearance of the glory of God” and so on. The classification of a passage to be Priestly should not be a mechanical process. However, the accumulation of identical style and theology does increase the possibility of the Priestly nature of a passage.

Second, vocabulary and style are used as the criteria for proving the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13, 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. However, these same criteria can also be used to prove that these three passages are not purely Priestly writings. Long time ago, it has been observed that not all parts of Num 20:1-13 are Priestly. For instance, Dillmann argues that Num 20:1b, 3a, 5, 7-8* and 11 are non-Priestly because of unusual Priestly vocabulary.9 Recently, the works of Christophe Nihan and Lothar Perlitt put forward more dimensions of consideration.

Christophe Nihan on Num 20:1-13

Christophe Nihan argues that Num 20:1-13 is a composition by a late post-Priestly author for three reasons.10 First, there are atypical of Priestly

---

9 Dillmann, Numeri, 110-113.
10 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 25, 29.
expressions, for example, the designation of Israel as קְהֵל ֹהֶוֹדָה (“assembly of YHWH”) in Num 20:4 is never found in P but only in Deut 23 (vv. 2, 3, 4, 9) and Num 16:3.11 The use of הָלַח (“to come up”) with reference to the exodus in Num 20:5 is not normal of P.12 The use of the plural form of the Qal participle יָרִים (“rebels”) in Num 20:10 is also not typically Priestly.13 Hence his first reason is also based on the criterion of vocabulary.

Second, textural comparison shows that a few verses of Num 20:1-13 are formed by the combination of other non-P verses. For example, Num 20:5 appears to combine both Num 13:23 and 16:14, two non-P passages.14 Num 20:11a is “modeled upon several passages describing Moses’ action as a miracle worker in the book of Exodus.”15

Third, there are expressions which are based on secondary texts. For example, the use of the verb מָנָה (“perish”) in Num 20:3 is “reminiscent” of Num 17:27-28 which bridges Num 17 and Num 18 and has a “marked editorial character.”16 “The staff before YHWH” in Num 20:9 is a clear allusion to Aaron’s staff in the story of Num 17:16-26, which is generally held to be secondary to P.17 Thus, for Nihan, Num 20:1-13 is post-Priestly, hence not Priestly. Therefore, one cannot deny the presence of both the Priestly and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13. There is a

11 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 28.
12 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 28-29.
13 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 29.
14 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 29.
15 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 29.
16 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 28.
17 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 29.
mixture of P and non-P language in the passage. Nihan assigns Num 20:1-13 to be post-Priestly by detailed observations on the phraseology and style of the passage, and most of his arguments are convincing.¹⁸

Lothar Perlitt on Deut 32:48-52

The mixing of language of Deut 32:48-52 is observed by Lothar Perlitt. In his essay, Perlitt states that Deut 1:3; 32:48-52 and 34:1a, 7-9 were composed by scribal redactors who mixed the Deuteronomistic language with the Priestly language.¹⁹ He observes that there are differences between Deut 32:48-52 and Num 27:12-14. If Deut 32:48-52 is later than Num 27:12-14,²⁰ then the variances imply that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 has modified the Priestly writing of Num 27:12-14. For example, the verb יְסַפֶּר ("to say") in Num 27:12 is changed to רָבָד ("to speak") in Deut 32:48. Some words that were inserted by the redactor (such as "on the same day," "land of Canaan" and "a possession") do not necessarily come from P.²¹ Other schools of tradition can also use such words or phrases. The redactor can expand or

---

¹⁸ However, one of his arguments is not without difficulty. Nihan excludes the Priestly character of Num 20: 3-5, 10 by the observation on the different usages of words and style. It should be pointed out that the speakers of 20:3b-5 are the Israelites, and the speaker of verse 10 is Moses, not the “Priestly” narrator. The Israelites and Moses are not representatives of the Priestly School. According to the narrative, the Israelites were murmuring and Moses was rebuking the Israelites. The Israelites can complain without the Priestly style. It is also arguable that if Moses is rebuking the people, his personal style will appear in such an emotional situation. He might rebuke others without using Priestly language. It is not necessary to assume that the Priestly redactors would edit everything to their style including complaints and rebukes. The Priestly redactors might use or keep the “foreign” materials in the texts with which they did not agree theologically. However, this discussion does not negate the main conclusion of Nihan.


²⁰ Perlitt does not state this clearly, but it seems that he has assumed this.

²¹ Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 73, 75.
modify Deut 32:48-52 with all sorts of learned traditions and make them fit his
current context.\footnote{Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 72.} Hence, according to Perlitt, Deut 32:48-52 is not dependent only
on Num 27:12-14. The intention of revising Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52 is not to
repeat the Priestly source, but to combine and connect itself with the book of
Deuteronomy.\footnote{Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 74.} The scribal school in the post-exilic period would blend the
phraseology and style of the Deuteronomic School with that of Priestly School.

Based on Perlitt’s work, we can suggest that the redactors could have thought
certain character was typical of Priestly language, and certain was typical of
Deuteronomic, and deliberately imitated it. Thus, the later school was influenced by
more than one school, and the theologies were blended. Hence, the Priestly elements
in Deut 32:48-52 do not necessarily signify a Priestly redactor behind the text.

The above works of Nihan and Perlitt have pointed out the mixture of Priestly
and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13 and Deut 32:48-52. How do other
scholars explain the fact of the mixing of language of different schools? If the
mixture of Priestly and Deuteronomic language of Deut 32:48-32 could be
understood differently in the frame of the book of Deuteronomy, could these three
texts be also interpreted differently in the frame of Numbers and Deuteronomy or
even the Pentateuch? Since the book of Numbers and Deuteronomy are discussed
together with the formation of the Pentateuch in current scholarship, the
understanding of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in these three
passages will be discussed in the frame of the formation of the Pentateuch.

**Thomas Pola’s argument on the end of P**

Because some of the proposals of the formation of the Pentateuch are built on Thomas Pola’s conclusion, it will be necessary to introduce his arguments about the end of P before looking at the models. Pola suggests that the end of P is in Exodus 40. He finds that the materials in Numbers and Deuteronomy do not bring a fulfillment to the promise in the Priestly basic writing (P, *Die priesterliche Grundschrift*) in Genesis 17. The so-called “Priestly passages” in Numbers and Deuteronomy contain several strange features which are unusual to P. Hence, Pola claims that there is no Priestly text in Numbers and Deuteronomy. He proposes that the promise of the Priestly texts is fulfilled at Mount Sinai, and the ending of P is in Exodus 40. There is no consensus about the ending of the Priestly document. The following models are selected because they can represent the diversity of the approaches to the formation of the Pentateuch.

---

24 Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.
26 Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.
27 Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.
28 Blum, “Issues,” 40. The end of P does not necessarily coincide with a certain presupposed concept of Priestly writing. Scholars have found evidence to locate the end of P at “the foundation of the cult” or “the dwelling among the Israelites” or “the death of Moses” or “the settlement of the land.” But so far, all the evidence is arguable, and arguments proposed to support them are inevitably circular. Ska also points out that the argumentation often runs the risk of being circular: research proceeds from a “concept” that determines the nature of P in order to identify the corresponding texts and, at the same time, it defines the nature of P on the basis of these same texts. See Ska, *Pentateuch*, 148. In other words, some scholars judge the scope and range of the P by the theology of the Priestly writing. But the theology of P is also determined by the scope and range of the Priestly writings. Therefore, it may be unwise to argue for an absolute end of P.
(2) Four opinions on the mixing of P and non-P language in Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

(a) Reinhard Kratz’s model

In the model of Reinhard Kratz, the mixture of P and non-P language is due to the formation of the Enneateuch. Kratz thinks that the first end of the basic document P⁶ is the story of the foundation of the sanctuary in Exod 40.²⁹ According to Kratz, the book of Leviticus is the secondary extension of the law, and Lev 26 (with 27 as an appendix) is the second conclusion of the Priestly writing.³⁰ Thus the main themes of the Priestly writing are “creation,” “patriarchs and exodus,” and “the foundation of the sanctuary.” The “creation” of the world focuses on the covenant with Noah, which guarantees the survival of the world. The “patriarchs and exodus” fuse in the covenant with Abraham, which guarantees that God will be God for Israel. “The foundation of the sanctuary” on Sinai let the people communicate with God by the cult instructed in Lev 1-27.³¹

Later, this Priestly writing was worked into the already existing literary complex of the Enneateuch. Supplements to the Priestly writing were added during

³⁰ Kratz, Composition, 110.
³¹ Kratz, Composition, 110.
this reworking. Such expansions hover between P and D in language and theology, sometimes more Priestly, sometimes more Deuteronomic, and sometimes a mixture of the two. Kratz states that since the Priestly writing in Numbers already presupposes the non-priestly context of Num 20-24 and Deuteronomy, this part of Priestly writing is a redactional stratum. Num 20 and 27 were inserted by the redactors, and other supplements in Numbers were added with a mixture of Priestly-Deuteronomic tone.

Kratz locates the time for the independent Priestly writing around 500 BCE, the combination of P with JE and the expansions in the framework of the Enneateuch in the fifth or fourth century BCE, the expansion process finished with the separation of the Pentateuch from the books of the Former Prophets. Hence, according to Kratz, Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are post-Priestly, and the amalgamation of P and D language are caused by the supplements to the Priestly writing.

(b) The model of Eckart Otto

Eckart Otto does not suggest an Enneateuch model, but about the redactions of the Hexateuch and the Pentateuch. His model is sufficiently complicated that a brief summary will not show its uniqueness. It can be summarised by the following table.

---

32 Kratz, Composition, 321.
33 Kratz, Composition, 112.
34 Kratz, Composition, 321.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Name of Stage</th>
<th>Redactor</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>The part of Pentateuch formed and named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Formation of pre-exilic Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Priestly intellectuals</td>
<td>700 BCE</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Deut 6:4-5; 12-26*; 28* (As a loyalty oath to YHWH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Horeb Redaction (DtrD)</td>
<td>Priestly scribes</td>
<td>Exile, the first generation</td>
<td>Babylonia</td>
<td>Deut 5; 9-10*; 26* (Introduction formation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Moab Redaction (DtrL)</td>
<td>Priestly scribes</td>
<td>Exile, the second generation</td>
<td>Babylonia</td>
<td>Deut 1-3*; Deut 29-30; Josh 1-11*; 23* and Judg 2:6-9 (Frame formation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Hexateuch Redaction</td>
<td>Post-exilic scribes</td>
<td>500 BCE</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Integration of P (Gen1-Lev 9) to DtrL (Hexateuch formation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pentateuch Redaction</td>
<td>Scribes from the Persian Diaspora</td>
<td>450 BCE</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>The Book of Joshua was removed. Decalogue, the Book of Covenant and Lev 17-26 (H) were inserted. Deut 31-34 as the conclusion of the Torah (Pentateuch formation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Otto, in the first stage the pre-exilic Deuteronomy (Deut 6:4-5; Deut 12-25* and Deut 28:20-44*) was circulated in a small group of Priestly intellectuals in Jerusalem, and was formed by the process of “secularization of the state” and “theologization of ethics.”

---


37 The process of “secularization of the state” happened in the seventh century BCE when Judean intellectuals drew on and transformed important texts of the Neo-Assyrian royal ideology, especially the loyalty oath of the Assyrian King Esarhaddon of 672 BCE. The loyalty oath to the Assyrian King is transformed to a loyalty oath to YHWH. The Judean intellectuals created an entirely new paradigm which limited the claim to political loyalty by requiring absolute loyalty towards God. They shifted the obligation of absolute loyalty from Assyrian king to YHWH. Regarding the Assyrian “state” ideology, it was impossible to suppose that humans could have any rights over against the state. If the claim for absolute loyalty was shifted from king (representative of the state) to YHWH, the people ought to obey YHWH rather than the king. This became the “secularization of the state.” See Otto,
Then the Deuteronomists of the first generation in exile combined the pre-exilic Deuteronomy with the law in Mount Horeb in Deut 5: 9-10*; 26*, and added the blessings to the curses in Deut 28 in the second stage which is called the “Horeb redaction.”\(^39\) The redactors expanded the Decalogue, then they organized the Deuteronomic law as the speech of Moses at Horeb.\(^40\)

In the third stage (“the Moab redaction”) the Deuteronomists of the second generation in exile first shifted the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law and the making of the covenant to the plains of Moab in Deut 29.\(^41\) They then added a narrative of the wandering of the Israelites in Deut 1-3, and connected this framed Deut 1-29 with the Book of Joshua to form a literary unity from Deut 1 to Josh 23,\(^42\) which was a narrative of the fulfillment of God’s promise to return home for the second generation in exile.\(^43\) According to Otto, the frame of Deuteronomy formed by the Moab redaction was aimed at solving the problem of the injustice. A new generation of the Israelites grew up in exile. They asked for justice because it was not they who had failed and caused the disaster of exile.\(^44\) The “land” is the central

---

\(^38\) During the Neo-Assyrian crisis, the Assyrian deportation of Judeans and the resettlement of the devastated rural areas destroyed the structure of extended families in the Judean countryside. Consequently, the system of genealogically based kinship collapsed. At that time, Hebrew ethics were legitimated by genealogies. In the process of “theologization of ethics,” the Urdeuteronomium as a reform programme revising the Covenant Code offered the answer to the collapse of the system of traditional ethics. See Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 37.


\(^40\) Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 687.


\(^42\) Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 39; idem, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 244.

\(^43\) Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 43.

\(^44\) Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 42.
theme of this redaction.\textsuperscript{45}

The fourth stage is called “Hexateuch redaction.” The redactors were post-exilic Priestly scribes in the middle of the fifth century BCE, during the period of Nehemiah’s activity in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{46} According to Otto, Deuteronomy (redacted by the Zadokites) and the Priestly Code\textsuperscript{47} (written by the Aaronides) represent two programmes with divergent concepts of “Israel’s origins, history and future.”\textsuperscript{48} For the post-exilic scribes, God’s will related to Israel’s ethics could only be one because God was one. Thus the scribes had to combine these two programmes.\textsuperscript{49} According to this redaction, the “land” was the most decisive gift YHWH had given to his people.\textsuperscript{50} The goal of creation and history was Israel’s dwelling securely in its own land.\textsuperscript{51}

The wilderness narratives in Num 20, according to Otto, were added by the redactor of Hexateuch in the period of Nehemiah.\textsuperscript{52} He thinks that the Hexateuch redactor added Num 20:1-13 with v.12 as the focus because he had to balance “the main roles” in Deut 1- Judg 2:9 (Moses and Joshua) and P (Moses and Aaron) in the context of the connection of P with Deut 1- Judg 2:9.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{45} Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 688.
\textsuperscript{47} For Otto, the Priestly source presents an outline of universal history. Gen 1, which is on creation, is the beginning of P. Gen 1-11 “calls attention to the goal of creation and the world history.” P ends in Exod 29:42-46. The goal of world history is that God dwells in the midst of Israel. P was a product in the exilic period. The book of Numbers was post-exilic and not from the Priestly source. See Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:688.
\textsuperscript{49} Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 27.
\textsuperscript{50} Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 49.
\textsuperscript{51} Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 689.
\textsuperscript{52} Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:689.
\textsuperscript{53} Eckart Otto, Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte
The last stage is called the “Pentateuch redaction.” The redactors were the post-exilic scribal priests who came from the Persian diaspora\textsuperscript{54} in the fourth century BCE, during the period of Ezra’s mission to Yehud.\textsuperscript{55} During the Pentateuch redaction, the Book of Joshua was removed and the first version of Pentateuch (from Gen 1 to Deut 34) was created.\textsuperscript{56} The interest of the Pentateuch redaction is very different from that of the Hexateuch redaction.\textsuperscript{57} It places the Sinai pericope in the middle of the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{58} In this redaction, the revelation of the Torah was the purpose of creation of the world and world history.\textsuperscript{59} This redaction supplemented the Sinai periscope, integrating the Decalogue and Covenant Code in Exod 20-23 and creating Lev 17-26 (the Holiness Code).\textsuperscript{60} This redaction provides an idea that Israel’s identity should not be constituted by where they live, but by the way they live out the faith. The Jews should keep the Torah regardless of whether they lived in the Promised Land or in the diaspora.\textsuperscript{61} The result was a “Diaspora theology” that gave relatively less weight to the land than to the Torah.\textsuperscript{62} The “updates of tradition” (\textit{Fortschreibungen}) of the Pentateuch redaction focuses on Deut 5-11 and Deut

\textsuperscript{54} Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31.
\textsuperscript{55} Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 51.
\textsuperscript{57} Hexateuch redaction “take over” the connection of Deuteronomy with the book of Joshua, and this interest is similar to that of Moab redaction. See Otto, \textit{Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43}, 254.
\textsuperscript{59} Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 34.
31-34* as the end of the entire Pentateuch. Otto thinks that some other passages of Leviticus and Numbers were added after the Pentateuchal redaction. The Pentateuch was finally closed during the end of the 4th century BCE.

For Otto, Num 20:1-13 and Deut 32:48-52 were products of the Hexateuch redaction, Num 27:12-14 was a later supplement after the Pentateuch redaction. Therefore, the diachronic order of the three texts is: Num 20:1-13, Deut 32:48-52, and then Num 27:12-14. All three are post-Priestly products. His model explains that the coexistence of the Priestly and non-Priestly language in the passages are due to the combination of the two different programmes under the faith of “One God.”

---

63 Otto, *Deuteronomium 1, 1-4.43*, 255.
67 Otto’s conclusion on the chronological order of Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 is not convincing. It is because some differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 may be well explained by that the Deuteronomic text alters the Numbers text, but not vice versa. The observations on the change of the explanatory conjunctions, and the change of the נַעַשׂ (Num 27:14) to a subordinate clause יָרָה (Deut 32:51) is an indication of a re-writing in Deut 32:51.
68 As a student of Otto, Reinhard Achenbach has developed his reconstruction of the book of Numbers based on Otto’s hypothesis. Achenbach also agrees that the end of P is in the book of Exodus. The difference is that Achenbach focuses meticulously on the final process of the addition of the supplements after the Hexateuchal redaction and the Pentateuchal redaction. He proposes a three-stage “theocratic” revision after the Pentateuch redaction. The first stage was on the sanctuary, the constitution of Israel and the inheritance of the land. In the second stage, purity and ritual laws were inserted. In the third and final stage, “theocratic” legends and other redactions were added. According to Achenbach, Num 20:1-13 was mainly from the Pentatuech redaction. The death of Miriam at Kadesh (Num 20:1ab) was composed by post-exilic scribes, while the wandering to the wilderness of Zin (Num 20:1aa) and the story at the waters of Meribah (Num 20:2-13) were rewritten by the Pentateuch redactors. Deut 32:48-52 was from the Pentateuch redaction. Num 27:12-14 was from the first stage of “theocratic” revision. Thus, in Achenbach’s model, Deut 32:48-52 is earlier than Num 27:12-14. See R. Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (BZAR 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 302, 308, 324, 557-561, 636, 638.
(c) Thomas Römer’s model

The mixture of P and non-P language can be explained by the model of Römer, who proposes that the book of Numbers was formed as a bridge between the Triteuch and Deuteronomy. Römer also accepts Perlitt’s idea that Deut 32:48-52 is not a product from the Priestly School. He proposes that the book of Numbers is the last book formed in the Pentateuch. It was inserted as a bridge connecting the Triteuch (Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus) and Deuteronomy. Römer argues that Exodus and Leviticus were already closed when Numbers was formed because the content of Num 1-10 should be better fitted into Exodus and Leviticus (because these two books also contain a lot of legal texts and lists), “but had not been added into them.”

Römer’s view can be seen as an extended version of Martin Noth’s view on the formation of the book of Numbers. Noth has already stated that the peculiar nature of the book of Numbers should be linked to the peculiar position and function of the book within the framework of the Pentateuch as a whole. With the “bringing of the narratives of Num 20-21,” the Pentateuch was approaching a close. For Noth, the last third of Numbers was a place where later insertions could be made when the Pentateuch had almost reached its conclusion. The place of insertion can be found

---

70 Noth, Numbers, 5.
71 Noth, Numbers, 7.
72 Noth, Numbers, 9.
in Numbers only because the other four books\textsuperscript{73} were fixed. New passages could not be inserted into these four books. The book of Numbers had not been fixed yet at that time, and later insertions were added into it. For Römer, not just the last third of Numbers, but the whole book of Numbers was a later insertion.

According to Römer, the book of Numbers is a post-Priestly product. There are two main reasons. First, he accepts the idea that the end of P is in Lev 9 (the cult of Israel).\textsuperscript{74} All materials later than Lev 9, including Numbers, must be post-Priestly. Second, the book of Numbers should be understood as reinterpretations of the positive accounts recorded in Exodus.\textsuperscript{75} The wilderness narratives in the early prophets and the book of Exodus were originally positive accounts of YHWH’s care for his people.\textsuperscript{76} The Priestly source also represents this view.\textsuperscript{77} However, the wilderness stories in Numbers are negative. Thus, this transformation from positive to negative is a sign of reinterpretations. Hence, the book of Numbers is post-Priestly.

Römer also borrows Noth’s idea of “successive supplementation” and William McKane’s theory of “rolling corpus” to explain the process of the formation of the book of Numbers. He states that the suggestion of “successive supplementation” may also apply partially to Num 11-20,\textsuperscript{78} while the idea of “rolling corpus” may also

\textsuperscript{73} Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy.
\textsuperscript{74} Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 426.
\textsuperscript{75} Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 432-433.
\textsuperscript{76} Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 430-432.
\textsuperscript{77} Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 432.
\textsuperscript{78} Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 436.
apply to other parts of the book of Numbers. Focusing on the formation of Num 11-20, Römer makes the point that Deut 1 and Num 13-14 are the kernels for the growth of part of Num 11-20. After Num 13-14 was formed, then Num 11:4-35 and Num 20:1-13 were added. Both passages are related to the theme of food and water as well as about Moses’ revolt against YHWH. The addition of Num 11:4-35 and Num 20:1-13 “transformed” Exod 15-17 into rebellion accounts. Later, Num 12:2-9; 12:1; 12:10-15 and 11:1-3 were added. Finally, Num 16-17, 15 and 18-19 were supplemented to Num 11-20 in several stages. Thus Römer presents Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 as post-Priestly, and the co-existence of P and non-P language is due to the bridging of Deuteronomy to the Triteuch.

(d) Israel Knohl’s model

Israel Knohl’s study is later than Perlitt’s article by seven years, but he neither refers to it nor develops a new hypothesis based on Perlitt’s view. However, it is still necessary to examine Knohl’s view since his opinion has received a lot of attention and responses from scholars. Knohl’s opinion is different from the traditional documentary hypothesis, according to which P is later than D and H (the Holiness School). Knohl argues that P is earlier than D and is edited by H. According to him,

---

79 Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 428, 436, 444.
81 Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 435.
82 Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 442.
83 Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 442.
even the Torah is edited by H.\textsuperscript{84}

Knohl claims that the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School are two different schools of thought.\textsuperscript{85} The Priestly Torah was produced in the period between the erection of the temple of Solomon and the reigns of King Ahaz and Hezekiah.\textsuperscript{86} His evidence includes the description of the tabernacle, the text which reflects the secured status of the priests, and the isolation of the priests from the people.\textsuperscript{87} The Holiness School was formed when there was a change in Priestly circles during the reigns of King Ahaz and Hezekiah.\textsuperscript{88} The content of Holiness School is against the background of the social-economic polarization and the religious crisis that developed in this period.\textsuperscript{89}

In the Priestly Torah, the commandments given at Sinai are related to the ritual-cultic sphere, but are not about social justice.\textsuperscript{90} Such teaching of the Priestly Torah was criticized by the prophets.\textsuperscript{91} The Holiness School created the broader concept of holiness that integrates morality and cult, in order to respond the prophets’ criticism.\textsuperscript{92} Knohl concludes that the Holiness School is later than the Priestly Torah,\textsuperscript{93} and the Holiness School also redacted the P stratum.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{84} Israel Knohl, \textit{The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School} (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 226. Knohl uses “HS” to represent “the Holiness School.”
\textsuperscript{86} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 57.
\textsuperscript{87} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 57.
\textsuperscript{88} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 56.
\textsuperscript{89} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 56.
\textsuperscript{90} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 52.
\textsuperscript{91} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 56.
\textsuperscript{92} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 57.
\textsuperscript{93} Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 51, 57.
Knohl’s classification on the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13 is based on his uncommon view on the Priestly writings. For Knohl, the Priestly Torah is a purer Priestly cultic conception, while the Holiness School displays a Priestly-popular orientation.95 Besides, “the affinity to the language of non-Priestly sources is one of the hallmarks of the Holiness School.”96 Most of the Priestly materials in the book of Numbers, according to Knohl, were products of the Holiness School.97 Only Num 5:11-31; 6:1-21; 19 and 28-29 were from the Priestly Torah, but they were all adapted and edited by the Holiness School.98 According to Knohl, Num 20:1-13 was of JE origin and edited by the Holiness School.99

Knohl considers Deut 32:51 as a repetition of Num 27:12-13, and they were also products of the Holiness School.100 He accepts the idea from Noth that this repetition became necessary after the book of Deuteronomy was appended to the Genesis-Numbers corpus.101 He suggests that the Deuteronomistic School had written and edited the book of Deuteronomy, and the Holiness School was
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94 Knohl, “Priestly Torah,” 51.
95 Knohl, Sanctuary, 44.
96 Knohl, Sanctuary, 82.
97 Knohl, Sanctuary, 100.
98 Knohl, Sanctuary, 104.
99 Knohl, Sanctuary, 105.
100 Knohl, Sanctuary, 95, 105-106. He thinks that the proof of the origin of the Holiness School in the final editorial stratum can be seen in Num 20:12. There is a direct address by God to Moses and Aaron in which God spoke in the first person. This “direct address by God to Moses and Aaron” is a characteristic of the Holiness School. The other four passages (Lev 14:33-34; Lev 15:31; Num 14:26-27 and Num 16:20-21), in which the first person pronoun appears in the divine speech to Moses and Aaron, all belong to the editorial stratum of the Holiness School. But in the Priestly Torah, the first person pronoun is used in the divine speech exclusively when divine words are addressed to Moses alone. See Knohl, Sanctuary, 94-95.
101 Knohl, Sanctuary, 95.
apparently responsible for attaching the book of Deuteronomy to the Tetrateuch. \(^{102}\)

He further states that in the beginning of the Persian period, the Holiness School concluded its activities with the final redaction of the Pentateuch. \(^{103}\) Thus, for Knohl, Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are all products of the Holiness School. \(^{104}\) The editors of the Holiness School often incorporated JE elements into Priestly language. That is why there is a mixture of styles. \(^{105}\)

There is no lack of divergent views. For instance, Baruch Levine says that Num 20 was redacted by the Priestly School, and the JE material of Num 20:1-13 has been reworked by the Priestly writers. \(^{106}\) According to Levine, Num 27:12-14 is a Priestly account. \(^{107}\) He mentions that Deut 32:49 is “assigned to the Priestly source” \(^{108}\) without any reference to Perlitt’s study. Other scholars such as Davies, Knohl, Sanctuary, 103.

\(^{103}\) Knohl, Sanctuary, 226.

\(^{104}\) Jacob Milgrom agrees with Knohl that there must be a clear distinction between the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School. For instance, he states that H introduces three radical changes regarding P’s notion of holiness. However, he has some reservations about Knohl’s classification on the amount of passages edited by the Holiness School in the book of Numbers. Milgrom states that it is certain Num 3:11-13; 8:15b-19; 15:1-41 are from the Holiness School. Other texts which probably should be assigned to the Holiness School are Num 3:40-51; 5:1-3; 9:9-14; 10:10; 19:10b-13; 28:2b; 29:39; 33:50-56 and 35-36. Milgrom criticises that the remaining passages (including Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) in Knohl’s list might be from the Holiness School, but there is insufficient evidence. Although Milgrom has written the article “Priestly ("P") Source” in the Anchor Bible Dictionary, he himself doubts the existence of a discrete literary source for the Priestly writings in a commentary of the book of Numbers. He uses the term “Priestly” only when focusing on matters of style and ideology. He admits that he has no reasonable assurance that his identification of any Priestly narrative is correct. But he states that Num 20: 6 belongs to P, and Num 20:9 is one of the Priestly texts. See Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1325-1330, 1334, 1343-44, 1850; idem, “The Changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19,” in Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas (ed. John F. A. Sawyer; JSOTSup 227; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 67; idem, “Priestly ("P") Source,” ABD 5: 454-461; idem, Numbers (JPSTC; Philadelphia, PA.: JPS, 1989), xix; idem, Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 140, 589.

\(^{105}\) Knohl, Sanctuary, 95.

\(^{106}\) Levine, Numbers 1-20, 483-4.

\(^{107}\) Levine, Numbers 21-36, 352, 353.

\(^{108}\) Levine, Numbers 21-36, 348.
Frankel, Knierim and Coats, Schmidt, Seebass and Ska also keep the traditional view and consider most of Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 to be products of the Priestly School.¹⁰⁹

From the above discussion of the various approaches to the formation of the Pentateuch, we can find that there are great differences in the scale among the approaches. Knohl takes the Holiness School as the redactor of the Pentateuch; Römer suggests the bridging of the Triteuch with Deuteronomy; Otto’s proposes the redactions of Hexateuch and the Pentateuch; the model of Kratz is in the largest scale that it involves the formation of the Enneateuch by redactional expansion. Although the scales are different, they all agree that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are post-Priestly. This brings out a point that “post-Priestly” is just a diachronic term clarifying that it is later than the Priestly writing. “Post-Priestly” is not necessarily anti-Priestly. One of the contributions of Perlitt’s article is that it shows the possibility that the scribal school in the post-exilic period would blend the phraseology and style of the Deuteronomic School with that of the Priestly School. Thus, the later redactor was influenced by different schools of traditions and theologies. Although we may be able to exclude the possibility that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 (and Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14) was from the Priestly School, we

cannot exclude that there are Priestly elements in this passage. The final redactor, who was not from the Priestly School in the strict sense, would have been affected by the theology of the Priestly School and the Holiness School. Blending the language and theologies of different schools, the later redactor produced a new tradition which could speak to his situation.

(3) Summary

Vocabulary, style and theology cannot be used as the criteria for the evidence for the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. There is a mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in these three texts. The blending of P and non-P language in these three passages can be understood as signs of “post-Priestly” additions during the formation of the Pentateuch. We have selectively reviewed the current scholarship on the formation of the Pentateuch with an eye on the Priestly and non-Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. There is a tendency that the Pentateuch texts can be classified to “pre-Priestly,” “Priestly,” and “post-Priestly.” The models of Kratz, Otto, Römer and Knohl all perceive the three texts (Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) as post-Priestly, and as the result of supplements. But post-Priestly does not necessarily mean anti-Priestly. It is possible that the later scribal school has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch.
2. Review of previous studies on divine anger in Deuteronomy

There is no study of the topic of divine anger that solely focuses on the book of Deuteronomy. Most of the older dictionary articles and essays discuss the idea or theology of divine anger/wrath in the whole Hebrew Bible, and seldom concentrate only on the passages of Deuteronomy. They prefer to give a synthesis of the concept of divine anger from the whole Hebrew Bible. Some of them devote part of the work into the discussion of divine anger in Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic History. The following studies are selected because they give contributions to the understanding of divine anger in Deuteronomy. It will be suggested that there are at least four approaches to the issue of divine anger.

110 The following summaries of some articles and essays can illustrate this common method. For instance, J. Orr says that anger is an energy of the divine nature called forth by the presence of daring or presumptuous transgression, and expressing the reaction of the divine holiness against it in the punishment or destruction of the transgressor. Divine anger has thus always an ethical connotation, and manifests itself to ends of righteousness and mercy. Such anger should not be weakened down into a mere “anthropomorphism” or “general expression for God’s aversion to sin,” but should be regarded as a real affection of divine nature. See J. Orr, “Anger (Wrath) of God,” DBH 1: 97-99; T. B. Kilpatrick states that the nature of divine anger is always to be understood by reference to the central truth of YHWH’s self-revelation that YHWH is a covenant God of His people. When the salvation of His people is infringed, He will be angry. Divine anger is manifested in judgments following upon wicked deeds. The wrath of God can be turned away as it is controlled by divine love (the ultimate divine purpose). See T. B. Kilpatrick, “Anger (Wrath) of God,” in ERE 1: 477-482; B. T. Dahlberg defines anger as: “The biblical conception of the Deity’s threatening with annihilation the existence of whatever opposes his will and purpose or violates his holiness and love.” He then discusses on “Irrational wrath,” “Wrath and Sin,” “Instruments of the divine wrath,” “The day of Wrath,” “Salvation from the wrath of God,” “The wrath of God and his love.” According to Dahlberg, in the Hebrew Bible the wrath of God may be provoked against Israel, individuals or groups within Israel, nations and their rulers, and mankind in general. See B. T. Dahlberg, “Wrath of God,” IDB 4:903-906.

111 The boundaries between different approaches are fluid. Some scholars may apply two or three approaches together. The classification of the approaches is just for the sake of clarity.
(1) Thematic approach

There is a section discussing the theology of divine anger in Deuteronomy in Albrecht Ritschl’s massive work *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation).\(^\text{112}\) In that section, Ritschl points out that the wrath of God is caused by the problems of the Israelites, such problems include their falling from the covenant, and their actions which may be regarded as a breach of covenant.\(^\text{113}\) When the Israelites worship foreign gods or make political union with foreign nations, they contradict the theocratic destiny of the covenant people.\(^\text{114}\) The Israelites who violated the covenant would be utterly destroyed.\(^\text{115}\) Ritschl concludes that the original concept of divine wrath is connected with the experience of sudden and surprising death in the case of those who have broken the conditions of the covenant.\(^\text{116}\)

Ritschl’s treatment on the covenant theme to divine anger is influential, even some current scholars use this similar idea to explain the occurrence of divine wrath.\(^\text{117}\) Although this approach can give a big picture for the theme, there are two

---

\(^{112}\) Albrecht Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Vol. II (3d ed.; Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1889) (1st ed.: 1874). Although this book is very old, it is also influential, as we shall see, some recent scholars still repeat ideas similar to Ritschl’s conclusion.

\(^{113}\) Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 127.

\(^{114}\) Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 127.


\(^{116}\) Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 129.

\(^{117}\) For instance, Herbert Haney also points out the tight connection between the wrath of God and the covenant. According to Haney, the wrath of God was provoked because the covenant was either “abrogated or abhorred.” Wrath fell upon the Israelites because they broke the covenant, and wrath fell upon “enemy nations” because they abhorred the covenant. See Herbert M. Haney, *Wrath of God in the Former Prophets*, (New York: Vantage Press, 1960), 17. Victor Matthews says that the Israelites were in a “treaty or covenant” relationship with YHWH. This relationship placed obligations on both parties and also stipulated specific penalties because of failure to abide by the terms of the treaty. The phrase “the anger of YHWH” occurs as a theological explanation for YHWH’s justified
limitations of such approach. Firstly, when the emphasis is on the process of synthesis and the common point of the passages, it may overlook the nuances among the passages. Secondly, the synthesised theme may be a product of generalisation and gross oversimplification. The theme may not be true to the context of the biblical texts. For instance, Ritschl has not dealt with most of the text in Deuteronomy. Part of his observations and conclusions are from his selection of Deut 4:24; 6:15; 9:8, 14, 19; 11:17; 29:27. Therefore his conclusion cannot be applied in all the passages with divine anger in Deuteronomy, and does not directly relate to the texts of our present study. In Deut 1:34 the wrath of God is not a result of the breaking of the covenant. According to the context of Deut 1:19-40, the main problem of the Israelites is their lack of faith, not their breach of the covenant. The Israelites suspected that YHWH hated them and wanted to destroy them by the hand of the Amorites. They did not believe that God would fight for them (Deut 1:32-33). In this case, they did not break a covenant. In addition, in Deut 1:37; 4:21 the anger of YHWH on Moses is also not caused by any action which can be claimed as breaking of the covenant. Thus,

response based on the Israelites’ violation of the covenant. See Victor H. Matthew, * Judges and Ruth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 50-51. In the last chapter of Deena Grant’s monograph, which attempts to deal with divine anger in the whole Hebrew Bible, it also states that divine anger arises over the Israelites’ breach of the covenant God made with the patriarchs and renewed with the subsequent generations. The wrath of God is also tempered by this covenant. The promise of tempered anger functions rhetorically to urge Israel to turn toward their covenant partner. See Deena E. Grant, *Divine Anger in the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 52; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 165-66. However, the section of “Angers at Individuals in Deuteronomy and the Historical Books” in her monograph is very short, just has two paragraphs across two pages, discussing Deut 29:18-19; Achan (Joshua), Jerobam (1Kgs 14:9), and Basha (1 Kgs 16:2) only. Although Grant’s monograph is the most current treatment on the issue of divine anger, her study on the book of Deuteronomy is highly selective. The wrath of God on Moses is never mentioned in her book, and her main observations and conclusions cannot be applied on Deut 1:37; 3:26 and 4:21 for our present study.
Ritschl’s comment on the divine wrath in the historical books, although including Deuteronomy, cannot explain the relation between the exclusion of Moses and the anger of God.

(2) Word study approach

In the third part of his *TDNT* article, Johannes Fichtner discusses six topics about divine wrath in the Hebrew Bible.\(^{118}\) The first is a word study of the expressions of divine anger. Second, Fichtner shows that the two main objects of divine anger include the Israelites and the nations.\(^{119}\) Third, he clarifies that sickness, persecution, the threat of premature death and other disasters are all signs of wrath.\(^{120}\) Fourth, Fichtner talks about the innermost nature of divine wrath, irrational/ incomprehensible, and examples of texts pointing out that divine anger is a reaction to human failure.\(^{121}\) In the Pentateuch, divine wrath smites the people when they rebel against His will;\(^{122}\) while in the Deuteronomistic History, the apostasy of the Israelites is the recurring reason for divine wrath against the Israelites.\(^{123}\) Fifth, Fichtner introduces the outbreak, duration and turning aside of divine wrath.\(^{124}\) Sixth and finally, the relationships between divine wrath and divine holiness, divine

\(^{120}\) Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:399-401.
\(^{121}\) Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:402.
\(^{122}\) Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:402.
\(^{123}\) Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:403.
righteousness and divine mercy are discussed.\textsuperscript{125}

One of Fichtner’s contributions is that he approaches the issue by paying attention to the usage of specific words for divine anger. Such linguistic information provides the basic ground for the discussion of that issue. He points out that some words, such as בְּשֵׁם יְהֹוָה or גֵּדָה יְהֹוָה and רָעָה יְהוָה are used in the Hebrew Bible exclusively for divine wrath.\textsuperscript{126} There are some combinations of terms used only to denote the wrath of God, such as נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה.\textsuperscript{127}

In addition, he argues that when the nouns for anger link with the name YHWH, such as בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, נֶמְרָה יְהוָה, this connection is of supreme theological significance because the name יְהוָה is a name of the covenant God. Such consistent linkage shows that the idea of anger is closely bound up with faith in the covenant.\textsuperscript{128} This claim is well accepted by other scholars, for example, Dahlberg also states that when a term for wrath is connected with a name for the Deity in the Hebrew Bible, the divine name is almost always that of YHWH, the covenant God.\textsuperscript{129}

However, one may doubt whether Fichtner’s above claim is justified for he says that divine wrath is connected to the covenant by the using of the name YHWH. We propose the context of the passage is more important than the connection with the divine name. There are examples that breaking of the covenant is related to divine

\textsuperscript{125} Fichtner, \textit{TDNT} 5:407-409.
\textsuperscript{126} Fichtner, \textit{TDNT} 5:395-396.
\textsuperscript{127} Fichtner, \textit{TDNT} 5:396.
\textsuperscript{128} Fichtner, \textit{TDNT} 5:396.
anger although the nouns for anger are not linked with the name YHWH. In Deut 29:23-24, the noun פָּרֶךְ is not combined with the name YHWH, but the context itself shows that divine wrath is caused by the abandonment of the covenant. Therefore the context of the passage is the primary factor to govern the connection between divine wrath with the covenant.

Besides, some of Fichtner’s statements have the problem of “generalization.” He states that divine wrath smites the one who has rebelled against His will, and the Israelites’ apostasy is the recurring reason for divine wrath against His people. This conclusion is too general to be applied to some texts in Deuteronomy. In the spy story Moses is neither said to rebelling against God’s will nor accused of any apostasy. Therefore, Fichtner’s treatment cannot solve our question of the relation of divine anger and the exclusion of Moses.

(3) The approach in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History

Many scholars have recognised that the theme of divine anger occupies an important position in the Deuteronomistic History. For instance, Ralph Klein states that the Deuteronomistic historian asks why YHWH has destroyed His land. The Deuteronomistic historian himself answers that it is because the people had served other gods, and forsaken the covenant of YHWH. The result of these transgressions

---

130 Fichtner, TDNT 5:402.
131 Fichtner, TDNT 5:403.
is an outbreak of divine anger.\textsuperscript{133} Similarly, Rudolf Smend points out that the
Deuteronomistic writings display a scheme of judgment in which God directs his
wrath against the Israelites because of their disobedience and idolatry, by which they
provoked YHWH to anger.\textsuperscript{134} Furthermore, Thomas Römer indicates that the whole
Deuteronomistic History maintains the assertion that the end of the monarchy, the
destruction of Jerusalem and the loss of the land result from YHWH's anger.\textsuperscript{135}
Moreover, Reinhard Achenbach also considers the motif of YHWH’s wrath becomes
the key to understand Israel’s demise when the Deuteronomistic/Deuteronomistic
covenant theology is under the influence of the Assyrian/Babylonian oaths of
vassality.\textsuperscript{136}

Anthony Hanson may be one of the pioneers who have observed the importance
of the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History. He
observes that divine wrath is not very prominent in JE or P, but occurs very
frequently in Deuteronomy and the “Deuteronomistic parts of the Pentateuch.”\textsuperscript{137}
Hanson believes that a moral principle in history is needed in the time of the
Deuteronomist.\textsuperscript{138} In Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic work, divine wrath is
increasingly moralized and rationalized, and approximates to the personal reaction of
YHWH to special flagrant sins, idolatry in particular.\textsuperscript{139} The Deuteronomic School

\begin{footnotes}
\item[133] Klein, Israel, 25.
\item[134] Rudolf Smend, “Wrath of God (OT),” EncChr 5: 811.
\item[135] Römer, So-called, 116.
\item[138] Hanson, Wrath, 39.
\item[139] Hanson, Wrath, 37.
\end{footnotes}
depicts the wrath as a working principle in history.\(^{140}\) Hanson’s observation on the high occurrence of divine anger in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History has set a base for further study.

Jörg Jeremias states that the anger of God plays a vital role in the Deuteronomistic History.\(^{141}\) The anger of God was caused by the grave sin of Israel.\(^{142}\) The Deuteronomistic theologians tried to understand the destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem from the knowledge of God’s wrath and the awareness of the severe sin of the people.\(^{143}\) Jeremias observes two characteristics of the Deuteronomistic History. First, God’s wrath is not mentioned in the older “source texts”\(^{144}\) but in the “interpretive Deuteronomistic texts.” Divine anger is an element of interpretation of history from the exodus to the fall of the kingdom in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem.\(^{145}\) Second, the Deuteronomistic theologians use different words of divine anger to distinguish different types and concepts of divine wrath in four different periods of Israel’s history.\(^{146}\)

In the period of Moses, Jeremias concentrates only on the text of the golden calf (Deut 9-10), but not the text of the spy story or the exclusion of Moses. Jeremias points out that the Deuteronomistic work would like to present that the Israelites

\(^{140}\) Hanson, *Wrath*, 37.


\(^{142}\) Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 46.

\(^{143}\) Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 46.

\(^{144}\) Eg.: 2 Sam 9-20; 1 Kgs 1-2; 17-19; 2 Kgs 1-8.


\(^{146}\) The period of Moses; the period of Joshua and the judges; the period of the Northern Kingdom (Israel); the period of the Southern Kingdom (Judah). See Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 54.
deserved God’s wrath because they had sinned in the beginning of their history.\textsuperscript{147}

In Deut 9-10, the Israelites provoked God to anger. They also provoked God before the destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{148} The story of the golden calf is connected with the sins of the divided kingdoms by using of the verbs בזון ("to provoke… to anger") and נזק ("to be angry"), and similar wordings such as “since the day they/ their fathers came out of Egypt” (Deut 9:7; 2 Kgs 21:15).\textsuperscript{149}

The Israelites, according to Jeremias, deserved to be destroyed because of their accumulative sins from the period of exodus to the period of the divided kingdoms. However, they were neither destroyed in the incident of the golden calf nor the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{150} In Deut 9-10, the Israelites were saved by the intercession of Moses. During the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, the people were deported into exile.\textsuperscript{151}

Although the text in Deut 1-4 is not the focus of Jeremias’ book, and his treatment does not directly contribute to our investigation of divine wrath on Moses, his study is still useful for it shows that some passages in the book of Deuteronomy can be understood in the Deuteronomistic History.

Kari Latvus attempts to identify the redaction activities that handle divine anger in D, P, book of Joshua and Judges.\textsuperscript{152} Latvus claims that in the original short

\textsuperscript{147} Jeremias, Zorn Gottes, 68.
\textsuperscript{148} Jeremias, Zorn Gottes, 69.
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\textsuperscript{151} Jeremias, Zorn Gottes, 73.
\textsuperscript{152} Kari Latvus, God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings (JSOTSup 279; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998),
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history of the Deuteronomists, YHWH’s anger is not a theme because there are only two passages (Deut 1:27, 34). This theme, according to Latvus, was introduced by the redactors of DtrN-group after the Deuteronomistic History was expanded and mentioned the anger theme. The DtrN historians rationalised the meaning of exile and interpreted that it was caused by divine wrath which in turn was caused by idolatry of the Israelites. In such claims, the Deuteronomistic historians understood that the Israelites were responsible for the guilt of national and historical events. The wrong religious attitudes and behavior of the Israelites were the reason for exile. The theology of anger is deeply bound to experiences of national catastrophes and crises, and ought to be evaluated only in that context. The values of the past are interpreted in the light of historical events and experiences.

Latvus’ study is worthy of note on the issue of the redaction of DtrN. For our present study, however, one point should be assessed. On the one hand, Latvus claims that the anger theme did not belong to the pre-exilic Deuteronomic law code, but was really a (late-) Deuteronomistic invention. On the other hand, he also notices the two passages (Deut 1:27 and 1:34) come from the basic text of the Deuteronomistic historian. It seems that Latvus contradicts himself. If divine

26. DtrN = the nomistic layer, which is formed during the exile, has an interest in law and emphasises the role of Moses as interpreter of the law.
156 Latvus, *Ideology*, 86.
anger has been already mentioned in the older layer of Deuteronomy, then it would not be an invention.

In her study, Samantha Joo traces the development of the usage of the Hiphil of the verb חלל in the Deuteronomistic History and Book of Jeremiah. She claims that this verb is a vital theological term in the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah. Joo adopts the “two level theory” of the Deuteronomistic History. She agrees that at least two layers of editorial work can be detected in the Deuteronomistic History. The “first redaction level” of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH1) compiled a continuous narrative from a pool of stories or an earlier prophetic source during the period of Josiah, while the “second redaction level” of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH2) modified these stories to explain the fall of Jerusalem and Samaria.

In DtrH1 the Hiphil of the verb חלל functions as a pivot, herding the punishment in the curse formulae against the first three dynasties and in the narrative recounting their fulfillment. There is no explicit claim that YHWH is the initiator of the calamities. Human and natural instruments fulfill God’s pronouncement against the dynasties.

---

161 Samantha Joo, Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology (BZAW 361; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).
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163 Joo, Provocation, 26.
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DtrH2 adopts the term הָבַלִּים to explain the fall of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{168} In these post-exilic levels of the Deuteronomistic History, הָבַלִּים usually links the catalog of sins to the punishment.\textsuperscript{169} Contrary to DtrH1, God is usually the primary agent of the punishment.\textsuperscript{170} God’s involvement is more explicit than the descriptions of the punishment in DtrH1.\textsuperscript{171} YHWH is depicted as the initiator of the calamities and the people should bear the responsibility for the exile.\textsuperscript{172} The crisis arising from the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 BCE and the deportations of its people to Babylon is the factor which would prompt DtrH2 to reconfigure the method in which DtrH1 explained the historical events.\textsuperscript{173}

The entry point of Joo is the passages that contain the Hiphil of הָבַל. Not all of Joo’s conclusion may give direct contribution to our present study because the verb הָבַל does not occur in the three passage containing divine anger on Moses (Deut 1:37; 3:26 and 4:21). However, Deut 4:25, which is also in the same context as Deut 4:21, does contain the verb הָבַל. According to Joo, Deut 4:25 is redacted by DtrH2 who depicts that God is the primary agent of destruction to the Israelites for their apostasy. This conclusion will be contributed to our discussion in Chapter Six when we deal with Deut 4.

Two others scholars, Dennis McCarthy and Norbert Lohfink, have clearly


\textsuperscript{169} Joo, \textit{Provocation}, 115.

\textsuperscript{170} Joo, \textit{Provocation}, 115-226.

\textsuperscript{171} Joo, \textit{Provocation}, 226.

\textsuperscript{172} Joo, \textit{Provocation}, 226.

\textsuperscript{173} Joo, \textit{Provocation}, 228.
expounded how the theme of divine anger works with the structure and theology of the Deuteronomistic work. McCarthy suggests that there are two formulae on the wrath of YHWH in the Deuteronomistic History.\textsuperscript{174} First, the “anger formula” which uses the phrase “the anger of YHWH blazes” or “YHWH is angry” is tied to the announcement of penalty. Second, the “provocation formula,” using the phrase “one provokes YHWH to anger,” is not closely tied to a divine judgment announcing a penalty. The two wrath formulae work in the well-knit structure in the Deuteronomistic History, from Deuteronomy to the book of Kings. Lohfink suggests that there is an “exile formula” which has not been noticed.\textsuperscript{175} He classifies McCarthy’s “anger formula” and “provocation formula” into one group rather than two because both of them will result in destruction. Lohfink’s study concentrates on the texts of Deut 28-29 and 2 Kgs 17:21-25, and he finds that the “exile formula” was a re-interpretation of the Deuteronomists who wanted to give hope to the people who were deported into exile, but not destroyed. The studies of McCarthy and Lohfink will be assessed in more detail in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

(4) The approach with ancient Near Eastern parallels

The theme of divine anger in the Hebrew Bible can be understood by comparing


it with the ancient Near Eastern texts. Since the Hebrew Bible is a product of the
Israelites who were surrounded by the ancient Near Eastern culture, such culture may
influence the authors and redactors’ way of thinking. Albrektson is one of
the scholars who observe the similarity in depicting divine anger between the ancient
Near Eastern texts and the Hebrew Bible. Albrektson maintains that the historical
events are interpreted as divine punishment of disobedient princes who incur divine
wrath. Albrektson notices that a Mesopotamian deity cannot simply be explained as a
personification of a certain phenomenon of nature, but is regarded as a personal will
which could influence historical events. Thus an author of an ancient Near
Eastern text explains that the destruction of Babylonia is because of a god’s anger.
Hence, Albrektson’s study has stressed on the similarities between the idea of divine
anger of the Hebrew Bible and that of the ancient Near Eastern culture.

Gray Herion’s article also emphasises that the wrath of YHWH in the Hebrew
Bible should be understood with the comparison of the many portrayals of divine
anger found in numerous ancient Near Eastern texts. Herion distinguishes two
types of ancient Near Eastern texts in depicting the anger of gods. In the first type the
anger of a certain deity is portrayed as an idiosyncratic aspect of that god’s

176 For more study, John C. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions Vol. 1: Hebrew and
(ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 235-236; For recent studies, see Eds. R. G. Kratz and H.
Spieckermann, *Divine Wrath and Divine Mercy in the World of Antiquity* (FAT 2/33; Tübingen: Mohr
Siebeck, 2008).
177 Albrektson, *History and Gods* (Lund: Gleerup, 1967), 100-103. He discusses the Mesha
stone, the curse of Akkad, the Era Epic and the Weidner Chronicle.
personality. Herion clarifies that this ancient Near Eastern picture of the wrath of gods is very different from that of YHWH in the Hebrew Bible, in which YHWH has a desire to restrain His own anger.

The second type can be further divided into two sub-groups. In the first sub-group, the historical devastation of a particular city is attributed to a deity who becomes angry because of some cultic sacrilege. In the second sub-group, a historical catastrophe is attributed to a god who becomes angry because the political leaders (or the people) break certain solemn oaths which they have sworn to keep. In both sub-groups, a god’s legitimate and official wrath is provoked because of human transgressions. Herion points out that the angry YHWH in the Hebrew Bible is similar to the second type divine wrath in the ancient Near Eastern texts. YHWH would be angry with the Israelites when they violated the covenant obligations. The anger of YHWH is not driven by His personal feeling but by His official duty. However, there is a great difference between these ancient Near Eastern depictions of divine wrath and that of YHWH. The ancient Near Eastern texts are written by kings who seek to legitimate their policies. The Hebrew Bible lacks such ideological function.

Furthermore, Herion compares the “Royal” (human) wrath in ancient Near

---

182 Herion lists out eight examples from the ancient Near Eastern texts which depict that the gods or goddess would become angry for no good reason. Some deities cannot control their irrational anger, and must be restrained by the intervention of other deities. See Herion, “Wrath,” 6:991-92.
Eastern texts with YHWH’s wrath.\(^{187}\) He explains that the function of depicting the wrath of Kings is not to humanize the kings but to aggrandize the king.\(^{188}\) According to Herion, when YHWH becomes angry with the Israelites for their violation of covenant, YHWH is portrayed as the “King” of Israel. Also when YHWH is angry with the mythological creatures, He is portrayed as having the sovereignty. Thus, Herion concludes that the anger of YHWH is not used to humanize YHWH, but to exalt Him.\(^{189}\) Thus, Herion’s comparison gives us both the similarities and differences between the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near Eastern texts.

Jörg Jeremias, however, stresses the difference between the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near Eastern parallels. He compares how divine anger is used in the ancient Near East texts and in the Deuteronomistic work. He found that they portray divine anger in different ways. The ancient Near Eastern texts were written after the time of distress had passed, and they tended to emphasize the good deeds of the new king who brought about the “turning point” of the divine wrath.\(^{190}\) In contrast, the Deuteronomistic History was written in times of distress, and it attempted to find out the reasons for God’s wrath.\(^{191}\)

The authors of the Hebrew Bible may agree with their surrounding culture and use similar idea to express their theology of the anger of God. On the contrary, they may also disagree with the surroundings and produce their own view on divine wrath.

---
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The studies of Herion and Jeremias stress that there are also great differences in depicting divine wrath between the ancient Near Eastern texts and the Hebrew Bible. For our present, however, the parallel texts with divine anger are not enough because we need to compare with the punishments which were caused by divine anger. So far, there is no parallel in ancient Near Eastern literature for a leader being forbade from entering a land by his deity, just like the punishment of Moses. Therefore, this type of approach cannot be used for our present study at this moment.

(5) Summary

To summarise, there are three points to note. In the first place, an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God (Fichtner, McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). For instance, Fichtner observes the details in the verb usage and word pairings; McCarthy differentiates the different words used in the “anger formula” and “provocation formula” in the Deuteronomistic History; Joo distinguishes the different usages of the Hiphil of the verb חנן in different layers of the Deuteronomistic work.

Second, the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be primarily understood in its own context (McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). The word study mentioned in the previous point cannot replace an exegesis of a passage in its own context because the meaning of a word can be determined primarily according
to its context. A word in different contexts will give varied meaning.

Third, the theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy can be studied under the framework of the Deuteronomistic History (Jeremias, Latvus, Joo, McCarthy and Lohfink). It can be observed that the usage of certain words of divine anger in Deuteronomy repeats its pattern in the Deuteronomistic work. Divine anger occurs very frequently in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic History, and is an important theme in these books (Hanson, McCarthy and Joo). Besides, if it is accepted that the book of Deuteronomy is part of the Deuteronomistic work, then it is reasonable to understand that theme in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History which depicts the wrath of God as a working principle in history (McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). The exile and the destruction of the people were caused by divine wrath (Hanson, Klein, Lohfink, Joo, Jeremias and Grant).192

3. Review of scholarship on sanctifying God

The meaning of the holiness of God is different from that of sanctifying God. The holiness of God is said to be more than just one divine attribute, and it includes all the riches and life, power and goodness that God possesses.193 In “sanctifying God” or “regarding God as holy,” God is the direct object of the verb “sanctify,” and it is not about a divine attribute. The root יָדַע has a primary positive sense of

192 Although a comparison with the ancient Near Eastern texts can input more perspectives on the issue of divine wrath, the lack of parallel text about a punishment similar to the exclusion of Moses makes such comparison not useful in our present study.

consecration and belonging, and a secondary sense of separation.\textsuperscript{194} The Qal of \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) may be translated as “to be holy,” “to be consecrated” and “to be set apart.”\textsuperscript{195} The Hiphil of \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) means causatively “to consecrate,” “to declare holy,”\textsuperscript{196} and “to make holy, consecrate, offer, surrender to God as a possession.”\textsuperscript{197} When this verb is used with human subject and divine object, for instance in Num 20:12 and 27:14, the Hiphil of \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) means “to treat, consider God as holy.”\textsuperscript{198} In Deut 32:51 the Piel of \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) has the sense of “to consecrate,” “to set apart” and “to consider as holy,”\textsuperscript{199} it refers to “to treat God as holy/ sanctified.”\textsuperscript{200} There are only five occurrences in which the verb \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) is used with human subject and divine object (Num 20:12; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 8:13; 29:23). Such small number of occurrence may account for the rare study of the theme of sanctifying God.

Baruch Schwartz has done an in-depth study on Israel’s holiness in the Torah.\textsuperscript{201} Schwartz clarifies three points on understanding the meaning of the root \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) in order to avoid any pitfall. First, Schwartz lists out two distinct meanings of the root \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \) in the Hebrew Bible. One of them (he gives the symbol: \( \text{\textit{\textendash}} \text{ד} \ I) has the sense of “separated,” “belonging to,” and “designated for.”\textsuperscript{202} This usage is approximated by
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the terms “holy,” “sacred” and their synonyms and derivatives. It expresses the idea that the persons and objects “are designated as belonging or pertaining especially and exclusively” to God. The other one (דָּבָר II) with the meaning “clean” or “purified” is less common. The Priestly tradition avoids using the verb וֹדֵד with this meaning, while the Chronicles uses חָכָם (“to purify”) “quite interchangeably.” Second, Schwartz clarifies that the root וֹדֵד does not convey any “value judgment.” “No intrinsic morality or piety is imputed” to the root in group וֹדֵד I. The root וֹדֵד conveys only “the quality of separateness.” Third and finally, Schwartz states that וֹדֵד does not convey “the abstract idea” of holiness. A sacred object is something which “belongs to the divine sphere.”

Ka Leung Wong also has summarized that there are five key concepts relating to holiness: separation, fearfulness, being contagious by touch under certain conditions, wholeness and ethical dimension. Although Schwartz and Ka Leung Wong have clarified some important concepts related to holiness, their studies do not directly address the issue of sanctifying God.

A “holiness spectrum” is proposed by Philip Jenson, and is used to provide a framework for integrating the theory of idealist and that of realist through their
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common polar structure.\(^{213}\) Jenson studies the structure and interpretation of the four basic dimensions of human experience (space, person, rite and time)\(^{214}\) and suggests that the principle of “grading” has a major role in presenting the concepts, institutions and rituals.\(^{215}\) Although the concept of “order” can provide a valuable guide to unlock the Priestly theology of the cult,\(^{216}\) it seems that such concept does not help much on the question of what sanctifying God means.

The recent article by Anna Angelini and Christophe Nihan is quite comprehensive,\(^{217}\) but there is also no treatment on the idea of “sanctifying God.” Some scholars have attempted to illustrate the relationships among holy, common/profane, clean/pure and unclean/impure by diagrams.\(^{218}\) Although these diagrams can represent how holy is related to various terms in the human sphere, they cannot address the theme of sanctifying God. It is admitted that the observations from the phenomenology of religion, the history of religions and the anthropology of religion all are an indispensable aid to the study of holiness in the Hebrew Bible,\(^{219}\) the meaning of “sanctifying God” is not the focus of their concerns. The above discussion shows that there are numerous perspectives to understand the meaning of


\(^{214}\) Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 88-209.


holiness of God, but the discussion of “regarding God as holy” is very rare.\(^{220}\)

**Sanctifying God as showing His awefulness, power and otherness**

In fact, “sanctifying God” is not totally unrelated to divine holiness. God Himself is holy, and He is also the source of holiness.\(^{221}\) “Sanctifying God” does not mean that there is a change in the status of God from less holy to more holy. It means the holiness of God is manifested. If we understand that “sanctifying God” means “manifesting the holiness of God,” the studies of some scholars on the concept of holiness are still worthy of consulting.

Although there is no mention of “sanctifying God” in Rudolf Otto’s *The Idea of the Holy*, his framework has provided important terms for commentators to express the meaning of sanctifying God. Otto creates a tradition on the study of “the holy.” He adopts from the Latin *numen* and coins a word “numinous” to stand for the experience of “the holy” in the human mind.\(^{222}\) The nature of “numinous” can be reflected in the mind in terms of an incomprehensible feeling of “*mysterium*”

---


\(^{221}\) David P. Wright, “Holiness (OT),” *ABD* 3:237.

tremendum” (aweful mystery). Otto uses different terms to express the meaning of “the holy”: “awefulness,” “overpoweringness,” “energy,” “the wholly other,” and “fascination.” In addition, Otto’s other expressions related to “holiness” of YHWH are “His fury,” “His jealousy,” “His wrath” and “the consuming fire.”

The most influential three terms of Otto are: power, awefulness and the wholly other. Some commentators think of the phrase sanctifying God as showing His power: demonstrating God’s power, might, mighty works, mighty wonders and authority. The religion historian Mircea Eliade claims that the sacred and the profane are two modes of being in the world. The holiness or “the sacred” is “the opposite of the profane.” These modes are two existentia
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situations assumed by man in his history.\textsuperscript{238} He explains that the act of manifestation of the sacred (\textit{hierophany}) is that something sacred show itself to us.\textsuperscript{239} The sacred, as understood by primitives and pre-modern human society, is equivalent to a \textit{power} and reality.\textsuperscript{240} In addition, John Goldingay states that “holiness has something of the dangerous \textit{power} of nuclear energy.”\textsuperscript{241} Furthermore, Derek Tiball understands that when God reveals Himself as holy, He displays His holiness in awesome \textit{power} to His people.\textsuperscript{242} Jacob Milgrom also identifies sanctifying God as providing awe and respect for His \textit{power}.\textsuperscript{243}

Others stress the human response to God. The transcendence of God causes people to fear and respect him, they take sanctifying God to be understood as showing His \textit{Awefulness}: manifesting God’s inapproachability,\textsuperscript{244} honour,\textsuperscript{245} respect,\textsuperscript{246} reverence\textsuperscript{247} and fear.\textsuperscript{248} Others focus on the difference between God and human being. It shows that God is “separated” from human being. They take it to mean showing His \textit{otherness}: acknowledging God’s wholly otherness,\textsuperscript{249} otherness,\textsuperscript{250} god-\textit{ness}\textsuperscript{251} and purity.\textsuperscript{252}
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Sanctifying God as showing His glory

In his book *Holiness of Israel*, John Gammie provides a systematic study on three main stream traditions’ understanding of holiness (Priestly, Prophetic and Wisdom) and also the variations of the three types on holiness. He claims that the concept of the holiness of God is a central concept in the Hebrew Bible. In the tradition of Priestly theology, Gammie has treated the tabernacle, holy time, rites of passage, holy persons and holy acts. Gammie critiques that Rudolf Otto does not use “glory” in his initial descriptive treatment or in his treatment of the Hebrew Bible. Based on the studies of Rolf Rendtorff and Moshe Weinfeld, Gammie points out that “glory” frequently represents divine majesty. Then, he claims that the glory of God is a theme common to the Priestly, Prophetic and apocalyptic literature. Glory is the aspect of the holiness that divinity manifests in some way to human eyes. John Hartley also states that when YHWH manifests Himself, His holiness is visible as glory. Similarly, Gordon Wenham understands

---
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sanctifying God as showing His glory.\textsuperscript{267}

There are a few commentators who highlight the love of God. This group gives a special understanding of divine holiness. The holy God is not really inapproachable, but He cares about human beings. Thus, to sanctify God is to show God’s mercy,\textsuperscript{268} to represent His care, concern and providence.\textsuperscript{269} However, such representations and translations are not supported by any strong argument.

From the above discussion, we may conclude that there are four ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s power, awefulness, otherness and glory. Could these four dimensions be used to clarify the fault of Moses in Num 20:1-13? We will discuss it in Chapter Seven and Eight.

4. Conclusion

Chapter Three is a review of scholarship related to the present study. It is divided into three sections. The first area we have discussed is about the source of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. Based on the persuasive arguments of Perlitt and Nihan, the solution to that problem adopted in this chapter is that Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are probably post-Priestly. It is believed that only style and phraseology is not enough to classify a passage to be Priestly because later redactors can imitate the style of the Priestly School. There are also
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observations of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in the three passages. It is possible that the later scribal redactor has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch. Although there are different models for the formation of the Pentateuch (Kratz’s Enneateuch model, Otto’s Hexateuch-Pentateuch model, Römer’s linkage formation between the Triteuch and Deuteronomy model, and Knohl’s Holiness School redaction model), there is still a tendency that the Pentateuch texts can be classified to “pre-Priestly,” “Priestly,” and “post-Priestly.” The approaches of Kratz, Otto, Römer and Knohl all perceive the three texts (Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) as post-Priestly, and as the result of supplements. But post-Priestly does not exclude the possibility that the final redactor would have been affected by the theology of the Priestly School and the Holiness School. Blending the languages and theologies of different schools, the later redactor produced a new tradition which could speak to his situation.

Second, previous scholarship on divine anger is discussed. We find that the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be primarily understood in its own context. Further, an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God. Finally, the theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy can be studied under the framework of the Deuteronomistic History

Third, a review of scholarship on sanctifying God is provided. There are
numerous perspectives to understand the meaning of holiness of God, but the
discussion of “sanctifying God” is very rare. But we can still find that there are four
ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s power,
awefulness, otherness, and glory.
Chapter Four: Divine Anger on Moses in Deut 1-3

In Chapter Three, it has been discussed that we have to carry out a contextual exegesis of Deut 1-3, a word study on divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy, and an interpretation of the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History. In this present chapter, we will interpret the two passages in Deut 1-3 to determine the relationship between divine anger and the exclusion of Moses. The usage of different words and expressions for divine anger in Deuteronomy will be analysed at the end of this chapter. Deut 4 will be interpreted in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History in the next chapter.

1. Was Moses innocent in Deut 1:19-46?

In Deut 1:37, Moses said that YHWH was angry with him because of the Israelites. The verb יָרָע occurs four times in the book of Deuteronomy and fourteen times in the Hebrew Bible, and is always used with God as its subject.¹ In most of the instances, the human objects (of the verb יָרָע) have sinned.² Why did Moses say that YHWH was angry with him? Has Moses sinned? What has Moses done?

(1) The context of Deut 1:37

¹ Deut 1:37; 4:21; 9:8, 20; 1 Kgs 8:46; 11:9; 2 Kgs 17:18; 2 Chr 6:36; Ezr 9:14; Ps 2:12; 60:3 (1 ET); 79:5; 85:6 (5 ET); Isa 12:1.
² See the discussion in the Excursus in section 3 of this chapter.
The context of Deut 1:37 is the verdict of YHWH to the Israelites (Deut 1:34-40) in the spy story.

In Deut 1-3, the two generations of the Israelites learnt a lesson from history. The importance of obedience to YHWH, who is also the owner of the whole land, is illustrated by a contrast of the battles of the two generations of Israelites who left Egypt. In the first battle (Deut 1:19-46), the Israelites were defeated; later after 38 years, the second generation won two battles. Deut 1:19-46 can be summarized into five sections:

I. 1:19-23 After Moses’ first exhortation, the Israelites suggested the proposal of sending the spies.

II. 1:24-28 Having heard the spies’ reports, the people did not want to go up to take the land.

III. 1:29-33 Moses gave his second exhortation, the people did not believe Moses’ words.

IV. 1:34-40 YHWH gave the verdict to the people

V. 1:41-46 Further disobedience of the Israelites

The above structure highlights the rebellion of the people. The reason for the

---


4 God has the right to give a certain area of the land to a certain nation (Deut 1:8, 20, 21; 2:5, 9, 19, 24, 31; 3:2, 20).

5 In Deut 1:26, 32 and 43, the first exodus generation did not obey the words of YHWH, while in Deut 2:8, 13, 33, 37; 3:3, the second exodus generation obeyed the commands of YHWH.

6 Olson also gives the outline of the story in five parts:
A. The mission of the spies into Canaan and their report (1:19-25)
B. The response of the people-fear and a yearning for security and safety of slavery in Egypt (1:26-28)
failure of the first battle is explained in Deut 1:19-46. Before the first battle, the
Israelites sent spies to the land. The people heard the good version of the report of
the spies (Deut 1:25), but they rebelled against the command of YHWH (Deut 1:26).
Although Moses encouraged them, they did not trust YHWH (Deut 1:30-32).
Therefore, YHWH was angry and swore a new oath. The Promised Land would only
be given to Caleb, Joshua and the second generation (Deut 1:35-39). However, the
first generation did not accept this judgment, and they insisted to go up and fight.
YHWH warned them not to go up and not to fight. The Israelites rebelled against
YHWH’s command again, and they were defeated (Deut 1:41-46). The first battle
was lost because of their successive rebellions against YHWH. We can find that
there are similarities in Part II, III and V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part II Deut 1:24-28</th>
<th>Part III Deut 1:29-33</th>
<th>Part V Deut 1:41-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The words from</td>
<td>“It is a good land…”</td>
<td>“Do not fear…”</td>
<td>“Do not go up nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses or the spies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fight... otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>defeated”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The negative</td>
<td>rebelled (v.26)</td>
<td>did not believe</td>
<td>did not listen and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>(v.32)</td>
<td>rebelled (v.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II, III and V are in a similar pattern: there is always an address to the Israelites
before their response.⁷ The collective responses of the Israelites are: “rebelled”
(Deut 1:26), “did not believe” (Deut 1:32) and “did not listen and rebelled” (Deut

---

C. Moses’ appeal and the people’s refusal (1:29-33)
D. The old generation will die (including Moses) (1:34-40)
E. The people try to take the promise into their own hands (1:41-46)
However, Olson’s outline does not show the theme of the responses of people. See Olson,
_Deuteronomy_, 25.
⁷ Miller also sees that the narrative unfolds in a series of responses to Moses’ command. See Miller,
_Deuteronomy_, 31.
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(2) The complex relation between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46

There is another version of the spy narrative in Num 13-14. This version is more detailed, and can be compared with the Deuteronomic version spy story.

8 Num 13-14 is one of the incidents of a series of murmurings in the wilderness which starts from Num 11. The first incident is that the people took to complaining bitterly before YHWH (Num 11:1-3). The second is that the people wanted meat to eat, not just manna. This complaint initiates the incident of the quail (Num 11:4-35). The third one is that Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses in Num 12. The spy story in Num 13-14 is the fourth one. In all of the incidents, Moses prayed or said to YHWH on behalf of those ones who have complained (Num 11:2, 11, 21; 12:13; 14:13-19). Dennis Olson states that the spy story has been linked by later editors to the census lists in Num 1 and Num 26 which form the basis of the structure of the book. His arguments are: firstly, in Num 14:29, the phrase “who are able to go forth to war,” in Num 1:3 implies an upcoming war. The first military operation prepared by the census in Num 1 is the battle after sending spies in Num 13. Thirdly, the phrase “from twenty years old and upward,” is the recurrent age formula which is used in Num 1. Therefore, all those numbered “from twenty years old and upward” of the first exodus generation in Num 1, are those who are condemned to be destroyed in the wilderness in Num 13-14. Secondly, the phrase “who are able to go forth to war,” in Num 1:3 implies an upcoming war. The first military operation prepared by the census in Num 1 is the battle after sending spies in Num 13. Fourthly, in Num 14:20, YHWH has promised Moses that he will forgive the Israelites as Israelites. Num 26:65, “For YHWH has said to them, ‘They shall die in the wilderness.’” recalls the spy story. Fourthly, in Num 14:20, YHWH has promised Moses that he will forgive the Israelites as Moses had asked him to forgive them (Num 14:13-19). The census list in Num 26 is a confirmation of the word of YHWH. Therefore, Num 13-14 is an important passage in the book of Numbers. See Dennis T. Olson, The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch (BJS 71; Chico, Cali.: Scholars Press, 1985), 138-41.

9 Scholars who agree with the source criticism of the Pentateuch commonly think that Num 13-14 is an interwoven composite of the so-called “J” and “P.” This theory can explain the occurrence of the doublets and inconsistencies in Num 13-14. The following table shows the classification of the “J” and “P” passages in Num 13-14 by some scholars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>J/ JE/ non-P</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray (1903)</td>
<td>13:17b-20, 22-24, 27-31, 33;</td>
<td>13:1-17a, 21-26, 32;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:1*, 3-4, 8-9, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:4, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:1-4, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:5-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:4, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:4, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:1b, 3-4, 8-9, 11-25, 39-45</td>
<td>14:1a, 2, 5-7, 10, 26-29, 33, 34b-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Num 13-14 is earlier than Deut 1:19-46, the possibility that Deut 1:19-46 can assess or share the tradition of Num 13-14 will be greater. On the contrary, if Num 13-14 is later than Deut 1:19-46, it would be difficult to maintain that Num 13-14 can provide exegetical background for Deut 1:19-46. Therefore, it is proper to investigate the relationship between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46.

If the content of Deut 1:19-46 is arranged according to the sequence of incidents of Num 13-14, we may find that there are three parallel accounts of the spy story, two of which (so-called “P” and “non-P”)\(^\text{10}\) are in Num 13-14. The following table lists out the main events in the three accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main events in the three accounts of the spy story</th>
<th>“P” in Num 13-14</th>
<th>“non-P” in Num 13-14</th>
<th>Deut 1:19-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I) The initiation of the spy mission</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The first exhortation of Moses (1:19-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The command of YHWH (13:1-2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The suggestion of the people (1:22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses’ action: sent the men (13:3)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Moses’ action: took twelve men (1:23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The name list of the spies (13:4-16)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses sent them out</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Since the existence of the so-called Yahwist (J) is very controversial in current scholarship of the Pentateuch, this present chapter will use the term “non-P” instead of “J.” See Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation (SBL SymS 34; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006); Rolf Rendtorff, The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch (trans. J. J. Scullion; JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Also, the term “P” is used for the sake of convenience. The Priestly nature of the “P” passages is questioned in recent models accounting for the formation of Numbers and the Pentateuch. See the discussion in Chapter Three of this dissertation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The return of the spies (13:25-26)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fruit of the land (13:26b)</td>
<td>The fruit of the land (13:23b)</td>
<td>The fruit of the land (1:25a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III) The report(s) of the spies</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The first report of the spies: “The Land flows with milk and honey…yet the people are strong.” (13:27-29)</td>
<td>The first report of the spies: “A good land.” (1:25b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The first exhortation of Caleb (13:30)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The negative response of other spies (13:31)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The second report of the spies: The land devours its inhabitants (13:32)</td>
<td>The second report of the spies: We saw the Nephilim (13:33)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V) The response(s) of the leaders to the grumbling of the people</td>
<td>Response of Moses and Aaron (14:5)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The second exhortation of Caleb (14:6-7)</td>
<td>The second exhortation of Caleb (14:8-9)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI) The people did not listen</td>
<td>The negative response of the people (14:10)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The negative response of the people (1:32-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII) The verdict of YHWH and the Prayer of Moses</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>The first speech of YHWH (14:11-12)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Moses’ intercessory prayer (14:13-19)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII) The death of the ten spies

| The death of the ten spies (14:36-38) | --- | --- |
| --- | Further disobedience of the people (14:39-45) | Further disobedience of the people (1:40-46) |

IX) Further disobedience of the people

In general the commentators suppose that Deut 1:19-46 is dependent on the non-P (so called “J”) source or tradition. For instance, Martin Noth thinks that the Deuteronomistic version is an independent variation of the theme based on the non-P version. He believes that “the beginning of the J narrative has been removed by an editor in favour of P.” The Deuteronomistic version, according to Noth, can help to clarify the contents and wording of non-P. However, such one-way direction dependency between Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 cannot be used to account for their complex relationship. In fact we can find the evidence for the dependence in both directions. One of the persuasive arguments for the usage of non-P by the Deuteronomistic version can be found in Deut 1:35-36 and its parallel texts in Num 14:22-23 (non-P). Why is the verb “see” used in Deut 1:35-36?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:22-23 (non-P)</th>
<th>Deut 1:35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כִּי-כָל-הָאָאוֹרֹת</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַעֲבוֹרָתָם אֲחַלְלָה</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמְרֵהּ בֵּיתוֹ</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִמְקֹרֶה וְיִשַׁלָּק</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִדְּקְרֶה</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְיִגְלָק יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִמְקֹרֶה לָהֶם אַלָּבָטָה</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


12 Noth, Numbers, 102.
13 Noth, Numbers, 104.
The judgment against the first generation was that they would not לָצָאת ("to see") the land (Num 14:23; Deut 1:35) and the gift given to Caleb was that he would "see" the land (Deut 1:36). Later, in Deut 1:37-38 the verb עָרַב ("to enter") is used. The verb סָהֵר in Deut 1:35-36 seems unnecessary. It can just say that no one shall "enter" the good land because the combination of the verb עָרַב ("to enter") and הַארָן ("the good land") can be found in Deut 6:18 and 8:7. However, the verb "see" in Num 14:23 is important since it is against the Israelites who "have seen" the glory and signs of YHWH. The punishment of not allowing seeing the land corresponds to the sin of failing to obey God’s word after seeing the glory and signs of God. Thus, the "seeing" in Num 14:23 is connected to its previous content, while there is no such connection in the "seeing" in Deut 1:35. It is likely that Deut 1 depends on the non-P tradition of Num 14:23, and not the other way round.

However, there is also evidence for a late date of non-P in Num 13-14 which

---

15 The combination of “enter” with “land” in Deuteronomy occurs 44 times, while the combination of “see” with “land” occurs only 8 times. This shows that “see the land” is less common in Deuteronomy.

has used the Deuteronomic version. For example, Num 13:22-24 (non-P), which is a parallel texts of Deut 1:24-25, is more elaborated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 13:22-24 (non-P)</th>
<th>Deut 1:24-25a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 And they went up through the Negev, and they came to Hebron and there Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai, the descendants of the Anak were. And Hebron was built seven years before Zoan of Egypt.</td>
<td>24 And they left And they went up into the hill country, and they came to Hebron and there Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai, the descendants of the Anak were. And Hebron was built seven years before Zoan of Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 And they came to the valley of Eshcol and from there they cut down a branch with one cluster of grapes; and they carried it on a pole by two, with some of the pomegranates and the figs.</td>
<td>25a And they took some of the land’s produce with their hands …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 That place was called the valley of Eshcol, because of the cluster which the Israelites cut down from there.

It has been pointed out that the mentioning of Hebron (Num 13:22) by non-P is used to anticipate the divine word concerning Caleb in Num 14:24.\(^\text{17}\) Besides, the theme of the fruit of Eshcol, which is elaborated into miraculous abundance, is related to the etiology of it.\(^\text{18}\) However, there is no such elaboration and etiology in the Deuteronomic version. It seems most reasonable to suppose that non-P has taken up the material in Deut 1 and has developed it further.\(^\text{19}\)

In addition, there is a difference in the expression used to modified the Promised Land in Deut 1:25c and Num 13:27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 13:27b (non-P)</th>
<th>Deut 1:25c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ירים המים</td>
<td>ירים המים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בא עלו אל הארץ אשת עלה ידה</td>
<td>בא עלו אל הארץ אשת עלה ידה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בחק יבש חלב ודבש חמה…</td>
<td>בחק יבש חלב ודבש חמה…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשת יהוה אלהינו נתן לנו</td>
<td>אשת יהוה אלהינו נתן לנו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 13:27b (non-P)</th>
<th>Deut 1:25c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and they said,</td>
<td>and they said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We came to the land to which you sent us and indeed flowing with milk and honey…&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;(It is a) good land which YHWH our God is giving to us.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Num 13:27b, the land is modified by “flowing with milk and honey,” while in Deut 1:25c the land is called a “good” land. The modifier “flowing with milk and honey” can be found in Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3 and 31:20, and therefore some

---

\(^\text{17}\) van Seters, \textit{Life of Moses}, 374.

\(^\text{18}\) van Seters, \textit{Life of Moses}, 374.

\(^\text{19}\) van Seters, \textit{Life of Moses}, 374.
commentators have classified it as a Deuteronomistic phrase.\textsuperscript{20} If the author of Deut 1 uses the non-P passage in Num 13:27b as his source, it is hardly likely that he would have changed “flowing with milk and honey” to “good.”\textsuperscript{21}

Moreover, in Num 14:12 it is said that YHWH would strike the Israelites with pestilence, and He would disinherit them. Then, He would make of Moses a nation greater and mightier than the Israelites. There is a sharp distinction between Moses and the Israelites. However, in Deut 1:37, Moses had to receive a punishment with the Israelites. Moses was not permitted to enter the land, as the Israelites could not see the land. Here, we cannot find a sharp distinction. If the author of Deut 1:19-46 has known Num 14:12, it is hard to understand how they would have been able to write Deut 1:37.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, according to the Numbers, the Israelites were saved by the intercessory prayer of Moses (Num 14:13-19, non-P). YHWH replied to Moses that He would forgive the people just as Moses had asked. If the Deuteronomists have used the non-P source, it is difficult to believe that they dropped out Moses’ intercessory prayer in Num 14.\textsuperscript{23}

In regard to the relation between the “P” passage and the Deuteronomic passage, Eryl Davies says that none of the parallels between Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 stems from the so-called Priestly writing’s version of the spy story, “the literary link may be more closely defined as being between Deut 1:19-46 and the J passages in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} van Seters, \textit{Life of Moses}, 374.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Römer, \textit{So-Called}, 125.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Römer, \textit{So-Called}, 125.
\end{itemize}
Num 13(-14).”  

Therefore, according to Davies, the Deuteronomic account does not reflect any of the peculiarities of P’s style. However, Davies may have overlooked the following examples that give the signs of dependence between Deut 1:9-46 and the “P” texts in Num 13-14.

First, there is an elaboration on the identity of Caleb and Joshua in the Deuteronomic version:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:24 (non-P)</th>
<th>Num 14:30 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:36, 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דודו וְעַלְמַיִלְיָה</td>
<td>... כִּי גֵּרֵל בֶּן יֶפְתָּן ...</td>
<td>36 ... olmadַיִלְיָה וְעַלְמַיִלְיָה ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... והַמְּלָא אֲחַרְוָה</td>
<td>... וַיִּקְרָא יְהֹוָה ...</td>
<td>36 ... והַמְּלָא אֲחַרְוָה ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... וְרַוְעַשׁ בֶּן נָו</td>
<td>... וְרַוְעַשׁ בֶּן נָו ...</td>
<td>38 ... וְרַוְעַשׁ בֶּן נָו ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:24 (non-P)</th>
<th>Num 14:30 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:36, 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ןוּבֵי מַלְיִלְיָה Caleb...</td>
<td>... except Caleb son of Jephunneh</td>
<td>36 except Caleb son of Jephunneh...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and he has wholly followed after Me...</td>
<td>... and Joshua son of Nun.</td>
<td>36 ... wholly followed after YHWH...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Joshua son of Nun...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a repetition that Caleb will enter the land (Num 14:24 [non-P] and 14:30[“P”]). The non-P version modifies Caleb by the expression “my servant,” while the “P” version called him “the son of Jephunneh.” In the non-P version we can find the character of Caleb, “wholly followed after me [=YHWH].” Such description of Caleb’s character is absent in the “P” version. In addition, Joshua is mentioned in the “P” version, but not the non-P version. Caleb is mentioned once in Deut 1:19-46 in which he is modified by “the son of Jephunneh” as the “P” version, as well as “and he wholly followed YHWH” as the non-P version. “Joshua son of

---

24 Davies, Numbers, 129.  
25 Davies, Numbers, 129.
Nun” can also be found in the Deuteronomist version as in “P.” Therefore, we can find a mixing of “P” with non-P in Deut 1:36 and 38. It is possible that the Deuteronomists have used both versions and merged them into one.

In fact, the first mention of Caleb in Deuteronomy is in Deut 1:36, in which he was appreciated by YHWH. Both Caleb and Joshua could enter the land. But we may not understand why they could. They were passive and had not done anything special. If we only rely on Deut 1, we are not sure that Caleb and Joshua were two of the spies. We do not know they had been to Hebron. And when YHWH said that he would give the land on which Caleb set foot (Deut 1:36), we do not know what land Caleb would receive. It is likely that the Deuteronomists not only use a source but presuppose their reader’s knowledge of that source. The presupposed knowledge that Caleb and Joshua were spies and had given a good report about the land in the Numeri version (“P” and non-P) would make the Deuteronomist version more understandable.

Second, Deut 1:39 is parallel to Num 14:31 (“P”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:3 (“P”), 31 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... נֶשֶׁנָה וּמִסְפָּרֵים ידֵיָו לָבֶד ...</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 3</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... וּמִסְפָּרֵים</td>
<td>... אַפְרָה אֱמֶרֶתָה לָבֶד יְהוָה ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 31 מִסְפָּרֵים</td>
<td>... אַפְרָה אֱמֶרֶתָה לָבֶד יְהוָה ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:3 (“P”), 31 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 ... Our wives and our little ones will become booty...</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 127.
YHWH quoted the saying of the first generation to the second generation that the little ones “would become booty” (Num 14:31[“P”]; Deut 1:39). Deut 1:39 refers to an aspect of the people’s fearful reaction to the adverse report of conditions in the land, but there is no earlier hint of their sayings concerning their children. When did the Israelites say that their little ones would become booty? We cannot find any hint in Deut 1. However, from Num 14:3 (“P”) we know that the Israelites said that their wives and our little ones would become booty when they grumbled against Moses. The possibility that the Deuteronomic version uses the “P” version is higher than the other way round.

Third, Deut 1:40 is parallel to another “P” text in Num 14:25:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 14:3-4 (“P”), 25 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 … return to Egypt.</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 …Let us appoint a head and return to Egypt.</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 turn and set out for yourselves to the wilderness</td>
<td>…turn for yourselves and set out to the wilderness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the way of the Reed Sea.</td>
<td>by the way of the Reed Sea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The command “to turn to the way of the Reed Sea” in Num 14:25 (“P”) can be

---

27 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 127.
28 It is also possible that the author of Deut 1:39 assumed that the reader has known the saying of the Israelites in Num 14:3. However, Lohfink argues that the first subordinate clause was a late expansion taken from Num 14:31. See Lohfink, “Canonical Signals,” 30-43.
viewed as a punishment which corresponds to the desire of the Israelites. The people wanted to return to Egypt (Num 14:4 [“P”]) and YHWH fulfilled their desire by commanding them to set out by the way of the Reed Sea (Num 14:25). The command of YHWH in Deut 1:40 could be understood in a similar sense if it presupposes the people’s suggestion of returning to Egypt.

Moreover, there are nearly word for word parallels in Deut 1:25 and Num 13:26 (“P”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 13:26 (“P”)</th>
<th>Deut 1:25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּרְדֵּבֵּן הָעֵדֶת וְעִם הָעֵדֶת וְעִם</td>
<td>וַיֵּרְדֵּבֵּן הָעֵדֶת וְעִמּוֹ הָעֵדֶת וְעִמּוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and they brought back to them a report</td>
<td>and they brought back to us a report…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, in Deut 1:35, the Israelites are called הָעֵדֶת הַרְגוֹי ("this evil generation"), the adjective רָע ("evil") does not occur in the non-P version, but appears in the “P” version (Num 14:27, 35) in which they are called חַסּוֹד הָעֵדֶת הַרְגוֹי ("this evil congregation").

A possible relationship between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46

From the above discussions we have seen Deut 1:19-46 shares or is dependent on part of the traditions of Num 13-14. We have also found some evidence that the Numeri version may have used the Deuteronomistic version. There is two-way inter-dependence between them. In addition, the differences between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 are so great that a common source could not account for all the variants.

We may propose that the Numeri version is formed by integration of the so-called “P” tradition and the non-P tradition which has used Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors. Part of Deut 1:19-46 must share the same traditions of Num 13-14. We may assume that Num 13-14 is based on Deut 1:19-46, but also on an older tradition which may also have been the Vorlage of the spy story of Deut 1.\(^{30}\)

After we have settled the relation between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version, we can compare the image of Moses in Num 13-14 with Deut 1:19-46:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About Moses</th>
<th>Num 13-14</th>
<th>Deut 1:19-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses gives exhortation to the Israelites</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>vv. 20-21, 29-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH wants to make Moses into a nation</td>
<td>14:12 (non-P)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercessory prayer of Moses</td>
<td>14:13-19 (non-P)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine anger on Moses</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>v. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The punishment includes Moses</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>v. 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For our present study, one of the contributions of Num 13-14 to Deut 1:19-46 is to show that the divine anger on Moses occurs in the Deuteronomic version, but not “P” or non-P of the Numeri version. One of the incompatibilities between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 is about the attitude of YHWH to Moses. In Numbers, the attitude of YHWH is so positive that He wants to make Moses into a nation greater and mightier than the Israelites (Num 14:12). In addition, YHWH has forgiven the Israelites according to the word of Moses (Num 14:20) after his intercessory prayer. Moses is not said to have committed any sin in Num 13-14. He was not excluded in

Num 13-14. In Deut 1:37, Moses said that YHWH was angry with him and this was the reason for his exclusion from the Promised Land.

In addition, divine anger is absent in Num 13-14. This absence is atypical of its context. In Num 11-12 there are three incidents about the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness. Moses spoke for the people because YHWH was angry (Num 11:1, 10, 33; 12:9). However, there is no explicit mention that YHWH was angry in Num 13-14, nor any connection of divine anger with the exclusion of the Israelites and Moses. The only word for “anger” in Num 14:18 is in the expression “slow to anger,” a component of the so called “hesed formula” which emphasizes the mercy of YHWH rather than his anger. Deut 1:19-46 gives a different picture. This shows that Deuteronomy has given an original account although it has shared a common tradition of Num 13-14 as its Vorlage.

(3) Are Deut 1:37-38 later additions?

Before the attempt to interpret Deut 1:37, it is necessary to clarify its origin. Some commentators consider Deut 1:37-38 not to be original to the narrative itself.32

---

31 The “hesed formula” occurs in Ex 34:6; Num 14:18; Neh 9:17; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Prov 14:29; Joel 2:13; Jon 4:2.
32 See von Rad, Deuteronomy, 40; Steuernagel, Deuteronomium, 6 (2d ed., 54-55) and others. Von Rad includes Deut 1:36 as a later addition on the ground that there is no precondition for the preferential treatment of Caleb. However, the prerequisite for the giving of the land to the second generation is also absent in Deut 1:19-40. On this ground, then, Deut 1:39 will be also counted as a later insertion. As a result, the verdict will only consist of Deut 1:35. However, such abrupt ending of the verdict cannot prepare the reader to understand that only the first generation had perished (Deut 2:14), and the second generation could enter the land (Deut 2:29). Therefore, Deut 1:39 should be retained as original. This shows that the absence of precondition for the preferential treatment cannot be the only reason for classification of an insertion. If the author of Deut 1:34-39 presupposes that the reader has known the traditions of Caleb in Num 13-14, then Deut 1:36 can be original.
For instance, August Dillmann points out that these two verses were inserted by the redactor of Deuteronomy because of three reasons. First, Deut 1:37-38 interrupt the flow of the context of 1:35-40. In Chapter One of this dissertation, we have seen that Thomas W. Mann also has this view. Second, the instruction to encourage Joshua in 1:38 occurs later in Deut 3:28 and 31:3-6. Dillmann thinks that the purpose for adding 1:38 is to solve the problem that Joshua is not mentioned in verse 36. Such missing of Joshua will lead to an impression that Joshua was also condemned with the first exodus generation. Third, Deut 1:39 connects well to 1:35-36, but not to 1:37-38.

For various reasons, however, Dillmann’s view cannot be accepted. Firstly, although it seems that Deut 1:37-38 interrupts the divine saying, we also find the unity of Deut 1:35-40 as a whole because of the presence of Deut 1:37-38. Both interruption and unity are present in Deut 1:35-40. Interruption of the flow should not be the only criterion used for thinking that verses 37-38 are secondary. There is unity in the flow of divine saying as well. Such unity is best illustrated by the following structure of the verdict:

I. 1:34-36 Contrast between The Israelites and Caleb

A 1:34 … YHWH…was angry (יְהֹוָה) …

B 1:35… No one … shall see (וְיָרֵד) the good land…

---

33 Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 239.
34 Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 482.
35 Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 240.
36 Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 240.
37 Dillmann, Deuteronomium, 240.
C 1:36a … except Caleb … shall see (יָרָא) it…

D 1:36b … because he has followed YHWH fully.

II. 1:37-38 Contrast between Moses and Joshua

A’ 1:37a …YHWH …was angry (יָרָא)…

B’ 1:37b… you shall not enter (וָאֵב) there.

C’ 1:38a … Joshua … shall enter (וָאֵב) there...

D’ 1:38b … because he will cause Israel to inherit it.

III. 1:39-40 Contrast between the second generation and the first generation

E 1:39… your little ones… shall enter there…

F 1:40… But as for you, turn around and set out for the wilderness…

All three sections give internal contrasts. Section I is parallel to section II. Both A and A’ describe that YHWH was angry with an object. The anger of YHWH is related to the exclusion of the first exodus generation and Moses. Clauses B and B’ indicate the first exodus generation and Moses shall not see or enter the land. C and C’ indicate that Caleb and Joshua shall see and enter the land. B and C are about who “shall not” and “shall” see the land, while B’ and C’ are about who “shall not” and “shall” enter the land. Clauses D and D’ explain that the reasons why Caleb and Joshua shall see and enter the land. The reasons are different. For Caleb, it is his personal faithfulness toward YHWH. He “wholly followed after YHWH,” that is, he
obeyed YHWH without reservation. Joshua’s mission is to inherit the land with the people. In section III, the second generation shall enter the land but the first generation shall return by the way of the Reed Sea. From the above unity in structure of the verdict of YHWH, the content of Deut 1:37-38 is not foreign to that of verses 34-36. In Deut 1:34-36, it is stated that the Israelites could not see the land, but Caleb could. A parallel can be found in verses 37-38 which state that Moses could not enter the land, but Joshua could. Both the Israelites and Moses were the objects of YHWH’s anger as mentioned in verse 34 and verse 37.

Secondly, if the above well-balanced structure is read as original, and also as Caleb and Joshua are in parallel, there is no such problem of missing Joshua in Deut 1:36. Besides, the fact that the instruction to encourage Joshua occurs in Deut 3:28 does not exclude the possibility that this instruction has been given already in Deut 1:38. The instruction can repeat just as the mention of Moses’ exclusion repeats.

Thirdly, Deut 1:39 can be read as a continuation of 1:37-38 because it helps to clarify the identity of the Israelites in verse 38, which says that Joshua will let “Israel” take possession. Since 1:35 has said that the Israelites could not see that land, then it may lead to a question of who will be the “Israel” in verse 38. Deut 1:39 can provide an answer: “the little ones,” the second generation Israelites, is the “Israel” in verse 38. They will receive the land. Therefore, Deut 1:37-38 can be original and not a secondary addition.
(4) Was Moses innocent in the spy story (Deut 1:19-46)?

According to the result of the investigation of the expressions of divine anger in Deuteronomy in the Excursus of this chapter, twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God are due to human sin. Moses said that YHWH was angry with him on the people’s account. Had Moses sinned in the spy incident? This section will argue that Moses was innocent in the spy story. Before we come to this conclusion, it is necessary to explain why other options are not preferable.

First, Moses did not make a wrong decision when he selected the spies (Deut 1:23). Moses action showed that Moses supported the suggestion of the people to send the spies. This suggestion of the people, however, would eventually lead to evil consequences. However, this explanation is not convincing because Moses was not the only one who supported the people’s proposal. All the spies supported the people’s proposal. Caleb was also one of the spies and carried out the spy mission. This means that Caleb also agreed to the suggestion of the people just as Moses did. Hence, this does not explain why Caleb and Moses had different consequences, in fact both of them supported the proposal of the Israelites.

Neither is it possible to say that Moses was lazy. It has been suggested that Moses had not input enough force and energy to deliver to the people the order of attack. It aroused the complaints of the people. Such an interpretation, however, cannot be sustained. According to the context of Deut 1:29-31, Moses had

---

38 Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 119-120. Rose holds a similar opinion. See Rose, Deuteronomium, 485.
39 Buis and Leclercq, Deutéronome, 40.
encouraged the people to fight. Moses’ exhortation clearly directs the people to focus on YHWH, who had already fought for them in Egypt, rather than on their enemies (Deut 1:30). YHWH’s company in the past can be a foundation for their faith. They need not fear (Deut 1:29). It is obvious that Moses had performed his duty as the leader of the Israelites.

If the context of Deut 1:19-46 does not provide sufficient information to deduce the sin of Moses, is it possible to use Deut 32:48-52 (or Num 20:1-13) to interpret the reason of divine wrath on Moses in Deut 1:37? Some commentators, for instance, the Jewish Rabbi Ramban thinks that Deut 1:37 alludes to the incident in Num 20:1-13. Ramban provides two explanations for the expression כֵּן לְךָ ("on your account") in Deut 1:37. The first is that “the children of Israel strove with the Eternal and all this happened because of your quarrel.” The second is “the expression for your sake may allude to the fact that… Moses and Aaron hit the rock in front of the people.”

Hence, according to Ramban, Deut 1:37 refers to Num 20:1-13. Similarly, Rashi believes that different biblical texts can interpret each other, so he quotes Ps 106:32 to explain the term “for your sake” in Deut 3:26. He also thinks that the incident in Deut 3:26 is related to the waters of Meribah in Num 20:1-13. Thus, Moses was not sinful in the spy story but he was sinful in the waters of Meribah.  

---

42 John Calvin also removes Deut 1:37-38 from its context to make a connection with Num 20:1-13. This removal is possible because he thinks that the Deuteronomic passage is not chronological. Quoted from George A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 22. McConville also says that it is not necessary to
This explanation must be rejected. First, this method withdraws Deut 1:37 from its context in Deut 1:19-46. The incident of the rock took place many years later. That Moses should suddenly mention incidents from so many years later while reviewing the incident of the spies would be odd. Second, in Chapter Three of this dissertation, it was argued that Deut 32:48-52 was a later text than Deut 1-3. It is not legitimate to use a later text to interpret an earlier text. Third, it would be strange for Moses to refer to the incident three times in Deuteronomy as the Israelites’ fault and ignore his own act entirely.

It would be wrong to suppose a “holistic” reading in this case. It has been pointed out that the combination of sources has yielded new meanings. Deut 1:37 can be assumed to refer to Num 20:1-13. This changes the meaning of “on your account” in Deut 1:37. In the incident of waters of Meribah, Moses’ sin was related to the people. This “holistic” reading may produce more than one meaning, it depends on which text is related. The above “holistic” reading requires the reader to relate the Deuteronomic spy story to the incident of waters of Meribah in Numbers only. If a reader relates the Deuteronomic spy story to the spy story in Numbers (Num 13-14) “holistically,” then the “on your account” in Deut 1:37 would be interpreted in another way: Moses is also innocent according to the version of the spy

---

43 Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 425.
44 Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 425.
45 Propp, “Why Moses,” 43, n. 19. Propp himself does not say that he agrees with this reading. He just quotes a possibility of a new reading: if one reads “holistically,”
story in Numbers. The problem of this “holistic” reading is that the Deuteronomistic
text itself does not ask the reader clearly to refer to any particular text.

Neither is it satisfactory to propose an “update of tradition” in Deut 1:37.

Recently, Eckart Otto explains the text Deut 1:19-46 under his scheme of the
formation of the Pentateuch. He reads Deut 1-3 in the perspective of the
“post-Deuteronomistic” book of Numbers. According to Otto, Deut 1:36-39 is
later than other part of the spy story in Deut 1:19-46. He maintains that Deut 1:36-39
is an insertion of the post-exilic “updating of tradition” (Fortschreibung).

This post-exilic “updating of tradition” presupposes the knowledge of Num 20:12-13.

This presupposition can provide the ground to understand הָנַל שָׁפֵר (“on your
account”) in Deut 1:37. In Num 20, the murmuring of the Israelites triggered
Moses not to believe in YHWH. Therefore, Deut 1:37 is read in the light of Num
20:1-13. Such “updating of tradition,” however, is much too uncertain to gain
support because there is no literary connection between Deut 1:37 and Num
20:11-13. When the incident of the waters of Meribah is mentioned in Num

---

46 Otto states that during the period of Nehemiah, the Hexateuch was formed by the integration of the
priestly source (P⁶) with the priestly early post-exilic supplements (P⁸) into the deuteronomistic work,
and it contains Deut 1- Judg 2:9. According to Otto, the Pentateuch redaction occurred in the period of
Ezra. The Pentateuch redactor separated the book of Joshua from the Pentateuch, inserted the book of
covenant in Exodus, and ended it with Moses’ death (Deut 34). This redaction shifts the focus to the
revelation at Sinai, while the gift of the land is pushed into the background. Otto thinks that some
other passages of Leviticus and Numbers were added after the Pentateuchal redaction. The Pentateuch
was finally closed during the end of the 4th century BCE. See Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:688-9.
47 Otto, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 397.
48 Otto, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 395.
49 Otto, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 403.
50 Otto, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 397.
51 Otto, Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43, 397.
52 Veijola, Deuteronomium, 41.
27:13-14 and Deut 32:50-51, some elements are also mentioned. Such elements include: the name of the place (the waters of Meribah), the sin (not regarding YHWH as holy), and the usage of second person plural pronoun (“you” = Aaron and Moses).

In Deut 1:37, none of these elements are mentioned. Besides, it is necessary to assume that the redactor of Deut 1-3 had the tradition of Num 20:1-13 in his mind when he updated the tradition. This assumption requires more solid foundations to be proven. Therefore, it is not necessary to read Deut 1:37 as a tradition which follows Num 20:1-13.

There is no evidence to support the view that Deut 1:37 is a “retrospective” reading. Some think that if the Israelites had trusted YHWH at Kadesh Barnea and entered the land under his command, the event recorded in Num 20 would never have occurred. The people’s faithlessness precipitated a series of unfortunate events, including the story of water from the rock in Meribah. Moses was blaming the people for the anger of God. Moses’ complaint reflects his “bitterness.”

It can be argued that if the Israelite history is understood in light of such suggestion, the spy story itself is also one of the consequences of the previous events: the exodus (Exod 14). According to such logic: if God did not bring the Israelites out of Egypt, the spy story would never have occurred. Consequently, God has to bear some of the responsibility of the spy story. This way of interpretation is not satisfactory.

Is it possible that the tradition which talked about the sin of Moses was not

---

53 Block, *Deuteronomy*, 73-74.
54 Block, *Deuteronomy*, 131.
mentioned in Deut 1:19-46 for some reasons? Some say that Moses was not without fault and was not an innocent victim.55 Moses omitted his own sin because the purpose of Moses’ speech was to exhort the new generation not to go on failing as their parents had done.56 However, such suggestion cannot explain why Moses omitted his fault three times in Deut 1-4.

There are not sufficient grounds to assert that Moses suffers vicariously for the people. There are scholars who think that Moses’ punishment is a type of vicarious suffering.57 They regard that Moses was like the servant of YHWH in Isaiah 53.58 However, according to Isa 53:5, the chastisement of the servant will bring peace to the people. Besides, the people will be healed, and will not receive the punishment which they deserved. But in Deut 1:35 the first generation received the punishment they deserved. YHWH punished them according to their “wishes.” Even after Moses was punished, they could not “escape” the punishment. Some scholars agree that Moses was innocent but they reject the interpretation of vicarious suffering because there is no notion of Moses as a “substitute.”59 Hence, there is no strong reason to suggest that Moses suffers vicariously for the people.

Finally, we come to the most persuasive option. The suggestion that Moses was

55 Christopher J. H. Wright, Deuteronomy, 42.
56 Christopher J. H. Wright, Deuteronomy, 42.
58 Cairns, Deuteronomy, 38; Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 261; Nielsen, Deuteronomium, 53.
59 Mayes, Deuteronomy, 147; Thomas W. Mann, “Denial,” 486-487; Veijola, Deuteronomium, 93.
punished because he was the leader of the people is probably essentially correct.\textsuperscript{60}

The term is understood in the way that being a leader of the people,\textsuperscript{61}

Moses had to bear the responsibility for the consequences of the sin of the people.\textsuperscript{62}

We have seen that there are parallels between Deut 1:34-35 and 1:37 in the structure of the verdict. Both parts involve the wrath of God. In addition, both are contrasted by the verses which follow them. The first generation is contrasted by Caleb, while Moses is contrasted by Joshua. Moreover, the punishments are similar: not allowing to “see” the land and not allowing to “enter” the land. These parallels signify Moses can be compared to the יָהָב (“man”) in Deut 1:35. As the leader of all the people, Moses was not permitted to enter the land just as the יָהָב was the leader of his family, and they would not see the good land.\textsuperscript{63} It is therefore likely that although Moses was innocent, the role of leader was the cause for him to bear the anger of God with

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & Blessing & Bringing Disaster \\
\hline
An individual (or a small number of people) influences a community & Gen 39:5 & 1 Kgs 14:16 \\
 & & Jer 15:4 \\
 & & Mic 3:12 \\
\hline
The amount is not different & Gen 12:13 & Deut 18:12 \\
 & Gen 30:27 & Jer 11:17 \\
 & Deut 15:10 & \\
\hline
A community influences an individual &  & Deut 1:37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Blessing and Bringing Disaster}
\end{table}

In four out of the ten instances, the community is influenced because of the deed or presence of a small number of people: the family of Potiphar is blessed by God because of Joseph (Gen 39:5); YHWH will give up the Israelites because of the sins of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:16); the people will be punished because of the deeds of Manasseh (Jer 15:4); Zion and Jerusalem will be destroyed because of the bad leaders, priests and prophets in the city (Mic 3:12). In five out of the ten instances, the number of the people who are influenced, is not greatly different from the other one. The case of an individual (Moses) influenced by the community occurs only in Deut 1:37. Consequently, it is a unique case.


\textsuperscript{61} The particle בְּנָא, meaning “because of” or “on account of,” occurs ten times in the Hebrew Bible. See \textit{HALOT} 1:149; \textit{DCH} 2:93. The table below shows that the particle בְּנָא is used in connection with blessing or bringing disaster to others.

\textsuperscript{62} Christensen, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 32; Veijola, \textit{Deuteronomium}, 41, 93.

\textsuperscript{63} Rose, \textit{Deuteronomium}, 485.
the people.

But to say this is not to include the possibility that Moses is compared to the other leader, king Josiah. According to some interpreters, the innocent fate of Moses may echo the undeserved death of the righteous king Josiah (2 Kgs 23:25-27). However, there is a great difference between Moses and king Josiah, and it would be unwise to equalise them. According to 2 Kgs 22:20, king Josiah was distinguished from the people. The people would face the disaster, but king Josiah would not see it, and he would be gathered to his grave in peace. The juxtaposition of “peace” and “disaster” is a contrast between Josiah and the people. Such contrast does not occur between Moses and the Israelites because Moses should bear a similar punishment with his people.

Norbert Lohfink may be right in the point that the readers of Deut 1:19-46 were the people in exile. Moses’ exclusion can be compared to the second generation in exile. The purpose of the narrative is the “readers’ identification with Moses.” There was a progression for the reader to identify themselves with Moses: First, to feel how a spark of hope kindled in Moses when all the first exodus generation had died, and Moses was still alive; second, to sense how the hope grew when Moses even received the divine command to begin the occupation of the land; third, to share with Moses the “dark act of obedience” by which Moses pronounced publicly Joshua

64 Braulik, Deuteronomium 1-16, 17, 28; Nelson, Deuteronomy, 56.
66 Deut 1-4* were written during the time of the second generation of the Babylonian exile.
as his successor; fourth, to learn from Moses how one should say “yes” to the divine will, even in such difficult matters; fifth and finally, the identification with Moses is complete when Moses stands as a “supplicant” before God. The second exile generation was innocent, just as Moses was innocent. The author wanted to persuade the people in exile to abandon individualistic ideas of personal guilt or innocence, and simply to feel themselves united with the great and total guilt of the nation.

When the second exile generation lived in exile, it seemed that God was angry with them. The second exile generation had experienced divine anger because of their fathers, just as Moses said that God was angry with him because of the first generation.

To summarise: in the context of Deut 1:19-46, Moses was not sinful. Out of the context of Deut 1:19-46, there are no other texts which explain the fault of Moses in the spy story. It is not necessary to deduce that Moses alluded to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, and he did not suffer vicariously. As a leader, he suffered with the people.

(5) Is the verdict operated according to the principle of corporate responsibility?

The phrase “on your account” follows the mention of divine anger in the

---

exclusion of Moses. Such phrase has become a component of the reason for the
exclusion of Moses. Moses should receive the penalty of the disobedient Israelites.\textsuperscript{70}
Being as a member and a leader of them, he should bear the responsibility for the
unfaithfulness of the people. It seems that “corporate responsibility” is the principle
behind the punishment of Moses. Is the whole verdict also operated by such principle?
We will examine each unit in the verdict one by one.

(a) The first exodus generation

YHWH was angry with the first generation and punished them not to receive
the land. They were called “evil,” which was a great contrast to the land which was
“good.” What was the sin of the first generation? How evil were they? According to
Deut 1:32, Moses said that they did not trust in YHWH. What is the meaning of not
trusting in YHWH? The context of the narrative itself can provide the answer to this
question.

From their experience, they should know that YHWH has gone before them to
seek suitable resting places, and to show them the right way, in fire by night and in
cloud by day (Deut 1:33). In addition, they should also know that YHWH will fight
for them just as He did in Egypt (Deut 1:30). Furthermore, they had heard the
command of YHWH that they have to go in and take possession of the land (Deut

\textsuperscript{70} Driver, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 27; Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 490-491; Judah Goldin, “The Death of
1:8). However, they thought that YHWH hated them, and would give them to the Amorites to destroy them (Deut 1:27). Thus, it is fair to say that the Israelites did not believe in YHWH’s word, His power to fight and His care for them. The punishment on the first generation was because of their own evil and of their failure in believing in YHWH. Hence, the principle behind the punishment is individual responsibility.

(b) Caleb and his descendants

Why could Caleb see the land? First, Caleb was not the leader of the Israelites, he did not have the same role as Moses. Second, according to Deut 1:36, the reason is that Caleb was מָלָא אֲחוֹר יְהוָה “completely followed YHWH,” literally means “he completely filled himself after YHWH.” The literary meaning gives some sense of the total obedience of Caleb. This phrase occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible, six of them are applied to Caleb related to the spy story.

---

71 Some scholars claim that Caleb was referred here because the Deuteronomist wanted to provide a background for later material in the Deuteronomistic History. See Mayes, Deuteronomy, 132; Noth, Pentateuchal Traditions, 132-33. For recent discussions of Caleb, see Dennis T. Olson, “Caleb (Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament),” EBR 4:779-81; Jacob L. Wright, David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

72 Craigie, Deuteronomy, 104. George Smith points out that in Deut 1:36 since YHWH is the speaker, the reader may expect “after me” rather than “after YHWH” as in Num 14:24. Smith then suggests that the original text in Deut 1:36 was מַלַא אֲחוֹר יְהוָה (“after me”), the last letter of which has been mistaken by a scribe for the initial of YHWH. See Smith, Deuteronomy, 24.

73 Craigie, Deuteronomy, 105.

74 Num 14:24; 32:12; Deut 1:36; Josh 14:8, 9, 14. In Num 14:30, YHWH said that Joshua could enter the land but did not give any reason. Joshua is not described as “completely following YHWH” in Num 13-14. In Num 32:12, however, both Caleb and Joshua could see the land because “they” completely follow YHWH. Joshua is also depicted as “completely following YHWH” in Num 32. This indicates that the phrase “completely follow YHWH” has become a generalized reason to qualify who can see/ enter the land. In Num 14, the Israelites have never been described as “not completely following YHWH” although they have different types of faults. In Num 14:11, they spurn YHWH and do not believe in Him; in Num 14:22, they have tested YHWH and did not listen to YHWH; in Num 14:27, they have grumbled against YHWH. In Num 32:8-13 they are qualified as “not completely following YHWH” (Num 32:11). The expression “not completely follow YHWH” picks up the expression used in a positive form in relation to Caleb in Num 14:24 and reverses it. The
How can we know that Caleb had a total obedience to YHWH? In Deuteronomy, the first mention of Caleb is in Deut 1:36. If we only rely on Deut 1, we are not sure that Caleb was one of the spies. We do not know he had been to Hebron. And when YHWH said that he would give the land on which Caleb set foot (Deut 1:36), we do not know what land Caleb would receive. Deut 1:36 is intelligible only in the literary context of Num 13-14.\(^{75}\) The author of Deut 1:36 should know the traditions about Caleb in Num 13-14.\(^{76}\) The presupposed knowledge about Caleb in the Numeri version would make the Deuteronomy version more understandable. According to Num 13:6, Caleb was one of the twelve spies. In Num 13:30 Caleb encouraged the people to go up and take possession of the land. He tore his clothes after the people said that they would appoint a leader and return to Egypt (Num 14:6). In Num 14:7-9, he encouraged the people not to be afraid. According to his message, he had mentioned YHWH three times. First, the condition for receiving the land is in YHWH (Num 14:8). Second, do not rebel against YHWH (Num 14:9a). Third, YHWH is with them, so the people of the land will be the prey of the Israelites (Num 14:9b). In such a short message, he focused on YHWH three times and saw YHWH as the sole vital factor for receiving the land. Caleb was the only one who had the courage to attack the strong city with its giant inhabitants.\(^{77}\) Hence, it is fair to say

---

\(^{75}\) Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 397.

\(^{76}\) Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 117.

\(^{77}\) Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 132.
that he had a great loyalty to YHWH. The gift of the land to Caleb was a reward for his loyalty and obedience.\textsuperscript{78} Since Caleb could receive the gift of the land according to his own obedience and loyalty, the principle behind the reward is \textit{individual} reward.

Why could the descendants of Caleb receive the land as well? Deut 1:36b may be used to prepare the reader to read Josh 14:6-15 because there are close links between Deut 1:36 and Josh 14:6-15.\textsuperscript{79} Martin Noth notes that the descendants of Caleb are mentioned with Caleb at the same time, so the fact that the land as gift to Caleb is not a personal fortune of the single person Caleb, his sons were also affected.\textsuperscript{80} They had not done anything. They could receive the gift just because they were the sons of Caleb. Hence, they were benefited by the merit of Caleb, not by their own merit. The principle behind this reward is \textit{corporate} responsibility.

\textbf{(c) Joshua and the second exodus generation}

Why could Joshua enter the land? According to Deut 1:38, he would make the Israelites possess the land. He was given a mission by YHWH. He would be the successor of Moses because Moses could not enter the land. The reward of Joshua is according to his own mission, so it is the principle of \textit{individual} responsibility.

\textsuperscript{79} For instance, the relative clause “that he sets foot on her [= the land]” (Deut 1:36b) refers to “the land on which your foot trod” in Josh 14:9a, rather than the clause in Num 14:24 “that he went to there.” See Perlitt, \textit{Deuteronomium}, 117-8.
\textsuperscript{80} Noth, \textit{History of Pentateuchal Traditions}, 133.
The second generation had not done anything. They were called not knowing “good or evil,” which is a contrast to their parents who were called “evil.” The main reason that they could receive the land is that YHWH wanted to transform the words of the first generation. According to Num 14:3 the first generation Israelites said that their wives and their little ones would become booty. In Deut 1:39, YHWH specially mentions that the second generation “whom you [= the Israelites] said would become booty.” Therefore, it is not because of their own merit that the second generation can receive the land, but because of the words of their parents. Consequently, the principle behind this reward is corporate responsibility.

(d) The co-existence of both principles

The idea that a righteous one suffers with the unrighteous can also be applied to Caleb, Joshua and the second exodus generation. They could not enter the Promised land immediately after the spy incident but only after thirty-eight years. They were also innocent but have to wander in the wilderness. Moses was not the only one who suffered with the people. Therefore, in the case of Caleb and Joshua, they were rewarded according to the principle of individual responsibility, but the actualization of their rewards was delayed according to the principle of corporate responsibility.

In sum we can see both the concepts of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” in this passage. We can find that the principle of
“corporate responsibility” applies to both the blessing and the punishment. In the case of blessing, Caleb’s sons could receive the land not because of their faithfulness, but because of that of their father Caleb. The second exodus generation also could receive the land not because of their own merit. In the case of punishment, Caleb, Joshua and the second exodus generation were also punished although they were rewarded with the gift of the land. They could not enter the Promised Land immediately after the spy incident but only after thirty-eight years. They were also innocent but have to wander in the wilderness. Moses was not the only one who suffered with the people. This coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” suggests that it is difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

2. Divine response to Moses’ prayer in Deut 3

Our second passage about divine anger on Moses is Deut 3:26-27 which is in the context of Deut 3:23-28.

In the broader context of Deut 3:18-28 Moses first spoke to the second generation of the two and a half tribes, and then to Joshua, and finally Moses himself prayed to YHWH. The common theme of the sayings is about crossing the Jordan. After Moses had given the land to the Reubenites, the Gadites and the half-tribe of

---

Manasseh (Deut 3:12-17), he commanded these two and a half tribes that they should cross over and arm before their brothers (Deut 3:18-20). Then Moses said to Joshua, “...so YHWH shall do to all the kingdoms into which you are about to cross” (Deut 3:21-22). Moses also prayed that he could cross over the Jordan to see the good land. But YHWH commanded Moses to go up to the top of Pisgah to see the land rather than crossing over the Jordan (Deut 3:23-28). This is the second mention of the exclusion of Moses in Deuteronomy.

For our present study there are two main issues on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 3:26-27. First, in Deut 1:37 and 4:21, the verb נא is used for the divine anger on Moses, while in Deut 3:26, נב is used. Why is a different verb used in Deut 3:26? Second, how can we understand ל американск (“for your sake”) in the context of Deut 3:26-27?

In Deut 3:26, the Hitpael of the verb נב is used to express YHWH’s anger. Many commentators point out that נב is a strong word, and is stronger than נא. The verb נב, meaning “to be angry” or “to be furious,” occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible, all are in the Hitpael stem. Of the eight occurrences, five of them were used with divine subject. Such usage of the verb נב with divine subject is shown in the following table.

---

82 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 13; Cairns, Deuteronomy, 50-51; Craigie, Deuteronomy, 127; Lundbom, Deuteronomy, 227; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 147.
83 Driver, Deuteronomy, 60; Smith, Deuteronomy, 55.
84 HALOT 1:781.
85 DCH 6:242.
86 Deut 3:26; Ps 78:21, 59, 62; 89:39 (Eng = 89:38); Pro 14:16; 20:2; 26:17.
87 The other three texts in the Proverbs (Prov 14:16; 20:2 and 26:17) are not used with divine subject,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 3:26</th>
<th>Hitpael</th>
<th>with (ב)</th>
<th>&quot;me&quot; = Moses</th>
<th>Moses prayed to YHWH with an inappropriate request and “for your sake” (למעןך)</th>
<th>YHWH did not listen to Moses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:21</td>
<td>Hitpael</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>YHWH heard the complaints and doubt of the Israelites (Ps 78:19-20)</td>
<td>A fire was kindled against Jacob; and anger also mounted against Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:59</td>
<td>Hitpael</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>God heard the apostasy of the Israelites (Ps 78:56-58)</td>
<td>YHWH greatly rejected Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:62</td>
<td>Hitpael</td>
<td>with (ב)</td>
<td>“His possession” = Israelites</td>
<td>God heard the apostasy of the Israelites (Ps 78:56-58)</td>
<td>YHWH delivered His people to the sword and more people died in Ps 78:63-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 89:39</td>
<td>Hitpael</td>
<td>with (לע)</td>
<td>&quot;your anointed&quot; = King of Israel</td>
<td>--- (Not clear in the context of Ps 89)</td>
<td>YHWH cast off and rejected the king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these five texts, the verb occurs with the preposition ב (“with” in Deut 3:26 and Ps 78:62) and לע (“with” in Ps 89:39). In Ps 78:59 and 89:39, the consequences are similar: someone is rejected by YHWH. The above comparison above can be used to know that this verb is used in the context of a rejection. In Deut 3:36, Moses is also rejected by YHWH, who does not listen to Moses’ prayer.

There are two reasons for the divine wrath in Deut 3:26: Firstly, it is the prayer of Moses. In Deut 3:25, he prayed to God let him go over and see the good land.

Some argue that YHWH’s anger in Deut 3:26 is merely a response to Moses’ prayer in 3:25. It is possible because in Deut 3:26, YHWH speaks to Moses, “It is enough for you. Do not continue to speak to me of this matter again.” It seems that YHWH

and they are not discussed here.

88 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 13; Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 273; Veijola, Deuteronomium, 92.
speaks this words angrily. YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses prayed to Him with the content which YHWH did not like at that moment. It is possible that the verb לָמָּגֵנהוּ (“And he was very angry”) is used as a kind of “word play” with the verb אֲנַחְרָה (“I cross”) Moses used in the prayer in 3:25.89

The second reason for the divine wrath in Deut 3:26 is that לֹאִי מֵנְכוֹנֵכָּה (“for your sake”) is mentioned by Moses. The preposition לֹאִי, meaning “for the sake of” occurs 272 times in the Hebrew Bible. There are a few ways to understand the function of “for your sake” here in Deut 3:26. First, it has been suggested that לֹאִי מֵנְכוֹנֵכָּה is a “gloss” after the influence of Deut 1:37 and 4:21,90 that is, it is a later insertion. Such argument is based on the context of Deut 3:26-27 in which YHWH is furious with Moses just after his prayer to Him, not because of anything of the people. The prayer is the main cause for divine anger. Second, if one reads Deut 3 after Deut 1, the “for your sake” in Deut 3:26 is related to the “on your account” in Deut 1:37. Moses was punished because of the sin of the people. Moses felt the anger of God again after he heard that YHWH refused his request. God refused Moses because the sin of the first generation was so great that the punishment which had been pronounced should be carried out, and his prayer could not be listened to.92

89 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 13; Christensen, Deuteronomy, 69; Driver, Deuteronomy, 60; Lundbom, Deuteronomy, 227; Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 273.
90 HALOT 1:614.
91 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 13.
92 The other way to read the expression is that, according to Lohfink, different prepositions are used in order to express different meanings. In Deut 1:37, the term מַלְאַלְעָא represents “because of the past behavior of the generation of the people.” In Deut 3:26, the term לֹאִי מֵנְכוֹנֵכָּה represents “because of the future of the people.” Norbert Lohfink, “Narrative Analyse von Dtn 1,6-3,29,” in Norbert Lohfink, Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V (SBA 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 103. However, according to the context of Deut 3:18-20, the “you” is
Therefore, the divine anger in Deut 3:26 is different from that of 1:37. In the first place, the reasons are different: in 1:37, Moses had not done anything wrong to irritate YHWH, while in 3:26, Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer. Secondly, the sayings of YHWH are different: in 1:37, YHWH said that Moses should not enter the land, while in 3:26 YHWH said that Moses should not ask again that he wanted to cross over the Jordan.

In Deut 3:27, the exclusion of Moses is mentioned only after YHWH has commanded Moses to go up to the top of Pisgah. The purpose of this command is to let Moses see the land. The exclusion of Moses is mentioned just because it explains the limitation of Moses. Since Moses could not cross the Jordan, he had to go up the mountain in order to see the land. In Deut 3:25, Moses asked YHWH to let him see the good land. In Deut 3:27, YHWH permitted Moses to see the land from the top of Pisgah. To a certain extent, YHWH has answered Moses’ request (even in His anger)!

**Summary**

In the context of Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer. Moses felt the anger of YHWH because he heard that God told him not to ask for entering the land again. However Moses was not “the two and a half tribes.” In Deut 3:20, Moses told the “you” that they can return to the land which Moses had given to them after their brothers occupied the land beyond the Jordon. The “you” in Deut 3:26 can be “the two and a half tribes” or “all the people of Israel” if we think that Moses has changed his audience from “the two and a half tribes” to all the Israelites. However, even if the “you” is the second generation, it does not point to the “future” of the generation.
punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses is not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” is used to clarify that Moses did not sin, and to illustrate that the sin of the first exodus generation was very great.

3. An Excursus: Reasons for divine anger in Deuteronomy

The first chapter of this dissertation has noted that in Deut 1:37 and 4:21, the verb נָאַ is used, while in Deut 3:26, the verb נָבֹא is used. In fact, we may find two more different verbs of divine anger in the context of Deut 1-4: נָאַ (Deut 1:34) and קָרָא (Deut 4:25). In the Book of Deuteronomy, “divine anger” is expressed by different words and if used as a verb, in different stems. The following table shows the distribution, the form, and the stem of the words of “divine anger” in Deuteronomy.
The vocabulary for divine anger in Deuteronomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>אָנָּךְ</th>
<th>אַהְמַת</th>
<th>חַרְמָת</th>
<th>חֵרְמָת</th>
<th>חָרְמָה</th>
<th>אֶרֶץ</th>
<th>אֲרֵץ</th>
<th>אָרֶץ</th>
<th>אִיר</th>
<th>נֵבָר</th>
<th>קִרְתָּן</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:37</td>
<td>Hitp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hitp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>Hitp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:8</td>
<td>Hitp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>Hitp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:18</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:19</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:22</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:23</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:26</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:27</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:17</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:19</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:22</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:27</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: “Hif” = Hiphil; “Hitp” = Hitpael; “Piel” = Piel; “Qal” = Qal; “n” = noun.

We will discuss the usage of the different terms of divine anger in turn.
The verb אֲנָחָמ, meaning “to be angry,” occurs four times in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 1:37; 4:21; 9:8, 20), but is absent in the Tetrateuch. Of these all of them are in the Hitpael stem, and are always used with God as its subject. This verb is a denominative verb, referring to the dilation of the nostril in anger. The usage of the verb אֲנָחָמ in Deuteronomy is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Object of the verb</th>
<th>Reason for divine anger</th>
<th>Consequence of divine anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:37</td>
<td>with (ב)</td>
<td>“me” = Moses</td>
<td>“on your [the Israelites] account” (בְּנֵלָלָמֵם)</td>
<td>YHWH forbade Moses to enter the Promised Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>with (ב)</td>
<td>“me” = Moses</td>
<td>“because of your [the Israelites’] words” (עַל רְבִירָתָם)</td>
<td>YHWH forbade Moses to cross the Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:8</td>
<td>with (ב)</td>
<td>“you” = the Israelites</td>
<td>the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16)</td>
<td>YHWH would destroy the Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>with (ב)</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16)</td>
<td>YHWH would destroy Aaron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these texts, the verb אֲנָחָמ often occurs with the preposition ב (“with”), which indicates the object of divine anger. In Deut 1:37 the reason for divine anger is בְּנֵלָלָמֵם (“on your [=the Israelites] account”), while in Deut 4:21, it is עַל רְבִירָתָם (“because of your [=the Israelites’] words”). The expression עַל רְבִירָתָם occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible. If one believes this term is the same as בְּנֵלָלָמֵם (1:37) and לְאָמְנֵנִי (3:26) in the parallel texts, one may think that עַל רְבִירָתָם means “for your sake.” However, it is also possible that the editor uses

---

93 HALOT 1:72.
95 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 17.
the term נְאַבַּר in Deuteronomy 1:34, 37, and 4:21 is an “explanatory interpretation” of קָרְבַּנְתָּם (see note 97). 

The consequence of divine anger in Deut 1:37 and 4:21 is the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land. According to the context of Deut 9, the reason for divine anger is that the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16). The punishment is that YHWH will destroy ( dmv) the Israelites (Deut 9:8) and Aaron (Deut 9:20). The verb יָרֵא does not relate to a certain type of sin, and the punishment caused by such divine anger is not fixed.

(2) The group נֶאֶבֶר with combination of other terms

(a) The combination of נֶאֶבֶר with חָרָה

The combination of נֶאֶבֶר with the verb חָרָה occurs five times in Deuteronomy. Of these the noun נֶאֶבֶר is associated directly with YHWH in Deut 6:15; 7:4; 11:17; 29:26 (27 ET).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The combination of נֶאֶבֶר with חָרָה</th>
<th>Deut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96 Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 114.
97 Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.
98 Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 244; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.
In Deut 31:17 יָפָא is used instead. According to the context, it is YHWH who is speaking. Therefore, יָפָא ("my anger") is also YHWH’s anger. In these five cases the anger of YHWH is the subject of the verb הָרִים which is always in the Qal stem.

Although one of the meanings of הָרִים can be “nose,” and the clause יָפָא יְהוָה can literally mean “the nose of YHWH would become hot,” it should be translated as “YHWH’s anger would be kindled.” Cornelis Houtmann explains the connection between “nose” and “anger” in this way: the nose is the organ used in breathing; when the breathing becomes more rapid and turns into snorting, this is the body’s way of saying that it is filled with rage.\(^99\) In some passages the nose plays a certain role in the description of anger.\(^100\)

According to the context of the above passages, the cause of divine anger is apostasy. “Following other gods” (Deut 6:14), “serving other gods” (Deut 7:4; 11:16; 29:25 [26 ET]), “worshiping other gods” (Deut 11:16; 29:25 [26 ET]), and “prostituting themselves to the foreign gods, forsaking YHWH, breaking the covenant which YHWH has made with them” are the sins which will give rise to the burning of YHWH’s anger. The punishments related to such anger are “destruction of the people” (Deut 6:15; 7:4; 11:17). In addition, YHWH would bring the curses on the land (Deut 29:26 [27 ET]), and forsake the people (Deut 31:17). The usage of the combination of הָרִים with the verb הָרִים is quite consistent in that it relates to the sin of


\(^100\) For instance, Ezek 38:18; Ps 18:8-9. See E. Johnson, "רָפָא," *TDOT* 1:351.
apostasy and the punishments are very destructive.

(b) The combination of הָמוֹנָה אַךְ with הָמוֹנָה אַךְ

There are three occurrences of the combination of הָמוֹנָה אַךְ with הָמוֹנָה אַךְ in the book of Deuteronomy (9:19; 29:22[23 ET], 27[28 ET]). They are constructed in the following three ways. In Deut 9:19 מִנְיָנָה שַׁחְתַּמְנָה אַךְ (“the faces of the anger and rage”) is the object of the verb יָתְרָג (“I was afraid”). Both הָמוֹנָה אַךְ and הָמוֹנָה אַךְ are used to qualify יַנְפִּי (“the faces,” in construct form). In the context Moses was afraid that the wrath of YHWH, which was caused by all the sins the people had committed, would destroy the people.

In Deut 29:22 (23 ET) בַּאֲסָפָה רֹבְחַמְחָה (“in His anger and in His rage”) are used as two adverbial prepositional phrases qualifying the main verb הָפִּיך (“turn,” Qal). In this context “His” anger is YHWH’s anger because YHWH is the antecedent of the third person masculine pronominal suffix. In this context YHWH had “turned” Sodom, Gormoral, Admah and Zeboiim in His anger and rage. The cause of such anger is not clearly stated, but the effect is very clear, it is destruction.

In Deut 29:27 (28 ET) רָאוֹחַמָּה וֹבֶהָמְטָה וֹבֶכֶפֹּס (“in anger, in rage, and in wrath”) are used as three adverbial prepositional phrases describing the “pulling out” (רָאוֹחַמָּה “and he pulled out,” Qal) and “throwing” (רוּשָלָה “and he cast/ threw,” Hiphil) actions of YHWH. This is the punishment for the Israelites because they abandoned the covenant which YHWH made with them. They turned, served and worshipped
other gods (Deut 29:24-25[25-26 ET]). The combination of אֶלֶג with חַדָּה does not relate to a certain type of sin or a fixed punishment.

(c) The noun אֶלֶג used with other terms

(i) אֶלֶג is used with חַדָּה

אֶלֶג is used with חַדָּה only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 13:18). In the construction of מָלֹא חַדָּה אֶלֶג (“from the wrath of His anger”), אֶלֶג (“His anger”) is used to qualify חַדָּה (“wrath,” in construct form). The prepositional phrase as a whole is used to modify the main verb יָשַׂב (“He may turn,” Qal), that is, YHWH may turn from the wrath of His anger. It can be noted that the expressions of divine anger are more common in Deut 1-11 and 29-32, which is the “frame” of the Deuteronomic law (12-26). The only one in Deut 12-26 is Deut 13:18, which says that YHWH may turn from his anger and show the people compassion if they do not let anything devoted to destruction stick to their hands. The combination of אֶלֶג with חַדָּה in this case does not relate to any sin and punishment.

(ii) אֶלֶג is used with נֵזֵן

The combination of אֶלֶג with the verb נֵזֵן is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 29:19 [20 ET]). According to the construction יְזַנְּנֵנָה אֶלֶג יְהוָה קְנָאתָה (“anger of YHWH”) and יְזַנְּנֵנָה אֶלֶג יְהוָה (“His jealously/ zeal”) are the subjects of the verb נֵזֵן (“will burn,” Qal). The cause of such divine anger is that someone of
the Israelites believed that he was safe even though he had gone his own stubborn ways after he had heard the words of the curses (Deut 29:18 [19 ET]). The punishment is that God would single him out from all the tribes of Israel and bring all the curses of the covenant to him (Deut 29:20 [21 ET]).

(iii) רַע is used with חֵרֵב

The combination of רַע with חֵרֵב is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 29:23 [24 ET]). In the construction חֵרֵב רַע, חֵרֵב and רַע are in a genitive relationship. חֵרֵב (“the anger”) is used to qualify חֵרֵב (“burning of,” in construct form). The whole is modified by חֵרֵב חֲרָמָא (“this great”). That great burning anger is used to describe the action of YHWH done on the land according to the context of Deut 29:22 (23ET) in which four cities were “turned” by YHWH in His anger.

(iv) רַע is used with קָרֵד

The combination of רַע with the verb קָרֵד is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:22). In the construction קָרֵד בְּקַרְדָּא, the noun בְּקַרְדָּא (“fire”) is the subject of the main verb קָרֵד (“be kindled,” Qal). The prepositional phrase בְּקַרְדָּא (“in My anger”) is used to modify the verb קָרֵד. The fire is kindled in anger because YHWH punishes the people by the way of “measure for measure.” In the context of Deut 32:21, the Israelites made YHWH jealous with what is no god, and provoked Him with the idols. Therefore, YHWH would make them jealous with what is no people,
and provoke them with a foolish nation.

(3) The group הָעֵנִים

(a) The noun הָעֵנִים

The noun הָעֵנִים occurs two times in Deuteronomy, both are found in the Song of Moses (Deut 32). In Deut 32:19 the noun הָעֵנִים occurs in a prepositional phrase מִלְּכֵּ֣ס הָעֵנִים, and is in a genitive relationship with מִלְּכֵּ֣ס הָעֵנִים ("His sons and His Daughters"). מִלְּכֵּ֣ס הָעֵנִים is used to qualify הָעֵנִים, that is, to describe the origin of the provocation. So the source of YHWH’s provocation is from His people.

According to Deut 32:16-18, the sin of the people is their apostasy. They sacrificed to demons and gods they did not know. They forgot the God who gave them birth. The prepositional phrase מִלְּכֵּ֣ס הָעֵנִים as a whole is used to modify the verb יָבֶּדֶנָּהּ ("and He spurned"). If the preposition בָּא means “because,” then the prepositional phrase explains why YHWH spurned the Israelites. The rejection of YHWH to His people is the punishment for their sin of apostasy.

The construction in Deut 32:27 is יָזֵרְבָּה הָעֵנִים. The noun הָעֵנִים is in a genitive relationship with יָזֵרְבָּה ("[the] enemy"). The origin of the provocation is described by the noun יָזֵרְבָּה. According to its context, the proud saying of the adversaries ("Our hand is triumphant, it was not YHWH who did all this." Deut 32:27) is the source of YHWH’s provocation. The “enemy” and “the adversaries” are the nations who defeated the Israelites. In the end of the Song of Moses, YHWH will take vengeance
on His adversaries (Deut 32:43), but it is not said that this vengeance is related to the provocation. Therefore, there is no explicit punishment to the provocation of divine anger in this text.

(b) The verb הָעַל

The verb הָעַל, meaning “provoke to anger,” occurs six times in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 21[2×]). Of which five are related to divine anger, that is, God is the direct object of the verb. The usage in Deuteronomy can be classified into two types.

In the first type, the verb הָעַל follows the verb קָנָה (“be jealous”). In each verse, the two verbs are in the same stem (Hiphil in Deut 32:16; Piel in Deut 32:21a), but there is no overall regular pattern. Both of them are in the Song of Moses (Deut 32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase with the verb הָעַל</th>
<th>Phrase with the verb קָנָה</th>
<th>Deut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Hiphil)</td>
<td>(Hiphil)</td>
<td>32:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבוחשה יריעושה</td>
<td>בֹּהֶרֶם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Piel)</td>
<td>(Piel)</td>
<td>32:21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התשאול</td>
<td>בְּלָא אַלָּא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the context of Deut 32:15-16, the subject of the verb שלִישׁוּרֵי יְהוָה is יִשְׂרֵאֵל.

101 HALOT 1:491. This verb is used frequently in Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah. See Driver, Deuteronomy, 72; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 155; Smith, Deuteronomy, 68; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy, 208. One of the main themes of the Deuteronomistic History is that Israel sinned and provoked God to anger. The anger of YHWH put an end to the history of the Israelites. See Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil: Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” 55. The verb is used in this key theme of the Deuteronomistic History. See Lohfink, “העלה,” TDOT 7:286-287. S. Joo’s study of the usage of the Hiphil of this verb הָעַל will be discussed in the next section.

102 In Deut 32:21, the verb הָעַל occurs two times. In the first one, YHWH is the object, while in the second YHWH is the subject. He provokes the Israelites to anger as a retribution for they have provoked Him to anger.
(“Jeshurun”), a term for the Israelites. The Hiphil of נָפַס is used with the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix. The antecedent to the pronominal suffix is אלהי (“God”) in Deut 32:15. Therefore, the object of נָפַס is the God who created the Israelites. In Deut 32:21 the construction is: נָפַס נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה (Piel) is בְּנֵי יְהוָה ( Beit Pe’ah (“His sons and His daughters”) in Deut 32:19, that is, the Israelites. The object of the verb, the first person singular pronominal suffix, is YHWH because Deut 32:21 is part of a saying of YHWH which begins in Deut 32:20. The prepositional phrase נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה (“with their vanities/ idols”) is used to modify the verb נָפַס, it explains how the Israelites have provoked YHWH to anger.

In the second type, a regular pattern is detected. The Hiphil infinitive construct of נָפַס has a prefixed preposition ל, is used with the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix, and is associated with the phrase נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה (“do” + “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiphil infinitive construct of נָפַס</th>
<th>“do” + “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH”</th>
<th>Deut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה</td>
<td>וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ יְהוָה אֶלֹהִים</td>
<td>4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה</td>
<td>וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ יְהוָה אֶלֹהִים</td>
<td>9:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה</td>
<td>וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ וַעֲשֵׂהוּוּ יְהוָה אֶלֹהִים</td>
<td>31:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “YHWH” in the phrase “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH” is the antecedent to the objective pronominal suffix in נַבִּית וַעֲנֵיה, so YHWH is the object of the verb נָפַס.

There are several usages of an infinitive construct with a prefixed preposition ל.

Lohfink believes that this syntax is at least *consecutive* in meaning, but he further
suggests that it is justified in asking whether it is not in fact meant to express purpose:

“Israel deliberately provoked Yahweh to anger.” The ground for Lohfink’s second suggestion is the passage in Deut 32. However, it has been pointed out that the usage of the verb קוטל in the Song of Moses is very different from its other occurrences in Deuteronomy. The pattern observed in Deut 4:25; 9:18 and 31:29 cannot be found in Deut 32. So the text of the Song of Moses cannot provide an interpretative basis for the meaning of the infinitive construct of קוטל with a prefixed preposition ל. Instead of expressing purpose, the construction can express result: “so provoking Him to anger.”

The sin of “making [(hw) of an idol” and the “doing [hw] of what is evil in the eyes of YHWH” will provoke YHWH to anger. In Deut 4:25-26, the sin refers to the future sin of the people, the punishment is the utter destruction [שמד] of the people. While in Deut 9:18-19, the sin refers to the past sin in the golden calf incident, the punishment is also the destruction [שמד] of the people. The sin in Deut 31:29 again refers to the future sin, but punishment is the befalling of the disaster [רהו].

(4) The verb דיבר

The verb דיבר occurs once in Deuteronomy, in Hitpael stem with YHWH as subject. דיבר denotes strong fury, and the tone is stronger than לאכ. The verb

---

105 Cairns, Deuteronomy, 50-51; Lundbom, Deuteronomy, 227; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 147.
The verb הָרָעָה, can mean “to be angry” or “to be furious.” The noun הָרָעָה occurs thirty-four times in the Hebrew Bible. The emergence and expression of YHWH’s behavior are always understood as YHWH’s reaction to “inappropriate human behavior.”

In Deut 3:26, the verb הָרָעָה is used with the preposition ב (“with”). According to the context of Deut 3:26, there are two reasons for divine anger: לְמַעַן (“for your sake”), and the prayer of Moses. The consequence is that Moses is rejected by YHWH. YHWH did not listen to Moses’ prayer. The punishment was kept the same and Moses was not allowed to enter the Promised Land.

(5) The group הָרָעָה

(a) The verb הָרָעָה

The verb הָרָעָה, meaning “to be angry,” occurs five times in the book of Deuteronomy. These five occurrences may be grouped into two types of usage: (i) The verb in the Qal stem is used with a divine subject (Deut 1:34; 9:19); (ii) The verb in the Hiphil stem is used with a divine object and human subject, and can be translated as someone (eg. the people) “made YHWH angry” or “provoked YHWH in anger” (Deut 9:7, 8, 22). The usage of the verb הָרָעָה in Deuteronomy can be shown from the following table:

106 Driver, Deuteronomy, 60; Smith, Deuteronomy, 55.
107 HALOT 1:781.
110 HALOT 2:1124.
| Deut 1:34 | Qal | --- | --- (the Israelites) | YHWH heard the words of the Israelites (Deut 1:27-28, 34) | YHWH swore that the first exodus generation could not see the land |
| Deut 9:19 | Qal | לֵיל (“with”) | “you” = the Israelites | the Israelites had made an image of calf (Deut 9:12, 16) | YHWH will destroy the Israelites |
| Deut 9:7 | Hiphil | --- | YHWH | the rebellion of the Israelites is against YHWH | No mention |
| Deut 9:8 | Hiphil | --- | YHWH | the Israelites had made an image of calf (Deut 9:12, 16) | YHWH will destroy the Israelites |
| Deut 9:22 | Hiphil | --- | YHWH (implicit) | No mention |

The verb קִזְמָה in Deut 1:34 is not associated with a preposition and a human object, but the implied object of divine anger is very clear, it is “the Israelites.” The reason for divine anger is the murmuring of the Israelites. They said that YHWH hated them and brought them out of Egypt to destroy them by the Amorites (Deut 1:27). And they quoted the words of the spies that the people were greater and taller than them; the cities were great and fortified up to heaven; the spies had seen the sons of the Anakim (Deut 1:28). YHWH heard these words and was angered (Deut 1:34). The punishment is that the first generation who left Egypt shall not see the Promised Land.

In Deut 9:18-19, divine anger is triggered by כל החטאاءים אשר הפשעים ("all the sin that you [the Israelites] had committed") and לָאַאֵת הָרָעָה בָּעָטִים יְהוֹה (in doing what was evil in the eyes of YHWH). The punishment is that YHWH was ready to destroy (יהוה) the Israelites.
In Deut 9:7, 8, 22, the verb מלחמה is used with human subject and divine object. In Deut 9:7 it is the reoccurring of the rebellion against YHWH that provoked Him to anger. There is no explicit mention of punishment towards their rebellion. In Deut 9:8 divine anger is set off by the action of the Israelites at Horeb. According to the context, the action is the making of the calf image (Deut 9:12, 16). The punishment is that YHWH was ready to destroy (שמארה) the Israelites. In Deut 9:22 (the Hiphil participle of the verb מלחמה) is used as an adjective with the main verb יוהה ("to be"). So, מלחמה יוהה יוהה can be translated as “You are provocative against YHWH.” The reason for divine anger is not explicit, it just told the places at which they provoked YHWH to anger. The punishment is not mentioned. The reasons for divine anger in the texts in the above table are different. Nearly all the consequences of divine anger in these texts are very serious. The threat of destruction is inherent in this verb.\(^{111}\)

(b) The noun מלחמה

The noun מלחמה occurs once in Deuteronomy. In Deut 29:27 (28 ET) מלחמה with the preposition ב is one of the three prepositional phrases באתי ובמה ובמה ("in anger, in rage, and in wrath"). The noun מלחמה is modified by the adjective הגדול ("great") which follows it. The reason for divine anger is that the Israelites abandoned the covenant which YHWH made with them. They turned, served and

worshipped other gods (Deut 29:24-25[25-26 ET]). The punishment is the pulling out of the people and the throwing of them into another land by YHWH. The three adverbial prepositional phrases are used to describe the pulling out and throwing actions.

After the above discussion, we will pay attention to the punishments triggered by divine anger in Deuteronomy. The following table shows the object, the sin and the punishment from God.  

---

112 Deut 13:18 is not shown in the table because it tells a promise of turning from divine anger rather than an occurrence of divine wrath.
# The object of divine anger, the sin and the punishment in Deuteronomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of divine anger</th>
<th>Sin</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing evil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruct-ion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure for measure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Gift</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1:34 | Rebelling against the command of YHWH (1:26) Not believing in Him (1:32) | ✓ | Exclusion |
| 1:37 | Moses | No mention | Exclusion |
| 3:26 | Moses | No mention | No mention |
| 4:21 | Moses | No mention | Exclusion |

| 4:25-26 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 6:15 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |
| 7:4 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |

| 9:7 | ✓ | Rebelling against YHWH | No mention |
| 9:8 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |
| 9:18 | ✓ | ✓ | No mention |
| 9:19 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |
| 9:20 | Aaron | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |
| 9:22 | ✓ | No mention | No mention |
| 11:17 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (שָׁמַר) |

| 29:19 | A man | Hearing words of curse and walking in his stubbornness | ✓ |
| 29:22 | Sodom etc… | No mention | Overthrow |
| 29:23 | The land | The Israelites’ abandonment of the covenant of YHWH | Calamities |
| 29:26 | The land | ✓ | Bringing curses on the land |
| 29:27 | ✓ | ✓ | Exile |
| 31:17 | ✓ | ✓ | Forsaking God | ✓ | Forsaking the Israelites |
| 31:29 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Evil/ disaster |
| 32:16 | ✓ | ✓ | No mention |
| 32:19 | ✓ | ✓ | Rejection of the Israelites |
| 32:21 | ✓ | ✓ | Making YHWH jealous | ✓ | Making the Israelites jealous |
| 32:22 | ✓ | ✓ | Burning of the fire of God’s anger |
| 32:27 | The enemy | Misunderstanding | No mention |
From the above table, in Deuteronomy, the objects of divine anger are the Israelites and individuals (Moses, Aaron, Someone, the city Sodom, the land, and the enemy). Most of the mentions of divine anger are caused by clear mentions of sins. The sin of idolatry occurs fifteen out of twenty-six times. It is the sin with frequent occurrence.

Three general ways which God will punish the Israelites when He is angry can be derived. These three ways show that God will punish his people in a reasonable way even in His anger. In the first place, it is the way of “destruction.” In most of the cases of the sin of idolatry, God will destroy the Israelites. For instance, in Deut 6:14-15, Moses warns that the Israelites should not follow other gods, otherwise they will be destroyed. In the incident of the golden calf, the Israelites had made YHWH very angry, and He wanted to destroy them (Deut 9:8, 19). Two verbs are used in these destructions: אָכַל and שָׁנַמְתָּה.

The verb אָכַל meaning “to destory” occurs seven times in Deuteronomy. Norbert Lohfink points out that the verb שָׁנַמְתָּה is used in three most important contexts of Deuteronomy: curse texts, the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb, and the destruction of indigenous nations during the occupation.\textsuperscript{113} In the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb (Deut 9), there are three occurrences of the destruction. The parallel account in Exodus does not use the verb שָׁנַמְתָּה.\textsuperscript{114} In Deut 9 the consequence of YHWH’s anger is אָכַל, while in Exod 32:10 it is שָׁנַמְתָּה.\textsuperscript{115} The root שָׁנַמְתָּה is thus

\textsuperscript{113} Lohfink, "אָכַל," TDOT 15:188-189.
\textsuperscript{114} Lohfink, TDOT 15:192.
\textsuperscript{115} Lohfink, TDOT 15:192.
specific to the book of Deuteronomy as a means of interpreting the tradition of Israel’s sin at Horeb.\textsuperscript{116} Since the verb לְחַמָּה has been used seven times in Deut 28, Lohfink suggests that the לְחַמָּה terminology in Deut 9 is borrowed from the curse texts of Deut 28 in order to establish a theological context.\textsuperscript{117}

The verb הָבַר meaning “to destroy” occurs three times with divine anger in Deuteronomy. For the usage of הָבַר, Otzen states that the destructions will come under divine judgment and perish. The divine judgment and perishing will happen to Israel because of her disobedience to the law and her idolatry. In most of the related passages in the Hebrew Bible, there recurs the typical expression, “and you shall perish from the land…. Thus, in these texts, the divine punishment consists in God’s driving his people out of the land.\textsuperscript{118}

The second way is “measure for measure.” The punishment is measured according to the sin of the Israelites. In Deut 29:18-19 (19-20 ET), when someone hears the words of curses (לאל), and he thinks that he will be safe even if he walks in the stubbornness of his heart, then all the curses (לאל) will be upon him. In Deut 31:16-17, when the Israelites forsake (нятие) YHWH, then YHWH will forsake (нятие) them. In Deut 32:21, when the Israelites made YHWH jealous (אני) with what is “not god,” and provoked (تفاعل) YHWH with their idols, YHWH will make them jealous (אני) with who is “not people,” and provoke (تفاعل) them with a foolish

\textsuperscript{116} Lohfink, \textit{TDOT} 15: 192.
\textsuperscript{117} Lohfink, \textit{TDOT} 15: 192.
\textsuperscript{118} Otzen, "הָבַר," \textit{TDOT} 1:22.
nation.

The third way is “removal of gift.” YHWH intends to give His gifts to the Israelites. If they sin, YHWH will take away the gift. In Deut 11: 13-17, God will give rain (מַפֶּה) to the land of the Israelites, and the people can gather in their grain. But if they serve and worship other gods, God will shut the heavens and there will be no rain (מַפֶּה) and the land will yield no fruit. The gift of rain and grain to the land will be removed.

To summarise, a word study on different expression of divine anger in Deuteronomy has been carried out, and the uniqueness of the words of anger has been pointed out. In addition, the punishments triggered by divine anger are classified into three main principles: destruction, measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlight the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry with not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment on Moses was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has interpreted Deut 1:37; 3:26-27 in their own context. In regard to Deut 1:37-38, we first argue that they are original, and not secondary additions. Then we examine the spy narrative in Deut 1:19-46, which is the context of Deut 1:37. Since Num 13-14 also give us another version of the spy story, we carry out a comparison of these two versions. The result shows that the relationship between
Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 is very complicated. There is two-way inter-dependence between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version. Num 13-14 is formed by integration of Deut 1:19-46 and an older tradition which may also have been used by Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors.

In the context of Deut 1:19-46, Moses was not sinful. It is not necessary to deduce that Moses alluded to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, and he does not suffer vicariously. As a leader, he suffered with the people. But it is not accurate to say that the announcement of punishment and reward in Deut 1:35-39 is controlled by the principle of “corporate responsibility.” In that passage, we can see both the concepts of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility.” This coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” suggests that it is difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

In Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer, and also because of the Israelites. Moses felt the anger of YHWH because he heard that God told him not to ask for entering the land again. However Moses was not punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses is not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” is used to clarify that Moses did not sin, and to illustrate that the sin of the first exodus generation was very great.
A word study on different expression of divine anger in Deuteronomy has been carried out, and the uniqueness of the words of anger has been pointed out. Twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God in Deuteronomy are due to human sin. In addition, the punishments triggered by divine anger are classified into three main principles: destruction, measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlight the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry with not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment which Moses received was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself. In the next chapter, an interpretation of Deut 4 and the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History will be carried out.
Chapter Five: The “Anger-Punishment Pattern” in Deut 4

In this present chapter, the exclusion of Moses will be studied in the context of Deut 4, then we will use the “lens” of the theme of the anger of God in the Deuteronomistic History to interpret divine anger on Moses.

1. Reason for divine anger on Moses in Deut 4

Our third passage which depicts divine anger on Moses is in Deut 4:21-28. In Deut 4 Moses highlights that the importance of keeping the statutes and rules is that the Israelites may live in the Promised Land (Deut 4:1-2). After telling the theme of a contrast between destroying and living (Deut 4:3-4), Moses explains the origin of the ten words of YHWH which was commanded at Horeb (Deut 4:9-14). When YHWH spoke to the people at Horeb, He did not appear in any form in order to forbid the people from making a carved image (Deut 4:15-20). In Deut 4:21-28 Moses retells that he was not allowed to enter the good land that the people would enter. However, Moses also foretells that the people would be destroyed in the land because they would make a carved image in the future. YHWH would scatter them among the peoples, and the Israelites would serve the idols there.

In our present study, Deut 4:21-28 is treated as a unit. There is a suggestion that this unit was composed by different hands because Deut 4:21-22 was used to provide
a transition from historical narrative to law, and Deut 4:23-28 was a later addition on the subject of image worship.¹ But such a suggestion overlooks the clear links between verses 21-22 and verses 23-28. In the first place, the expression “crossing the Jordan,” which can be found in Deut 4:21-22 and 26, well connects 4:21-22 and 23-28. The function of Deut 4:21-22 is to highlight the gift which the Israelites would receive from God. They could live on the land that they were crossing the Jordan to occupy, while Moses could not cross the Jordan. In addition, YHWH is depicted as the active agent who did not allow Moses to enter the land, and would destroy and scatter the Israelites. In both 4:21-22 and 4:23-28 YHWH alone can decide who can live in the land.

It should be noticed that in Deut 4:21-22 Moses has mentioned his death which is not mentioned in Deut 1:37 and 3:26-27. His death and his exclusion from the land can be paralleled with the destruction and the scattering of the future generations of the Israelites. In fact, the whole passage of Deut 4:21-22 can be compared to the destiny of the future generations as the following table shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moses (Deut 4:21-22)</th>
<th>The future generations (Deut 4:23-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divine anger</td>
<td>“YHWH was angry with me…” (v. 21)</td>
<td>“… to provoke Him to anger.” (v. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause of divine anger</td>
<td>“… because of your words” (v. 21)</td>
<td>“… act corruptly, make an idol in the form of anything, do the evil in the eyes of YHWH…” (v. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death as a punishment</td>
<td>“I will die in this land…” (v. 22)</td>
<td>“… you shall be utterly destroyed.” (v. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not allowing living in the land as a</td>
<td>“I would not cross the Jordan…” (vv. 21-22) “I would not enter the</td>
<td>“YHWH will scatter you among the peoples…” (v.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 94.
Although Moses repeated twice that he would not cross over the Jordan (Deut 4:21, 22), this is not his main focus. His main point is to contrast the Israelites who would cross over and take possession of the land (Deut 4:22, 26). We find that YHWH was angry with Moses (Deut 4:21), and the Israelites would provoke YHWH to anger (Deut 4:25) as well. Besides, Moses would die beyond the Jordan (Deut 4:22), the future generations of the Israelites would be destroyed after crossing the Jordan (Deut 4:26). The extinction of the future generations is interpreted as a consequence of provoking YHWH to anger just as the death of Moses is interpreted as the consequence of divine anger. The “scattering” (דָּשַׁנָּה [Hiphil]) is another consequence of divine anger, it is parallel to the exclusion of Moses. The common point between the “scattering” and the exclusion is that the Israelites could not live in the Promised Land.

In Deut 4:21 the verb יָרָא (“to be angry”) is used. This is the same verb used in Deut 1:37. Its usage is discussed in the previous chapter. In Deut 4:25 the verb for divine anger is יָשָׁבַע, with the meaning “to provoke … to anger,” it occurs six times in the Pentateuch (only in the book of Deuteronomy) and fifty-four times in the Hebrew Bible. This verb is used frequently in Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah. One of the main themes of the Deuteronomistic work is that the Israelites sinned, and they provoked God to anger. The verb is used

---

2 HALOT 1:491.
3 Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 21(2×)
4 Driver, Deuteronomy, 72; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 155; Smith, Deuteronomy, 68; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy, 208.
in this key theme.\(^5\) The preposition לָ is used with the infinitive construct, forming לְ, to express consequence or result.\(^6\) This infinitival construction can hardly be purposive, nor is it complementary.\(^7\) Thus, the result of doing evil in the eyes of YHWH was that it provoked Him to anger. Finally, the anger of YHWH could put an end to the kingdoms of the Israelites.

Samantha Joo’s study of the usage of the Hiphil of the verb כִּתְחַם has been introduced in Chapter Two. Deut 4:25-27 is assigned as a unit in Joo’s second redaction level of the Deuteronomistic History. She claims that from the time of Moses, the people had been warned about the consequences of their provocation of God.\(^8\) In these descriptions, God is usually portrayed as the primary agent of destruction.\(^9\) God is depicted as acting alone, he punishes the Israelites and delivers them into the hands of the enemy.\(^10\) Since the people forgot the covenant of YHWH and made an idol image, they should bear the responsibility for the destruction and the “scattering.” If Joo’s thesis is right, then the contrast between divine anger on Moses in Deut 4:21 and divine anger on the people in Deut 4:25 is great. Moses was innocent, but the people had the punishment that they deserved.

The innocence of Moses is highlighted by using the expression על מרחיבים. This expression occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible. It hardly means “for your

---

\(^6\) Nelson, Deuteronomy, 60.
\(^7\) Wevers, Greek text of Deuteronomy, 80-81.
\(^8\) Joo, Provocation, 226.
\(^9\) Joo, Provocation, 71.
\(^10\) Joo, Provocation, 226.
sake” as Bertholet maintains because the assumption that this term is the same as (Deut 1:37) and (Deut 3:26) does not have a solid ground. Rather, can be translated as “because of your words” in which the “words” refer to the “murmurings” of the people in the spy story. The Israelites were afraid and gave murmurings when they received the report of the spies. In Deut 1:34 YHWH heard the voice of the Israelites’ words, and He proclaimed the judgment on the people and Moses. Thus, is an explanatory interpretation of in Deut 1:37. Therefore, the function of “because of your words” is clarifying that Moses was punished because of the murmurings of the people in the spy story. This is also the understanding of the LXX translator who translates as peri (because of the words being said by you)

The extinction of the future generations of the Israelites in Deut 4:25-28 can be interpreted by the three punishment principles which we have discussed in the previous chapter. Firstly, “destruction,” the Israelites will make an idol (to provoke”) YHWH, and they will be (“destroyed”) (Deut 4:26). The key word is used just as it is used in Deut 6-9. Secondly, “measure for measure,” the future Israelites will make an idol, then they will worship the gods made by the hands of man (Deut 4:27). Thirdly, “removal of gift,” the Israelites will do evil in the land, then they have to leave the land because YHWH will scatter them and drive them to

---

11 Bertholet, Deuteronomium, 17.
12 Lundbom, Deuteronomy, 244; Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 336-337.
13 Veijola, Deuteronomium, 114.
14 Perlitt, Deuteronomium, 336-337.
the nations (Deut 4:27).

To summarise, in Deut 4 Moses’s exclusion is used to compare to the destruction and “scattering” of the future generations who could live in the land. Moses was excluded because of divine anger and the sin of the first generation. The future generations were destroyed and scattered because of their own sin which provoked YHWH to anger.

2. The theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History

We have discussed the exclusion of Moses in the context of Deut 4:21-28. If Deut 4 is one of the layers of the Deuteronomistic History, how can the exclusion of Moses be understood in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History? In this section we will propose the scheme of “anger-punishment pattern” in the Deuteronomistic History to interpret the exclusion of Moses. This “anger-punishment pattern” is built on the “wrath formulae” of Dennis McCarthy and Norbert Lohfink.

McCarthy notices that there are two basic phrases to speak of divine wrath in the Deuteronomistic History: one is “the anger of YHWH blazes” or “YHWH is angry” (McCarthy names this as the “anger formula”); the other is “one provokes YHWH to rage” (it is named as the “provocation formula”). Each formula has its

---

own immediate associations. The “anger formula” is typically the climax of a stylized description of Israel’s desertion of YHWH. This is an assertion that the covenant is broken when the Israelites broke the relation with YHWH and formed a covenant with another god.\footnote{McCarthy, “Wrath,” 100.} A divine judgment announcing a penalty always ties to this “anger formula.” On the contrary, the “provocation formula” is not closely tied to the announcement of a penalty and the stylized description of infidelity involving the whole nation.\footnote{McCarthy, “Wrath,” 100.} Hence, McCarthy observes that the announcement of a penalty is another factor to distinguish these two formulae.\footnote{McCarthy’s contribution is great for he is the first who distinguishes the two wrath formulae and discusses them in relation to the structure of the Deuteronomistic History. However, his study of divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy is highly selective. With regard to the “anger formula” in Deuteronomy, it can be found in Deut 1:34, 37; 4:21; 6:15; 9:7-8, 19-20; 11:17; 29:19, 26, 27; 31:17; while the “provocation formula” is in Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 19, 21. Nevertheless, McCarthy only selects Deut 31:16-19 and then talks about the intention of linking the anger with the passing of a leader which marks the transition to the conquest era. His conclusion only fits the particular passage in Deut 31 and not all the texts with divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy. Furthermore, the connection of divine anger with transition of leadership does not appear in most of the above occurrences in Deuteronomy. Therefore, McCarthy has not identified the uniqueness of the usage of divine anger in Deuteronomy. His interpretation cannot reflect the whole picture of Deuteronomy or the three occurrences of divine anger on Moses. Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil. Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in \textit{Liebe und Gebot: FS L. Perlitt} (ed. R. G. Kratz et al.; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 137-155; repr., N. Lohfink, \textit{Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V} (SBAB 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 37-55.} Lohfink disagrees with the point of McCarthy that the “provocation formula” does not link to penalty on the ground that there are penalties following the “provocation formula” in the three dynasties of the Northern Kingdom.\footnote{Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil. Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in \textit{Liebe und Gebot: FS L. Perlitt} (ed. R. G. Kratz et al.; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 137-155; repr., N. Lohfink, \textit{Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V} (SBAB 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 37-55.} The word סנה (“to destroy”) does follow the “provocation formula.” Thus Lohfink claims that both the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula” are parallel, and are based
on a single basic scheme. Both the formulae will result in destruction. Lohfink himself suggests an “exile formula” which does not end in destruction.

The studies of McCarthy and Lohfink bring out the important role of the “wrath formulae” in the Deuteronomistic History. The naming of the formulae by them shows their different emphasis on the character of the formulae. McCarthy calls them the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula.” The names indicate their connections to divine anger. Regarding Lohfink’s “exile formula,” it omits the anger of God, but focuses more on the punishment, the exile. There should be a more systematic naming scheme for these “formulae.” To integrate the different names, I propose the scheme of the “anger-punishment pattern,” of which both the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” belong as sub-groups.

In addition, for our present study, I also propose an “anger-exclusion pattern” which includes the exclusion of Moses. We use the word “pattern” instead of “formula” because, as we shall see, different verbs or nouns for divine anger and punishments are used, and the variations among the passages are so great that they cannot be said to be “formulae.”

(1) The “anger-destruction pattern”

---

22 It is equal to McCarthy’s two “wrath formulae.”
23 It is equal to Lohfink’s “exile formula.”
We will first deal with the “anger-destruction pattern.” There are eight texts which connect “divine anger” with “destruction” in Deuteronomy, and four in the Former Prophets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Destruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Deut 4:25-26</td>
<td>נטש (Hiph, infc)</td>
<td>שמד (Qal, infa &amp; Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Deut 6:15</td>
<td>אלי (n)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Deut 7:4</td>
<td>אלי (n)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Deut 9:8</td>
<td>קבש (Hiph)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph, infc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Deut 9:19</td>
<td>אלי (n) מים (n) קבש (Qal)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph, infc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Deut 9:20</td>
<td>אלי (Hith)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph, infc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Deut 11:17</td>
<td>אלי (n) שמד (Qal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Deut 31:17</td>
<td>תרזה (Qal)</td>
<td>שמד (Qal, infc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Josh 22:20</td>
<td>קפז (n)</td>
<td>נתי (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Josh 23:16</td>
<td>תרזה (Qal)</td>
<td>שמד (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1Kgs 16:12-13</td>
<td>כנס (Hiph, infc)</td>
<td>שמד (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2Kgs 22:17</td>
<td>כנס (Hiph, infc)</td>
<td>י抻 (Niph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = noun; Qal = Qal; Hiph = Hiphil; Niph = Niphal; Hith = Hithpael; infa = infinal verb form)
In spite of different expressions of divine anger and different verbs of destruction are used, the pattern occurs similarly, and the concept is the same: the destruction is a result of divine anger. Although we have listed out all the occurrences of these patterns before making a comparison, a detailed study of the usage of different words will not be done here, for the present purpose is just to show the general pattern of the theme of divine anger.

The “anger-destruction pattern” carries out several functions. First, the divine anger pattern serves to reinforce some of the key speeches and essays in their function of structuring the narrative. The distribution of the “anger-destruction pattern” is similar to that of McCarthy’s “anger formula,” which can be found in the framework of Deuteronomy, at the end of the Book of Joshua, and at the end of the story of the kingdoms. Thus, the references to divine anger are concentrated at certain key points, among them the major transitions from one to another of the eras which characterize the Deuteronomic narrative. An inter-relationship between the anger of YHWH and the destruction of the people is highlighted.

Second, the “anger-destruction pattern” marks out the responsibility of the people. Ten out of the twelve occurrences of the pattern are related to the sin of the people.
people, exceptions are Josh 22:20 and 1 Kgs 16:12-13. In the former, the cause of divine wrath is the unfaithful action of Achan, while in the latter the sin of king Baasha and his son Elah is the problem. From the above table, the cause of divine anger is usually related to the apostasy of the Israelites. In the eight occurrences of the “anger-destruction pattern” of Deuteronomy, three of them (Deut 9:8, 19, 20) are used in the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb. It is about the idols which the first generation of the Israelites made. The other five occurrences point to the apostasy of the future generations of the Israelites. It shows that the “anger-destruction pattern” is applied to both the future generations and the first generation of the people who left Egypt. In the Former Prophets, three of the four causes of divine anger are idolatry of the Israelites.

Third, the pattern works in the formation of a “well-knit structure” in the Deuteronomistic History, tying beginning (Deuteronomy) to end (Book of Kings). It should be noticed that there are close links between the first “anger-destruction pattern” (Deut 4:25-26) and the last (2 Kgs 22:17). Both of them use the verb לֹא (‘would provoke’) YHWH to anger by something (‘doing’) what was evil in the eyes of YHWH. In Deut 4:25-26 Moses, the first prophet in Deuteronomy, foretold that the future generations of the Israelites לֹาֵם (‘would provoke’) YHWH to anger by doing what was evil in the eyes of YHWH. In 2 Kgs 22:17 Huldah, the last prophetess in the Deuteronomistic work, proclaimed the message of YHWH that the people לֹא (‘had provoked’) YHWH to anger with all their deeds.

These two “anger-destruction patterns” connect Deut 4 with 2 Kgs 22, where probably the original form of Deuteronomy was found before the reforms of king Josiah (2 Kgs 23).

The “anger-destruction pattern” can be found in important transition stages of the Deuteronomistic History and suggests that the interpretation of the punishment as divine anger is well accepted by the Deuteronomists’ traditions. The editors agree with the idea that the history of a nation would be affected and altered by divine anger. When the people of Israel rebelled against YHWH or committed evil deeds, it would make YHWH angry. The prophets have warned the people that these sins would provoke YHWH’s anger. The divine anger will initiate the means of punishment, and then destruction would occur. This interpretation has become a pattern with fixed logic but various terms have been used to describe divine anger or the destruction. This idea was common in the ancient Near Eastern texts, the nations around Israel also believed that gods would be angry with his people.\(^{30}\)

---

(2) The “anger-exile pattern”

The “anger-exile pattern” in the Deuteronomistic History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Cause of Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Exile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Deut 4:25-27</td>
<td>Making an idol and doing what is evil in the eyes of YHWH (4:25)</td>
<td>נְאֵם (Hiph, infc)</td>
<td>מָרַךְ (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Deut 29:27</td>
<td>Forsaking the covenant of YHWH (Deut 29:24) and serving other gods (Deut 29:25)</td>
<td>אָסַף (n)</td>
<td>נָפַשׁ (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>בָּאָסְתַּת (n)</td>
<td>כָּנָשׁ (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 Kgs 8:46</td>
<td>Israelites’ sin against YHWH</td>
<td>כל אָסַף (Qal)</td>
<td>כֵּבֶד (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 Kgs 14:15</td>
<td>Making of Asherim (idolatry)</td>
<td>נָפַשׁ (Hiph, ptp)</td>
<td>נָפַשׁ (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 Kgs 17:17-20</td>
<td>Abandonment of all the commandments of YHWH and idolatry</td>
<td>כל אָסַף (Hiph, infc)</td>
<td>רָב (Hiph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2 Kgs 23:26-27</td>
<td>The sin of Manasseh (Different types of idolatry, cf. 2 Kgs 21:1-9)</td>
<td>נָפַשׁ (n)</td>
<td>רָב (Hiph, 2×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>הָרָזָה (n, 2×)</td>
<td>נָפַשׁ (Qal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2 Kgs 24:20</td>
<td>(The evil action of Zedekiah)</td>
<td>אָסַף (n)</td>
<td>כֵּבֶד (Hiph, infc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n= noun; Qal = Qal; Piel = Piel; Hiph = Hiphil; Niph = Niphal; infc = infinitive construct; ptp= participle)

Here we have a cluster of seven “anger-exile patterns” in which different words for divine anger and different verbs for the exile are used. Nevertheless, the “anger-exile pattern” is still very clear. This pattern is built on Lohfink’s “exile formula,” which is developed from McCarthy’s “anger formula” and “provocation

---

31 נְאֵם, נְפַשׁ, נַפְשׁ, נַפַּשׁ, נַפְשָׁה, נַפַּשׁ, נַפַּשׁ, נַפַּשׁ.
32 מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ, מָרַךְ.
formula.” Lohfink observes that there is a variation in 2 Kgs 17. Both the formulae are found, but the word נזם (“to destroy”) is absent, moreover, the words רוח (“to remove”) and קור (“to cast/ throw”) are present.\(^{34}\) The results of divine wrath are changed to the removing and throwing out of the Israelites, such punishment can be classified as “exile,” and so Lohfink calls this the “exile formula.”\(^{35}\) The consequence of McCarthy’s two formulae is destruction, while that of Lohfink’s formula is exile.\(^{36}\)

How was the “exile formula” formed? Lohfink proposes that it came from the re-interpretation of the wrath of God by the Deuteronomists, who modified the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula” to the “exile formula.”\(^{37}\) Lohfink has two grounds for his proposal. First, in Deut 28:63 the word נזם is re-interpreted. It is not a statement of a dark ending any more, but a heading for its following sentence.\(^{38}\) Second, in Deut 29 the “exile formula” is introduced.\(^{39}\) In Deut 29:21-27 (22-28 ET) the object of divine anger is the land, not the people.\(^{40}\) The land was burnt and resulted in devastation. The Israelites would be thrown out into another land, but it is not said that they would be destroyed. Therefore, according to Lohfink, the “anger formula” is developed into the “exile formula” by omitting the

---

\(^{34}\) Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 150.
\(^{35}\) Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 150.
\(^{36}\) Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 151.
\(^{40}\) Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 154.
word דָּמָה, and using the word דָּמָה. Instead of destruction, there would be deportation of the people. Thus, Lohfink concludes that the Deuteronomists re-interpreted the “anger formula” because they knew and wrestled with the wrath of God. They discovered that even if their God was still so severe, in the end He could not give up His love for Israel.

Lohfink’s suggestion of the “exile formula” as a re-interpretation of the Deuteronomists is persuasive. There is, however, one point deserving to be clarified. He claims that in Deut 28:63 the word דָּמָה is re-interpreted from a dark ending to a new title, but he does not explain how he can draw this claim in that essay. We can find his reasoning from another article of his, דָּמָה,” in volume 15 of *TDOT*. In that article he explains that Deut 28:63 does not end with an “infinitive construction” conveying the totality of the destruction. Instead, the two verbs (אֲבָרָהָם and אָבֶד) appear in “finite” form as a kind of new title, in which the following verses of Deut 28:63 develop as they depict life in exile. Thus, his key basis is the change of form of אֲבָרָהָם and אָבֶד from “infinitive” (in Deut 28:20, 24, 45, 48, 51, 61) to “finite” form (28:63). Against this we may argue that there is no change of “finite” form at all. According to the text of Deut 28:63, אֲבָרָהָם appears as אָבֶד, and לָאֲבָרָהָם as לָאָבֶד. Both of them are infinitives, not finites. If there is no change of infinitive

---

construction, it is suspected that Deut 28:63 can still be read as a new title for the verses after it. Although the above claim of re-interpretation in Deut 28:63 is in doubt, most of Lohfink’s other arguments are convincing. His observations on the absence of the verb שמה and the presence of the verb שלם in Deut 29 and 2 Kgs 17 are correct. Besides, his suggestions to this replacement of verbs are also highly possible.

Just like McCarthy’s wrath “formulae” which serve to reinforce some of the key speeches and essays to structure the narrative, the seven “anger-exile patterns” found in the curial parts of the Deuteronomistic work also have the same function. The first two of them can be found in the frame of Deuteronomy (Deut 4:25-27 and Deut 29:27); 1 Kgs 8:46 is in the prayer of Solomon; 1 Kgs 14:15 is in the speech of the prophet Ahijah; 2 Kgs 17:18 belongs to the Deuteronomists’ explanation of the fall of Samaria and the Northern Kingdom; 2 Kgs 23:26-27 is the Deuteronomists’ note of the coming of the doom even after the reform of King Josiah; 2 Kgs 24:20 is an explanation of the fall of Jerusalem. Idolatry and the evil actions of the kings are the main causes for divine wrath.

We will select four of them to illustrate the characteristics of the “anger-exile pattern.” The first one can be found in Deut 4:27. In Chapter Three we have pointed out that the usage of the verb דמי (“to scatter”) in Deut 4:27 is different from the usual understanding of the exile. Usually, the verbs דא (“to remove”) or שלם (“to

---

cast/ throw” or נלאם (“to take into exile”/ “to deport”) will be used for the carrying of
the people into exile. In addition, the “peoples” and “nations” in Deut 4:27 are plural
rather than singular. The scattering of the people into different nations matches the
dispersion of the Jews throughout the nations, a phenomenon that has its first peak in
the Hellenistic period, two or three centuries after the Babylonian exile.\textsuperscript{49} Therefore,
the “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 4:27 is a varied form.

The second “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 29 deserves a closer look. According
to Lohfink, it was introduced by the Deuteronomists as an “exile formula” after a
series of sentences of destruction in Deut 28. It seems that this does not belong to
one of the early layers of the Deuteronomistic work because its comparison with Jer
21:5b and Ezek 19:12a will show that Deut 29:27 (28 ET) may be influenced by or
share the tradition with the prophets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 21:5b</th>
<th>Deut 29:27 (28 ET)</th>
<th>Ezek 19:12a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb נחל (“to uproot”)</td>
<td>נחל נחלות (Qal) יהוה (Hophal)</td>
<td>נחל נחלות (Hophal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Deut parallel with Jer, same words for anger | נכמה נכמתו נכמתו נכמתו נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורה נכמת נורת נכמת נורת נכמת
| Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb של (“to cast”) | שלשללה שלשללה (Hiphal) (Hophal) | שלשללה שלשללה (Hiphal) |

\textsuperscript{49} Lust, “Exile and Diaspora,” 99-122.
There are some similarities in the terms and pattern for divine anger in Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b. The three nouns for divine anger in Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b are the same, with the same preposition ב, and also in the same order. In the Hebrew Bible the juxtaposition of חֵם, חֵמְרָה, and לְוָדָה occurs only in Deut 29:27, Jer 21:5b and Jer 32:37. The expressions in Jer 32:37 are slightly different, they are “in My [=YHWH] anger, in My [=YHWH] fury and in great wrath.” Hence, it can be supposed that there is a parallel between Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b.

Regarding the verbs for exile, both Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a use נָתַתְשׁ (“to uproot”) and נָשָׁל (“to cast/ throw”) in the same order. There are only three occurrences of the combination of נָתַתְשׁ and נָשָׁל in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 29:27; Ezek 19:12a and 2 Chr 7:20. In Deut 29:27 the direct object of נָתַתְשׁ and נָשָׁל is the Israelites. In Ezek 19:12a the vine, the mother of the princes of Israel (Ezek 19:1), is the one being uprooted and cast out. In 2 Chr 7:20 the object of נָתַתְשׁ is the Israelites, while that of נָשָׁל is “this house” where YHWH sanctified to His name, that is, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 21:5b</th>
<th>Deut 29:27</th>
<th>Ezek 19:12a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb: “to uproot”</td>
<td>and YHWH uprooted them</td>
<td>But it was uprooted from their land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut parallel with Jer, same words for anger</td>
<td>… and in anger, in anger in fury</td>
<td>in fury;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in fury and in great wrath; and in great wrath,</td>
<td>to the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb: “to cast”</td>
<td>and cast them</td>
<td>it was cast down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| into another land, | | |
temple. The affinity between Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a is greater than that with 2 Chr 7:20 because the expression וְחָמַת (“and in fury”) can be found in Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a, but it is absent in 2 Chr 7:20. The parallel between Deut 29:27, Jer 21:5b and Ezek 19:12a is too close to be accidental. It is possible that Deut 29:27 has merged the traditions of these two prophetic books. If this is true, the “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 29:27 is inherited from the same traditions of Jer 21:5b (Jer 32:37) and Ezek 19:12a. Then, Deut 29:27 belongs to a late layer of the book of Deuteronomy.

The uniqueness of 1 Kgs 8:46 is that it is an exception on the subject of the verbs for exile. In all other six “anger-exile patterns” the subject of the verbs for exile is YHWH, while in this prayer of Solomon the expression וְחָמַת (“their captors”) is the subject of the verb וַיִּשְׁלַךְ (“to carry”). When YHWH is the subject of the verbs for exile, the event of deportation is depicted as the work of God. He alone is the initiator of the exile. But, in fact, the exile in 1 Kgs 8:46 is not initiated by the captors. According to the context, it is YHWH who gives the people to the enemy, so that the captors can carry the people to the land of the enemy. Therefore, in 1 Kgs 8:46 YHWH is the ultimate authority who let the people be carried into exile. When all the “anger-exile patterns” signify that YHWH is the active agent who initiates the exile, the lordship and sovereignty of YHWH on both the land and the Israelites is affirmed. YHWH alone can allow who can live in the land. It is also

---

50 There is not sufficient evidence to draw this conclusion at this stage. The relationship is too complicated to be discussed here.
YHWH himself who can punish the Israelites according to His will.

Finally, we come to 2 Kgs 23:26-27. This “anger-exile pattern” occurs after a positive appraisal of king Josiah. The narrative of the reforms of Josiah (2 Kgs 23) is very interesting in that the reform movements are framed by two “anger-punishment patterns.” The first of them is an “anger-destruction pattern” which can be found before the making of the covenant with the people in the message of Huldah the prophetess (2 Kgs 22:17). This is the last occurrence of the “anger-destruction pattern.” After the reforms of Josiah we can only find the “anger-exile pattern,” but not the “anger-destruction pattern.” The other “anger-punishment pattern” which frames the reforms of Josiah, is in 2 Kgs 23:26-27. This framework of the reforms of Josiah tells us that king Josiah first heard a message with the “anger-destruction pattern” from Huldah the prophetess. But he was not discouraged by the message of destruction, rather, he was determined to repent with the people. After his three main reform movements, we do not find the message of destruction anymore. The “anger-destruction pattern” is replaced by the “anger-exile pattern;” and the latter is not as severe as the former. This replacement suggests that the reforms of Josiah could bring a certain degree of hope to the people. The readers of 2 Kgs 22-23 should grasp the chance to repent and obey God, just as king Josiah had done.

51 The three reform actions are: the making of the covenant with the people (2 Kgs 23:1-3), the reform of the cult (2 Kgs 23:4-20), and the restoration of the Passover (2 Kgs 23:21-23).
(3) The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses

The “anger-exclusion pattern” in Deut 4:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Cause of Divine Anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger-destruction pattern</td>
<td>The sin of the Israelites (future generations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-exile pattern</td>
<td>The sin of the Israelites (future generations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-exclusion pattern of Moses</td>
<td>The sin of the Israelites (first generation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, we come to the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 4:21. The pattern of the “anger-exclusion pattern” is also very clear. Comparing with the previous tables of the “anger-destruction pattern” and “anger-exile pattern,” it can be noted that “the sin of Moses” is absent, while we can find the expression “because of your words.” Thus it seems that there is a replacement of the cause of divine anger in the “anger-punishment pattern” of Moses.

From our observation on the “anger-exclusion pattern,” we propose that the replacement of the cause of divine anger may indicate a clarification of the innocence of Moses, and an emphasis on the sin of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed the sin of the Israelites by using the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” which explain that the sins of the kings and the people provoked YHWH to anger, which caused the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem.
Regarding the “anger-exclusion pattern,” the Deuteronomists also confessed that it was the grave sin of the Israelites that caused Moses to be punished. Because Moses did not sin in the incident of the spy story, the phrase “because of your words” (Deut 4:21) follows the clause “YHWH was angry with me” in the speech of Moses. This phrase clarifies that Moses was innocent. The divine anger and punishment on Moses was not irrational. Moses was excluded from the Promised Land because of the sin of the first exodus generation.

The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses is compared with different “anger-punishment patterns” of Israelites in Deut 4. In Deut 4:21-28, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses connects with the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” of the Israelites. The exclusion of Moses, which is caused by the anger of God, is compared with the destruction and dispersion of the future generations which are also initiated by the provocation of divine anger. The sin of the first generation of Israelites is alluded in Deut 4:21, while the sin of the future generations of Israelites is mentioned in Deut 4:23-28. These two mentions of the sin of the Israelites are like the “inclusio” of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed that the Israelites were a sinful people since the first generation who left Egypt to the last generation during the fall of Jerusalem. They confessed that they were people who deserved the wrath of YHWH.

We have suggested that Deut 1-3 has a dual role as the introductory chapters to the book of Deuteronomy and the historical introduction to the Deuteronomistic
History. Therefore, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 1-3 can be also understood in the scheme of the “anger-punishment pattern” of the Deuteronomistic work.

The “anger-exclusion pattern” in Deut 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 1:37</th>
<th>Cause of Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Divine Anger</th>
<th>Word for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מִפְּלַעֲשָׁה (“on your account”)</td>
<td>לָא (Hiph)</td>
<td>לא (Qal) with בֵּן</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 3:26-27</td>
<td>קַנֵּנֶס (“for your sake”)</td>
<td>נָבָר (Hiph)</td>
<td>לא (Qal) with בֵּן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses appears in the frame of Deut 1-3. The first occurrence of it is at the beginning of Deut 1 in the spy narrative; while the other one can be found at the end of Deut 3 where Moses retold his prayer to God. It can be noted that “the sin of Moses” is also absent, while we can find the expressions “on your account” and “for your sake” are always attached to divine wrath. Thus there is a replacement of the cause of divine anger in the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses. Hence, like Deut 4:21-22, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses can highlight the sin of the Israelites and the innocence of Moses.

Another important element in the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 1:37 is that the verb נָבָר is used for divine anger. This verb coheres with the concluding chapter of the Deuteronomistic work in 2 Kgs 17, in where YHWH was very angry (נָבָר) with Israel and removed them out of his sight. Thus, the wrath of YHWH against Moses is a prelude to the end of Israel in the Deuteronomistic
3. Conclusion

In conclusion we may briefly review the two main sections which we have been discussing. The first section attempts to show that in Deut 4 Moses’s exclusion is compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. Moses was excluded because of divine anger and the sin of the first generation. The future generations would be destroyed and scattered because of their own sin which provoked YHWH to anger.

In the second section, we propose the scheme of the “anger-punishment pattern” to integrate Dennis McCarthy’s “wrath formulae” and Norbert Lohfink’s “exile formula.” We place the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses as one of the sub-groups. The Deuteronomists confess the sin of the Israelites by using the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” which explain that the sin of idolatry and evil actions of the people (and the kings) provoked YHWH to anger, which caused the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem. Regarding the “anger-exclusion pattern,” we propose that the replacement of the sin of the Israelites by “because of your words,” “on your account” and “for your sake” may indicate a clarification of the innocence of Moses, and an affirmation of the sin of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed that it

---

was the grave sin of the people that caused the innocent Moses to be punished. Such a pattern forces the Israelites to look at the severity of their sin that even the innocent one would be affected. Hence, divine anger and the exclusion of Moses work together in the “anger-punishment pattern” to bring out the principle of divine work in history. Not all the mentions of the exclusion of Moses are interpreted by the divine anger tradition. We will look at them in the next two chapters.
Chapter Six. The sin of Moses in Num 20 and Num 27

Before we come to the post-Priestly text of Deut 32:48-52, it is necessary first to interpret Num 20:1-13 and 27:12-14 because Deut 32:48-52 depends on the traditions of these two passages. In this chapter we will try to give an interpretation of the sin of Moses in Num 20:1-13. Then, we will seek to explain the change of the description of the sin of Moses and Aaron in Num 27:14.

1. The sin of Moses in Num 20

Moses and Aaron were not allowed to lead the people into the Promised Land after the incident of waters of Meribah. The story (Num 20:1-13) can be divided into five sections:

1) 20:1  Itinerary formula (with the death of Miriam)
2) 20:2a  Exposition
3) 20:2b-5  Complication (crisis and speech report)
4) 20:6-12  Resolution (narration, speech report, execution of instruction and speech report)
5) 20:13  Concluding etiology

The first verse of Num 20 does not give a direct cause or connection to the plot of the

---

1 Knierim and Coats, Numbers, 225-226.
narrative but it has two implicit linkages to the chapter as a whole. One of which is the place “Kadesh.” This chapter begins with the record that the people stayed at Kadesh (Num 20:1). Then, Num 20:14 starts another narrative which also occurred at Kadesh from where Moses sent messengers. In Num 20:16, the message of Moses also mentions Kadesh. After the Israelites were rejected by Edom, they set out from Kadesh and came to Mount Hor (Num 20:22). The second linkage of Num 20:1 to the chapter itself is the mention of the death of Miriam. In Num 20:28-29 Aaron’s death is also mentioned. Aaron’s death echoes Miriam’s death. Thus, Num 20 can be read as depicting the fate of the three siblings: all of them could not enter or live in the Promised Land. (Miriam [Num 20:1], Aaron [Num 20:12, 24-29] and Moses [Num 20:12]).

Num 20:2-5 describes the complaints of the people where verse 2 states the cause of the complaints, and verses 3-5 the content of the complaints. Their complaints do not start with water but begin with two occurrences of the root בּוּן (“perished”) followed by two הַלְמ ("why") questions. The people had mentioned

---

2 Marvin Sweeney suggests that Moses “is denied entry into the Promised land when he commits sin at the rock of Meribah, most likely because he and Aaron did not purify themselves following the burial of their sister Miriam.” See Marvin A. Sweeney, “Moses,” OEBT 2: 115. However, Sweeny’s suggestion is not supported by any reason.

3 HALOT 1: 184.

4 The most important address to the problem of “no water to drink” occurs only at the end of the complaints. The motif of “death” in Num 20:1 recurs in Num 20:3-4. When the Israelites contended with Moses, they wished that they had perished when their brothers perished before YHWH. And they feared whether they would die in the wilderness. The two הַלְמ ("why") questions ask the purpose of the journey. The first question asks, “Why have you brought (בְּרָאוֹ Hiphil)...into this wilderness?” The second question is, “Why have you made us come up out of Egypt to bring (בְּרָאוֹ Hiphil) us to this evil place?” They thought that the wilderness was “evil” (Num 20:5) and was the destination of the journey, that it was a place for them and their beasts to die (Num 20:4). They forgot that they should be brought into the land which YHWH had given to them (Num 20:12). They had focused on the things they lacked, i.e., grain, figs, vines, pomegranates and water (Num 20:5).
YHWH two times, however, they did not find any hope or solution from YHWH.

They had lost the aim and the meaning of the journey. In Num 20:6, Moses and Aaron left the assembly and went to the tent of meeting. They responded to the people’s complaints not verbally but by a gesture, falling on their faces to the doorway of the tent of meeting. After that, the text reads: the glory of YHWH appeared to Moses and Aaron.

In Num 20:7-8 YHWH instructed Moses and Aaron with five verbs, each verb has its object. The instructions given by YHWH are very clear and provide a solution to the problem of water shortage. Then, Moses performed five actions. It seems that Aaron only performed one action with Moses: the assembling of the people (Num 20:10). Finally, the problem was solved (Num 20:9-11).

In Num 20:12, YHWH judged that Moses and Aaron had not believed in him because they have performed some actions which were not instructed by YHWH. By doing so, they had not regarded YHWH as holy before the Israelites. Thus, Moses and Aaron could not bring the assembly into the Promised Land. The concluding etiology in Num 20:13 recounts that the holiness of YHWH is retained. The name of the place, the waters of Meribah, means that the Israelites had contended with YHWH. Moses and Aaron were punished and excluded from the Promised Land.

---

5 Their brothers had “perished before YHWH”(Num 20:3) and they were “the assembly of YHWH” (Num 20:4)
6 Baentsch believes that YHWH sanctified himself by the pronouncement of the judgment of Moses and Aaron. See Baentsch, Numeri, 570. Seebass argues that the “them” in the “through them” may be “the Israelites” because it is the closer object of the suffix. See Seebass, Numeri 10.11-22.1, 283.
7 In v. 3, it is Moses whom the Israelites had contended with, but now in v. 13, the Israelites contended with Yhwh.
What is the sin of Moses?

(a) Actions of Moses contrast with Num 20:8

The sin of Moses has been disputed at great length. To approach the problem of the sin of Moses, it is necessary to clarify whether the sin is in the action or in the word, whether the sin is in one action or more than one action, and whether we should restrict the sin to be one action only. Some scholars attempt to solve the problem by finding one fault of Moses. But it is not necessary to restrict to only one sin. According to the narrative of Num 20:1-13, Aaron and Moses performed different actions and not both of them have spoken the words, but both of them received the same punishment. It illustrates that different actions and words will give rise to the same description of sin and same punishment in this case. Thus, the punishment is due to different actions (more than one). The sin can be in the action and in the words as well. It seems that it is not a choice of “either – or.” There should be more than one action signifying the sins of Moses and Aaron. Hence, we may accept all the reasonable possibilities rather than just give one probable solution to the issue.

Then, how can we begin to solve the problem? The context of the text itself

---

gives a clue: in Num 20:8 YHWH commanded Moses and Aaron five actions: “take the staff,” “assemble the congregation,” “speak to the rock,” “bring forth water” and “let the congregation drink.” However, later Moses performed five actions: (a) he took the staff; (b) he assembled the people; (c) he spoke to the people; (d) he lifted up his hand; and finally (e) he struck the rock twice. Then YHWH condemned Moses and Aaron. There are differences between the commands of YHWH and the actual carrying out of the commands. Thus, the main faults of Moses can be deduced by comparing Moses’ actions and words with YHWH’s commands.9

Comparison of the instructions of YHWH with the actions of Moses and Aaron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commands in v. 8</th>
<th>Action done by Moses in vv. 9-11</th>
<th>Action done by Moses and Aaron in vv. 9-11</th>
<th>Types of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>take (singular)</td>
<td>took (v. 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assemble (singular)</td>
<td></td>
<td>assembled (v.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak (plural)10 to the rock</td>
<td>said to the people (v.10)?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ii &amp; iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring forth (singular)11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let the congregation drink (singular)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>lifted up his hand (v.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>struck the rock (v.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Is the sin deliberately suppressed? There is no evidence to support the view of Eryl Davies, who suggests that there may be a motivation that was to avoid incriminating Moses and Aaron unduly by dwelling on the precise nature of their transgression or the view of Kapelrud, who contends that the author had been deliberately vague about the sin to answer the demands of an explanation why they never came to lead the invasion into the Promised Land. Snaith’s suggestion that the sin had been clearly defined in the original narrative but had been deliberately lost in the editing does not have sufficient ground. The explanation of Schmitt that the author has deliberately suppressed the exact nature of the error of Moses in order to stress the divine pronouncement of Moses’ lack of faith must also be rejected. See Davies, *Numbers*, 206; Kapelrud, “How Tradition failed Moses,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 242; Snaith, “Numbers,” 264; Sailhamer, *Pentateuch*, 76.

10 Sakenfeld also has observed that “take” the staff is singular imperative, while “speak” to the rock is a second person masculine plural. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.

11 The last two verbs of Num 20:8 are singular in MT but plural in the LXX. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.
There are three types of actions: (i) actions performed according to the instruction of YHWH; (ii) actions that YHWH had commanded them to do but they had not done; and (iii) actions that had been performed but not instructed by YHWH. In Num 20:9, Moses was simply carrying out God’s instruction. He took the staff. The phrase “just as he had commanded him” (Num 20:9) makes this very clear. Then, Moses and Aaron assembled the assembly” (Num 20:10). Although the imperative of the verb “assemble” in Num 20:8 is in the singular form, it is followed by “you (=Moses) and Aaron” immediately. Both Moses and Aaron were ordered to perform the action and they did as they had been told.

The sin of omitting from God’s commands

In Num 20:8 the verb דיברתם (“you speak”) is in plural form. YHWH had ordered both of them to speak to the rock.12 But only one of them had spoken because the verb אמרו (“and he said”) in Num 20:10 is in the singular. This is the first point in which they disobey YHWH, one of them has not obeyed YHWH’s instruction. The second fault is that one of them spoke to a wrong object. They were ordered to speak to the rock, but one of them spoke to the people. Not both of them spoke to the rock, instead, one of them spoke to the Israelites. The identity of the speaker who said to the people in Num 20:10 is ambiguous. The text does not

---

12 Coats also makes the point that the two (Moses and Aaron) will be required to speak to the rock. See George W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness: The Murmuring Motif in the Wilderness Traditions of the Old Testament* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1968), 78.
actually specify the speaker,\textsuperscript{13} the subject of the verb “said” can be Moses or Aaron. It is not wrong in saying that Moses was the speaker. It is also how the author of Ps 106:32-33 understands it: “... Moses suffered on their account... and he spoke rashly.” The speaker is taken to be Moses because of “his independent status in other verses” in this passage, and because of the tradition of Ps 106.\textsuperscript{14}

In Num 20:8, YHWH commanded either Moses or Aaron to bring forth water from the rock. In Num 20:11, “and water came forth” from the rock. The water became an active subject in this sentence. It was not Moses or Aaron who brought forth water from the rock. Also, YHWH instructed that either Moses or Aaron to “let the people drink.” But in Num 20:11 “the congregation and their beasts” are the subjects of the verb “drank.” It was not Moses or Aaron who had performed the instruction given by YHWH.

The sin of lifting up his hand

YHWH had not commanded Moses to lift up his hand but he did so (Num 20:11). Labuschagne states that the gesture has a military connotation (the readiness to fight and the will to prevail) in Exod 14:8 and Num 33:3b; the expression has a weakened meaning, “deliberately,” in Num 15:30.\textsuperscript{15} Roy Gane also claims that this is the language of sinning with a “high/ lifted hand,” that is, defiantly.\textsuperscript{16} Recently, the studies of Jean-Pierre Sonnet and Ka Leung Wong have given solid reasonings to

\textsuperscript{13} Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.
\textsuperscript{14} Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.
\textsuperscript{16} Roy Gane, Leviticus, Numbers (NIVAC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2004), 671.
support this view.

Jean-Pierre Sonnet has argued attractively that the sin of Moses is that he deliberately despised the word of YHWH “with raised hand.”  

Moses knew and was aware of his act of defiance and rebellion against the order given by YHWH.  

The first basis of Sonnet’s argument is the text of Num 15:30-31. Sonnets believes that the narrator has sent a signal to the readers of the book of Numbers:  

ץ יד יוהו אל יהיה (“and Moses raised his hand”). This gesture of Moses illustrates the voluntary and deliberate nature of his sin just as the sin of “with raised hand” in Num 15:30-31. The term יייר in Hebrew adopts a metaphorical language, the raised hand is a sign of defiance.  

The text of Num 15:30-31 also helps to explain the punishment of Moses. According to which, the punishment to the sinner who sinned with raised hand will be קִצ (“to cut off”), he would be removed from the people. In Num 20:12 it is said that Moses could not lead the Israelites to the Promised Land. Moses’ fate was different from that of the people. This distinguished fate is the punishment of removal from the people. Sonnet agrees with Olivier Artus that the narratives are used to support the laws in the book of 

---

18 Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 539.  
19 Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 539.  
Numbers. So the narrative of Num 20:1-13 is used to lead the readers to the concept of the sin of “with raised hand” in Num 15:30-31.

Sonnet’s second basis is the characterization of Moses in the Pentateuch. From the book of Exodus to Deuteronomy, the body of Moses is linked to the plot of the narratives. Thus the lifting up of Moses’ hand gives a sign of the fault of Moses, and points out Moses’ deliberate action and his rebellion against YHWH’s command. The line of thought of Sonnet is sensitive to the literary plot of Moses and the relationship between law and narrative in the book of Numbers.

On different grounds, Ka Leung Wong also proposes a persuasive suggestion that the raising of Moses’ hand constitutes at least part of the sin of Moses. By comparing to the passages of the Exodus version of the waters of Meribah (Exod 17:1-7) and the plague narrative (Exod 7-10), Wong argues that when the text talks about striking with the staff, the preceding action is either the stretching out of the hand or the staff, but never the raising of the hand or the staff. Examining all the occurrences of the texts in which רוח is used with י, Wong notices that eight of the occurrences all underline the various human subjects’ attitude, their readiness to fight and their will to prevail. So the phrase בָּדוֹחַ is a demonstration of their own power to prevail against a hostile and even superior force. Consequently, the

---

26 Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 540.
29 Wong, “And Moses,” 399.
30 Wong, “And Moses,” 399.
The gesture of “raising one’s hand” is “not to be interpreted literally, but figuratively as representing his attitude, a demonstration of his own power to fight against a hostile and superior force before him.”

By reference of Num 14:9 and 11, the implied superior force is God. Since Moses regards God as his enemy, he rebels against God by not following His command to speak to the rock. Therefore, there are good grounds for supposing that the raising of hand of Moses is one of his faults. However, the view taken here is that the lifting up of the hand is not the only sin involved.

Only Moses had lifted up his hand, Aaron had not, but both of them were punished. If the raising of hand was the only sin, Aaron would not be punished because he did not commit such sin.

The sin of striking the rock

In Num 20:8, YHWH also ordered Moses and Aaron to speak to the rock, but Moses struck the rock (Num 20:11). This striking was not only unnecessary but also repeated. Many scholars agree that the sin is in the striking of the rock instead of speaking to the rock. The striking of the rock replaces the speaking to it, such

---

31 Wong, “And Moses,” 400.
32 Wong, “And Moses,” 400.
33 Wong, “And Moses,” 400.
34 If Moses’ sin is indicated by the raising of his hand, Aaron’s sin should be indicated by other actions. Since both of Aaron and Moses did not perform three tasks instructed by YHWH (speaking to the rock, bringing forth water, and letting the congregation drink), Aaron himself would not be innocent in this incident.
35 Elliott-Binns, Numbers, 132; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 160; H. Holzinger, Numeri (KHCAT 4; Tubingen : J.C.B. Mohr, 1903), 85; Knierim and Coats, Numbers, 228; Mays, Numbers, 110; Scharbert, Numeri, 80; H. Schneider, Numeri (Würzburg: Echter, 1952), 53; de Vaulx, Nombres, 226; Wenham, Numbers, 150; Wong, Numbers, 250.
replacement is the mistake of Moses. Therefore, the replacement of speaking to the rock is a denial of God’s word.

However, Jacob Milgrom does not think that the action of striking the rock is the sin of Moses. Instead, he thinks this action is necessary. Milgrom’s conclusion is based on the following observations and reasons. First, Milgrom quotes Ramban’s comment that Moses was told to take the staff in Num 20:8. When the staff is “employed, striking is either specifically mentioned or implied.” Second, the Israelites did not know the command of speaking to the rock which YHWH specially told Moses. Their previous experience in Exod 17 would have led them to expect Moses to strike the rock. Consequently, when they saw that Moses struck the rock, they “could not be aware” that YHWH was not regarded as holy in the sight of them. Third, Exod 17 and Num 20 are records of the same account, this is based on the following grounds. Most critics posit Exod 17 and Num 20 as two variant accounts for the same incident because there are remarkable parallels in both context and style. In addition, Bekhor Shor, a medieval Jewish exegete, also postulates Num 20 as a duplication of Exod 17 because he notices that the story about the manna, the quail, and the waters from the rock each occur twice, once in Exodus and once in Numbers. Moreover, according to Deut 33:8, Massah and Meribah must refer to the same incident because they are in the poetic parallel clauses. The text of

---

36 Seebass, Numeri 10,11-22,1, 282.
Ps 78:15-31 and Deut 9:22 also support such possibility. Furthermore, in Num 20:13 the place is called “waters of Meribah, meaning that the Israelites quarreled with YHWH.” Such wording also occurs in Exod 17:7. Therefore, observing that Moses was ordered to strike the rock in the Exod 17 version, and assuming that Exod 17 and Num 20 are variants of the same incident, Milgrom deduces that Moses was also ordered to strike the rock in the Numeri version originally. Hence, the “striking on the rock” is a fulfillment of the command.

But, why is there a command of “speaking to the rock” in Num 20:8? According to Milgrom, the term “and speak” was incorrectly inserted. He reconstructs the original text of Num 20:8a to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>קִחְתָּאָה דַּהְמָה</th>
<th>“Take the staff”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָהָנִיאָא אֲשֶּׁר כָּהָה</td>
<td>and assemble the congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָתָא וּאָהֶרֶךְ אָהֲרֶך</td>
<td>you and Aaron, your brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶל הָסָלֶנֶה</td>
<td>to the rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָרְפִיָחָא אֵל הָסָלֶנֶה</td>
<td>and strike the rock (lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְעָנִיָּה</td>
<td>before their eyes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וּנֵיהֵל מִיָּה</td>
<td>and it may yield its water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He suggests that the original text of Num 20:8a contained the command “strike the rock.” This clause fell out accidentally because of “homoioioteleuton.” Later, “and speak” was incorrectly inserted because Moses did speak and the promise of giving

---

41 Milgrom, “Magic,” 254.
42 Milgrom, “Magic,” 255.
43 Milgrom, “Magic,” 256.
44 The phenomena of “homoioioteleuton” (“identical ending”) refers to the erroneous omission of a section influenced by repetition of one or more words in the same context in an identical way or similar way. See Tov, Textual Criticism, 238.
out water was fulfilled.⁴⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text of Num 20:8 after the insertion of “and speak”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| הק אֶת הַשֶּׁמֶּהָה | 8 “Take the staff
| והקהל אֵת תַּעַרָה | and assemble the congregation
| אתה ואַחְרֵיהֶם אֵת אָחָרוֹן | you and Aaron, your brother
| והדברת | and speak (inserted)
| אל הֶעָלֶה | to the rock
| לפני אֹהֶל | before their eyes,
| וְהָתַת מְדִירָה | and it may yield its water.

Milgrom’s suggestion faces two serious obstacles. In the first place, Milgrom’s point that the Israelites expect Moses to strike the rock because of their previous experience and the assumption that Exod 17 and Num 20 are records of the same incident are incompatible. If Exod 17 and Num 20 are duplicate accounts of the same tradition, Exod 17 would not be the previous experience of the Israelites. If the incident of the waters from the rock occurred only once, the Israelites would not expect Moses to strike the rock.

Second, Milgrom’s reconstruction of the text of Num 20:8a requires the coincidence of both the homoioteleuton of the clause “and strike the rock” and the incorrect insertion of “and speak.” There is no textual evidence for his hypothesis. If there is an understanding that Moses and all the prophets perform the miracles in silence as a contradictinction to pagan magic, it is hard to believe that the later scribe would insert “and speak” in the command of God. The later scribe did not necessarily see that the fulfillment of the miracle is related to Moses’ saying. It is,

⁴⁵ Milgrom, “Magic,” 256.
therefore, unlikely that the striking of the rock is necessary, rather it is one of the sins of Moses.

Another suggestion that Moses had misused the staff when he struck the rock, may be correct. The staff is called “the staff of God” (Exod 4:20). The staff of God in Moses’ hand “profiles Moses as the representative of God.” Johnson Lim has drawn attention to that only YHWH has the prerogative to decide how the staff is to be used; using the staff of God to strike the rock without authorization was an act of defiance. Hence, the misuse of the staff is also a sin of Moses.

(b) Words of Moses

Besides the actions, the sin(s) may lie in the speech of Num 20:10. The sin of Moses and Aaron is that they have not served as instruments of God’s blessing by their “rash words,” instead they have implied doubt of God’s plan to help the people, perhaps doubted their role as instruments, or even have wanted to withhold from the people the goodness God has promise to give. The sin is a lack of trust impeding God’s mercy to the community. There are three ways to understand the words of Moses: (a) An open-ended question: “shall we bring forth water?” (b) A question

---

46 Lim, *Staff of God*, 162.  
47 Lim, *Staff of God*, 162.  
48 Lim, *Staff of God*, 163.  
50 Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 149.  
51 Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 151.  
expecting a negative answer: “Can we bring forth water?” (c) A rhetorical question to express a refusal to produce the water: “Shall we indeed../ Why shall we bring forth water?” It has been pointed out that the unfaithful content of the question itself would lead to the judgment of God. In Ps 106:32-33 it is claimed that Moses spoke rash words, and this supports the view that the speech of Num 20:10b is the root of the problem. The speech is uncalled for, and implies a claim that they, not God, will produce the water. In its arrogance it fails to foster true belief in and reverence for YHWH.

It would be wrong to suppose that the sin of Moses is that he said something before the rock-striking action which originally should be performed in silence. According to Milgrom, such silent performance of miracle can contrast sharply with the pagan magic (Egypt and Mesopotamian). When Moses spoke to the rock, the Israelites would have taken “his words as an incantation and him as a magician” who performed the miracle by his own power rather than by “divine agency.” We have argued that there is no strong basis for such suggestion.

However, Milgrom’s other point is still useful. When Moses said, “shall we…” (Num 20:10), the “we” does not include God because there was no visible evidence

---

53 Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 148-149.
54 Philip J. Budd, Numbers, (WBC; Dallas, Texas: Word, 1984.), 219.
55 Budd, Numbers, 219. However, Sakenfeld states that Ps 106 represents one view of the matter, but even its statement is not explicit in identifying Moses’ speaking as sin. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 147.
56 Milgrom, “Magic,” 262.
of God’s presence on the rock.\textsuperscript{59} Hence Moses implied that the miracle was his miracle, not God’s.\textsuperscript{60} Moses attributed the miracle power to himself.\textsuperscript{61} This is a denial of God’s essence.\textsuperscript{62} In such denial, Moses and Aaron missed the chance to sanctify God.\textsuperscript{63} Nili Fox also points out that the medieval commentators have focused on the pronoun “we” in “shall we bring water” in the speech. By attributing the act of drawing water from a rock to himself and Aaron, Moses fails to credit the miracle to YHWH before the Israelites.\textsuperscript{64}

To summarise: the sin of Moses can be found in Num 20:10. The speaking itself was a sin or the rash words were faults. His sin can also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses’ hand has both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expresses that Moses defiantly despises YHWH’s command. The raising of Moses hand alludes to the “high hand” in Num 15:30-31, which speaks about a man deliberately disobeys the word of YHWH. He misused the staff, and rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it.

2. The loss of leadership of Moses in Num 20

Before discussing the meaning of the disbelief of Moses and Aaron, it is

\textsuperscript{59} In Exod 17:6 YHWH said that He would be standing on the rock.
\textsuperscript{60} Milgrom, “Magic,” 257.
\textsuperscript{61} Milgrom, “Magic,” 264.
\textsuperscript{62} Milgrom, “Magic,” 258.
\textsuperscript{63} Milgrom, “Magic,” 258. Seebass disagrees with Milgrom that Moses acted magically when Moses spoke something during the performance of the miracle. Such interpretation, according to Seebass, is a “read-in” interpretation. See Seebass, Numeri 10,11-22,1, 282.
\textsuperscript{64} Nili S. Fox, “Numbers,” in The Jewish Study Bible (2d ed.; ed. A. Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 308.
necessary to settle the issues brought out by David Frankel and Herbert Specht recently. Frankel brings out a textual issue in Num 20:12. He points out that the infinitive construction לה-sanctify me (“to sanctify me”) did not exist in the original form of the text. According to him, the infinitive construction is supplemented by a redactor to “did not believe in God.” He thinks that Num 20:12 has been expanded by a short interpretive gloss “to regard me as holy before the eyes of the Israelites” because of four reasons: (a) The second half of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51 seem to be secondary. Since Num 20:12 is the parallel text of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51, the verse is suspected to be a late gloss. (b) Frankel thinks that usually an author uses only one term to present the same thing. Two different terms are used to describe the people of Israel: “sons of Israel” and “this assembly.” (c) The sin of Moses and Aaron “seems overloaded.” It remains unclear “where the weight of the sin lies – in the lack of trust in God or in the failure to sanctify.” (d) The implication that Moses and Aaron failed to sanctify God “flies in the face of verse 13,” which clearly states “and He sanctified himself through them.” Since verse 13 is not a late supplement, then verse 12 is.

Frankel’s arguments are not convincing. First, Frankel assumes that the original version must be clearer and simpler than the one with supplements. He finds that there are difficulties in the second half of verse 12. Then he deduces that these
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difficulties are produced by the “interpretive gloss.” When the gloss is removed, the original meaning is much clearer. According to Frankel’s assumption, the supplementary gloss of the redactor does not really help to interpret the sentence. It causes more hard sayings. It seems that the redactor did not know that his gloss is a problem but Frankel does. However, one may ask why the redactor will make something more difficult to understand although his original intention is to interpret something. Could we assume that the redactor was also aware of the problem? It is not necessary to assume that the inconsistencies are caused by the redactor since most redactors would try to avoid the inconsistencies caused by his editorial activity. It is also unnecessary to reconstruct an “imposed original form” of the verse to interpret the difficulties in Num 20:12.

Second, regarding the two different terms used to mention the people of Israel (“the sons of Israel” and the “assembly”), it is not necessary to assume that an author can use only one term. Three terms, in fact, can be found to represent the Israelites in this paragraph. The term “assembly” has been used four times (Num 20:4, 6, 10 and 12). “The congregation” has been used five times (Num 20:1, 2, 8[2×] and 11). The term “the sons of Israel/ the Israelites” occurs in verses 1, 12 and 13. Third, “the sin of Moses and Aaron seems to be overloaded” does not necessarily point to an “interpretive gloss.” There is no “standard” for us to measure whether a sin is overloaded. Fourth, there is not an “either-or” choice between verse 12 and verse 13.
Frankel says that the claims that verse 13 is a late supplement “are baseless.” Then he deduces that the second half of verse 12 is a late gloss. Such “either-or” relationship may be also baseless. One would not know why one of the two verses should be later. There is no contradiction between verse 12 and verse 13 if we read the text that God was not regarded as holy before, but He sanctified Himself after He announced the punishment to Moses and Aaron. Consequently, it is not necessary to separate “believing in God” and “regarding God as holy.” Instead we can confirm that there is a relationship between them.

On the issue of the source of Num 20:12, Herbert Specht proposes that the Priestly author cites Isaiah 7:9 in Num 20:12. His grounds include four points. First, the verb נָא (‘to believe’) is not used by P elsewhere. Second, there are parallels in details between Isaiah 7:9 and Num 20:12. The first parallel is that both verses are YHWH’s words to the leaders (to King Ahaz [Isa 7:9]; to Moses and Aaron [Num 20:12]). The second parallel is that in both passages YHWH gives His salvation but the leaders could not receive it. In Isaiah 7:7-9 “Ahaz will not remain” although YHWH promises that the plan of Aram and Ephraim should not succeed, while in Num 20:11-12 Moses and Aaron would not enter the land though

---
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YHWH has given the land and water to the people.\textsuperscript{75} Third, the Priestly writing has cited other prophetic speeches.\textsuperscript{76} Fourth, according to Specht, Thomas Pola’s comparison of Ezek 20 with P that Ezek 20 has an impact on the development and formation of the primary and secondary Priestly materials.\textsuperscript{77} Hence Specht believes that Num 20:12 is a deliberate allusion to Isaiah 7:9.\textsuperscript{78}

Regarding the expression with an infinitive in לָא תִּמְנוֹת in Num 20:12, Specht thinks that P can use this word because “sanctuary” and “to sanctify” are important parts of his interpretation of the world.\textsuperscript{79} Specht sees Num 20:12 is also a citation of Ezek 20:41 because Specht accepts Pola’s study that there is a strong relationship between Ezek 20 and P.\textsuperscript{80}

Specht’s reasonings of the citation of Isaiah 7:9 are not convincing. First, the syntax of Isaiah 7:9 and Num 20:12 is very different so that Num 20:12 is not quoting Isaiah 7:9. Isaiah 7:9 is an “if” clause with an imperfect (or yiqtol) verb, while Num 20:12 is a “because” clause with a perfect (or qatal) verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 7:9</th>
<th>Isaiah 7:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אם לא תאמנה</td>
<td>If you will not believe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כי לא תאמנה</td>
<td>you shall not be settled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 20:12</th>
<th>Num 20:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָנוּ בָּאתְךָ אַתָּ הַקֹּהֶל וּבָאָלָה</td>
<td>“Because you have not believed in me…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לכן לא תִּבָּאוּ אַתָּ הַקֹּהֶל וְהָאֲלָה</td>
<td>therefore, you shall not bring this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{75} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
\textsuperscript{76} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
\textsuperscript{77} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
\textsuperscript{78} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
\textsuperscript{79} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
\textsuperscript{80} Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.
In Isaiah 7:9 the disbelief is in the subordinate conditional clause, and has not occurred yet, while in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron have already committed the “not believing.” Even if P has quoted the prophetic speeches in other passages, it does not prove that P has also quoted Isaiah 7:9 in Num 20:12. Furthermore, the proposal that Ezek 20 has a great impact on P does not support that Isaiah 7:9 also has an impact on Num 20:12.

Besides, there are also great differences between Ezek 20 and Num 20:12. In Ezek 20:41 the verb קָרַה (“to sanctify”) is in Niphal stem and used with a divine subject, but in Num 20:12 the infinitive of the verb קָרַה is in Hiphil stem with implied human subjects (Moses and Aaron). In addition, the phrase לְעֵינֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (“before the eyes of the Israelites”) in Num 20:12 has a different meaning from that of לְעֵינֵי הַנַּעֲרִים (“before the eyes of the nations”) in Ezek 20:41. Therefore it seems that it is very unlikely that Num 20:12 is quoting Isaiah 7:9 and Ezek 20:41.

The meaning of disbelief in God in Num 20:12

In Num 20:12 the verb אָמַן is in the Hiphil stem. The verb אָמַן occurs three times in the book of Numbers, six times in the book of Deuteronomy and a total of ninety-seven times in the Hebrew Bible. In Num 14:11 and 20:12, אָמַן means “to believe.” In Num 12:7, אָמַן is used as a participle, qualifying Moses, and can be translated as “is faithful.”
The observation that Num 20:12 is linked to Num 14:11 by the same verb יִפְקַח describing the sin they have committed is not satisfactory.\textsuperscript{81} According to Olivier Artus, the sin of Moses and Aaron is comparable to that of the first exodus generation in Num 14. Therefore they deserved a similar punishment.\textsuperscript{82} However, Artus’ treatment on the linkage between the disbelief in God and the exclusion of Moses is not convincing enough. The nuance between the two disbeliefs in Num 14 and 20 should be noticed. According to the context of Num 14, the Israelites did not believe that YHWH could bring them into the land (Num 14:3), while in Num 20 Moses and Aaron did not believe that speaking to the rock could bring out the water. Besides, the relationship between the punishment and the disbelief is also different in these two narratives. In the spy narrative the Israelites did not believe that they could receive the land from God, so YHWH did not give the land to them. This punishment in Num 14 is measured according to their disbelief. Thus, it is punished according to the principle of “measure for measure.” However, the disbelief of Moses and Aaron in Num 20 is not about the land, but about the command of speaking to the rock. Such command is not so relevant to the Promised Land. Thus, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is not measured according to their disbelief. Hence, the connection between the exclusion of Moses and disbelief in God has not been solved by Artus’ suggestion.

\textsuperscript{81} Olivier Artus, \textit{Etudes sur le livre des Nombres: Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13, 1-20, 13} (OBO 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 238.
\textsuperscript{82} Artus, \textit{Etudes}, 238.
Ludwig Schmidt’s interpretation is useful. He says that Moses and Aaron did not trust in YHWH that the rock will give out water by their words.\(^{83}\) Therefore, they did not speak to the rock.\(^ {84}\) Moses doubted this power, so in Num 20:10 he asked the people whether this miracle would be possible. He struck the rock twice because he wanted to show that he could not bring the water out from the rock. He wanted to demonstrate his “powerlessness.” Thus, Schmidt has explained why such sin is said to be “not believing in God.”

How is the Hiphil of the verb \(יָנָה\) used in the Hebrew Bible? Alfred Jepsen has surveyed the interpretations of eight scholars on this verb, and he finds that there is a wide range of meanings among the scholars.\(^ {85}\) The range is from the idea of “making one sure” to that of “having stability oneself.”\(^ {86}\) The Hiphil of \(יָנָה\) is not very often used in the Prophets and the Psalms, but it does appear frequently in the narratives of Israel’s early history and in the Wisdom Literature.\(^ {87}\) From a survey of the usage of the Hiphil of \(יָנָה\) in the word’s own context, Jepsen concludes that the Hiphil of \(יָנָה\) contains primarily a statement about the subject which gains confidence, mostly with reference to a person or a message.\(^ {88}\) He suggests the best paraphrases of the meaning of the Hiphil of \(יָנָה\) are “to gain stability, to rely on
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\(^{83}\) Ludwig Schmidt, *Das vierte Buch Mose, Numeri Kapitel 10,11-36,13* (DATD 7/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 92-93.

\(^{84}\) Schmidt, *Numeri*, 93.

\(^{85}\) Alfred Jepsen, “\(יָנָה\),” *TDOT* 1:298-299. The range is wide because the scholars arrive at the different meanings by different methods: etymology, different understandings of the meaning of the Hiphil stem, and different assessments of the concept of faith in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.

\(^{86}\) Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:299.

\(^{87}\) Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:300.

someone, to give credence to message or to consider it to be true, to trust in someone." Jepsen thinks that in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron did not believe that

89 Jepsen, "מָאָס," 308. In Num 20:12, the object of the Hiphil of מָאָס is God. The verb מָאָס (Hiphil) with divine object can be found also in Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22. In Num 20:12, the subjects of the verb מָאָס are Moses and Aaron, but in Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22, the subject of the verb מָאָס is the first Exodus generation. The following analysis will show that the usages of the verb מָאָס in these four texts (Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22) are different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Object with preposition</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מַלְאַךְ אֲשֶׁר עָבַרְתָּ בָּעָה</td>
<td>בְּךָ</td>
<td>“You” = Moses and Aaron</td>
<td>Num 20:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in me</td>
<td>did not believe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בְּךָ</td>
<td>בְּךָ</td>
<td>this people = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites</td>
<td>Num 14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in all the signs</td>
<td>in me</td>
<td>did not believe</td>
<td>Deut 1:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אֲבֹדֶךָ</td>
<td>בְּךָ</td>
<td>“You” = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites</td>
<td>Deut 1:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in this word</td>
<td>in Yhwh</td>
<td>did not believe</td>
<td>2Kgs 17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אֶל הָאָרְמִיתָה</td>
<td>בְּךָ</td>
<td>The fathers of Israelites = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites</td>
<td>2Kgs 17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Yhwh</td>
<td>in God</td>
<td>did not believe</td>
<td>Ps 78:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אֶל הָאָרְמִיתָה</td>
<td>אֶל הָאָרְמִיתָה</td>
<td>Jacob and Israel in Ps 78:21 = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites</td>
<td>Ps 78:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Num 14:11, YHWH was disappointed that the people did not believe in him although he had done a lot of signs among them. My understanding of the text is the people did not believe that YHWH could bring them into the Promised land. The people even wanted to kill Caleb and Joshua, the two faithful and brave spies, who said that YHWH would bring them into the land (Num 14:8). In this case, the subject of מָאָס (Hiphil) is the first Exodus generation. Wildberger notices that the usage of this verb in Num 14:11 is specific: believing in God has become “an acknowledgement of His wonders.” See Wildberger, "מָאָס," TLOT 1:145.

In the context of Deut 1:32, Moses retold the spy story to the second Exodus generation. He told them when the first Exodus Israelites were afraid that they would be destroyed in the hand of the Amorites, Moses encouraged them by saying that God would fight for them (Deut 1:30) and God had carried them as a father carried a son in the wilderness (Deut 1:31). Even after the first Exodus Israelites had heard Moses’ message, they still did not believe in God (Deut 1:32). It may mean that the Israelites did not believe that God would fight for them as mentioned in Deut 1:30. It may also mean that they did not believe that God would continue to carry them as mentioned in Deut 1:31. In addition, they did not believe that God will go before them as mentioned in Deut 1:33. Although the object of their disbelief is clear, the content of their disbelief is ambiguous.

In 2Kgs 17:14, the subject of מָאָס is אַבֹדֶךָ ("the fathers") of the Israelites. מָאָס occurs only three times in 2Kgs. (2 Kgs 17:14, 15; 21:15) The other two occurrences point to the first Exodus generation. In the context of 2Kgs 17:13-15, “the/your fathers” received the commandments and laws of YHWH (2 Kgs 17:13) and had made a covenant with YHWH (2 Kgs 17:15). If “the/your fathers” in 2 Kgs 17:14 refers to the Exodus generation, it also makes sense because it says that “their fathers” stiffened their necks. Therefore, there is a great possibility that the מָאָס in 2Kgs 17:14 also points to the first Exodus generation. The tradition, which is about the fathers of the Israelites who did not believe in God, is quoted as an example to illustrate that the Israelites were very stubborn. But it is not certain which incident shows that their father did not believe in God. Again, the object of their disbelief is clear, but the content of their disbelief is not.

In Ps 78:21-22, the subject of מָאָס is "Jacob/Israel" (Ps 78:21): it represents the Exodus generation, since the context of Ps 78:22 is about the murmuring stories in the wilderness. The people demanded more food (Ps 78:18). They doubted whether God could give bread or provide meat for
“God was able to supply water for the people without their help, without striking the rock.” Thus, we interpreted that this disbelief is that Moses did not believe the words of YHWH. He did not believe that he could tell a rock to yield water to the people. Therefore he did not do according to the command of YHWH. Rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it.

How is the disbelief related to the failing to regard YHWH as holy? We have seen that there are four ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s power, awefulness, otherness and glory. Now we shall see that the dimension of “power” attracts more attention. According to Wong, Moses exalted himself higher than God, and made the people focus on his power instead of YHWH’s power. Moses did not rely on God in executing the instructions and did not manifest YHWH as the holy one, the powerful and wholly other God. It is possible that the Israelites did not realize that it was YHWH who had given them waters from the rock and turned away their affliction. Thus Moses and Aaron hindered the people from seeing that YHWH, as the God of the people, helps the people with wonders. So they had not fulfilled their work that YHWH should be regarded as
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them (Ps 78:20). This shows that the people did not believe that God could provide food for them. In this case, the content of their disbelief is obvious. The above examples show that the usage of the verb יָשָׁכָה varies from case to case. In two cases, the content of their disbelief is clear but have different meanings: they did not believe that God would bring them into the Promised land (Num 14:11); and they did not believe that God would provide enough food (Ps 78:22). In Deut 1:32 and 2Kgs 17:14, the content of their disbelief is not obvious. Wildberger also points out that the theological usage of the Hiphil of יָשָׁכָה is “in no way uniform” because this verb is “nevertheless at home in various traditions” and its usage undergoes “transformation in the course of the history of Israelites religion.” See H. Wildberger, TLOT 1:146.
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holy before the people. It is also possible that the failure to sanctify appears to refer to Moses’ ignoring the capacity of words alone, the speaking to the rock, to bring about a divinely directed result. What is the relationship between sanctifying God and the punishment? It is believed that if Moses spoke to the rock, he could manifest the power of the word of God. As Moses did not speak to the rock, he failed to demonstrate the holiness of YHWH to the Israelites. Artus observes that the theme of holiness is developed by the preceding chapters of Num 20. First, in Num 15:40 the chapter concludes with an exhortation to the holiness of the Israelites. Second, in Num 16:1-17:5 (especially 16:5) the question of holiness is the core issue of the confrontation between Moses and his critics. Third, in Num 18 the legislative texts are about the holiness of the sanctuary. Finally, in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron failed to show YHWH’s holiness, that is the power of His word and actions. Therefore, the literary context of Num 20 with its preceding texts can help to explain the importance of “sanctifying God.” The Promised Land, according to Artus, is only for those who can demonstrate “a sufficient holiness” to live in the presence of the holy
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par excellence: YHWH. 103 Since Moses and Aaron did not regard God as holy, they were not allowed to enter the land.

But it has been pointed out that the punishment of Moses and Aaron is a denial of their future “leadership” rather than a denial of their “personal privilege” of entering the land. 104 The leadership of Moses and Aaron is shown by the Hiphil of the verb נָבָא (“bring”/“lead”) in Num 20:12. Sakenfeld also observes that God’s judgment does not say that the two will not personally enter the land; rather the emphasis is on that they will not “lead” this assembly into the land. 105 A possibility is given by Seebass, who says that the leadership of bringing the Israelites into the land must be dependent on the promise of God, which is the word of God. The denial of God’s word will lead to the consequential loss of that leadership. 106 Thus the punishment on Moses and Aaron is mainly about the loss of leadership, not just the loss of the entry of the land.

Why was their leadership removed? It is implied that Moses disobeyed God deliberately just as the offender in Num 15:30-31 when Moses raised his hand. According to the sentence in Num 15:30-31, Moses should be “cut off” from his people. Many attempts have been made as to how the sentence of “cutting off” was executed. 107 The LXX translator of Num 15:30 understands that it was the premature death of the offender, so LXX translates נָבָא as ἐξολεθρεῖσθαι (“he shall be
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103 Artus, *Etudes*, 238.
105 Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 149.
completely destroyed”). The passage Num 15:32-36 shows clearly that the offender needed to face the death penalty because YHWH told Moses that the offender should be put to death by stoning (Num 15:35). However, the term “cutting off” is absent in Num 15:32-36. Therefore, “cutting off” in Num 15:30-31 does not necessarily mean the death penalty in Num 15:32-36. In the majority of offenses, the penalty “cutting off” originally meant a cutting out which leads to “banishment from one’s clan or territory” or “exclusion from the cultic community” or “excommunication from the cultic community and the covenant people.” But in the course of time it was perceived somewhat differently. It came to connotate premature death, loss of status or office, and finally “death at the hands of heaven.” If Moses needed to be separated from the people, he could not lead them into the Promised Land.

3. The re-interpreting of the sin of Moses in Num 27

Num 27:12-14 is a command of YHWH to Moses when Moses and the people had settled in the plains of Moab (Num 22:1; 26:3, 63). This place is different from the location where the incident occurred in Num 20:1-13. Moses and the people were

108 The expression “cutting off” can be found in Exod 31:14, which also talks about the profanation of the Sabbath.
109 Levine, Numbers 1-20, 466.
111 Hasel, TDOT 7:348.
112 Levine, Numbers 1-20, 466.
at Kadesh at that time. The saying in Num 27:12-14 consists of three parts: the order to ascend the mountain and see the land (Num 27:12); Moses’ death is foretold (Num 27:13); and the reason for Moses’ death (Num 27:14).

What is the meaning of “rebelling against God’s word”? In Num 27:14, הָרִיב ("to be rebellious")\textsuperscript{113} is in the Qal stem. The verb הָרִיב occurs three times in the book of Numbers (Num 20:10; 20:24; 27:14), eight times in the book of Deuteronomy and forty-four or forty-five times in the Hebrew Bible. In Num 20:10, the participle of הָרִיב is used as a noun. Moses rebuked the Israelites as “rebels.” In Num 20:24 and 27:14, the object of the verb הָרִיב is יִפְּקָדָנִי ("my [=YHWH’s] mouth"), that is, the command or word of YHWH.

Both Rolf Knierim and Ludger Schwienhorst find out that this verb is used in the two oldest instances that the son rebelled against his parents (Deut 21:18, 20).\textsuperscript{114} Schwienhorst expresses that הָרִיב is a word of “negative import” denoting willful, fundamental, and rebellious disobedience.\textsuperscript{115} When this verb is used with divine object, it refers “consistently to stubbornness toward God.”\textsuperscript{116} This verb is used in accusations against Israel’s rebelliousness with respect to YHWH’s “public deeds especially those in the wilderness.”\textsuperscript{117}

Why is “not believing in God” replaced by “rebelling against God’s word” in Num 27:14? In Chapter Four it has been discussed that the “rebelling” in Num 27:14

\textsuperscript{113} HALOT 1:633.
\textsuperscript{115} Schwienhorst, TDOT 9:7.
\textsuperscript{116} Knierim, TLOT 2:687.
\textsuperscript{117} Knierim, TLOT 2:688.
may be due to the combination of Num 20:12 with Num 20:24. According to Num 27:12-14, the mention of “Aaron’s being gathered to his people” is used to compare with “Moses’ being gathered to his people.” Since Num 20:24 depicts that Aaron was going to be gathered to his people, this verse is used in Num 27:12-14. When Num 27:12-14 adopts Aaron’s death, it also adopts the reason for his death: rebelling against YHWH’s word. Therefore, Num 20:24 is the first that re-interprets the sin of Moses and Aaron to be rebelling against YHWH’s word because they have not done what YHWH commanded them to do in the incident of waters from the rock. Then, why is “not believing in God” replaced by “rebell ing against God’s command” in Num 20:24? There are different suggestions on the question of the replacement of "לَا الْجَاهَالُوتُ بِي" ("not believed in me") by "مُرِيتِ الْقَدْرَةِ إِلَيْكَ" ("rebelled against my word") in Num 20:24 and 27:14.

The suggestion that the change is used to accuse Moses by using the same word from his mouth is not satisfactory. Some scholars observe that in Num 20:10 Moses had accused the Israelites of being rebels, in Num 20:24 and 27:14 Moses himself becomes guilty of the same charge. It is possible, but such ironic effect can be much enhanced if the word מִרְגָּנָה is used immediately in Num 20:12 rather than in Num 20:24.

There is also no evidence to support the view of Schwienhorst, who thinks that the word’s function is to transform the Deuteronomistic usage of “rebelling.”

---

contends that in the Deuteronomistic History מֶרֶד (especially in the phrase “to rebel against the mouth of YHWH’”) is used to show that Israel’s rebelliousness consists in not listening to the commandments of YHWH. 119 This Deuteronomistic usage is a term for the people’s rebelliousness. Schwienhorst regards that the Priestly writings (Num 20:12, 24 and 27:14) has “turned against” this Deuteronomistic usage. He thinks that מֶרֶד has become a term for the leaders’ rebelliousness. 120 However, Schwienhorst does not give any basis or motivation for the Priestly School to turn against the usage of Deuteronomist. He has not explained why the rebellion of the leaders became a message of the Priestly School.

The explanation that the change can re-interpret the meaning of “not believing in me” is more possible. The change of verb (from מֵרֶד to לא אָמְנָה) is an interpretation that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron (מֵרֶד, 20:24) has been replaced with the focus on their faithlessness (לא אָמְנָה, 20:12). 121 In addition, the usage of the expression יִפְקָד (“my [=YHWH] word”) as the direct object of “rebell” is used to contrast the main theme of “obeying YHWH’s word” in the book of Numbers. The expression יִפְקָד is a characteristic expression in Numbers. There is a high occurrence of the prepositional phrase על יִפְקָד (“according to the word of YHWH”) in the book of Numbers. Of the twenty-five occurrences of the prepositional phrase על יִפְקָד in the Hebrew Bible, nineteen were found in

121 Sailhamer, *Pentateuch*, 76.
The book of Numbers highlights that both the leaders and the people have carried out the instructions according to the word of YHWH. The expression יְהוָה הָיָתָם signifies the obedience of the leaders and the people in Numbers. When the redactors use the expression “rebelling against יְהוָה הָיָתָם” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they may want to imply that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers.

Furthermore, the meaning of “rebelling against YHWH’s word” is more concrete than “not believing in God.” Saying that “Moses and Aaron did not believe in God” does not specify what action means that they did not believe in God. When saying that “Moses and Aaron rebelled against YHWH’s word,” the action of their rebellion is obvious, they have not done the instructions according to YHWH’s word.

In Num 20:24 the less clear expression “did not believe” is replaced by a clearer one,
“rebelled against YHWH’s word.” One of the possibilities of the origin for this re-interpretation is that there are cases that “not believing” is used in connection to “rebelling” in Deut 9:23 and Ps 78:8. The redactors of Num 20:24 may either share the same tradition of Deut 9:23 and Ps 78:8, or be influenced by the traditions of Deut 9:23 and Ps 78:8, who see that “rebelling” and “not believing” are simultaneous behavior of the sinners.

Thus we may conclude that in Num 27:12-14 the sin of Moses is changed to “rebelled against the word of YHWH.” This change is due to the adoption of Num 20:24 which speaks about Aaron being gathered to his people, and also about their rebelling against YHWH’s word. Therefore, Num 20:24 is the first to reinterpret the sin of Moses and Aaron to be rebelling against YHWH’s word because they have not done what YHWH commanded them to do. Num 27:12-14 follows this reinterpretation.

4. Conclusion

The argument of this chapter is that several faults can be found in the actions and speech of Moses in the incident of the waters from the rock in Num 20:1-13. The

---

125 The accusatory formula “to rebel against the mouth of YHWH” can be found in some texts. With הרצא in the Qal stem: Num 27:14; 1 Kgs 13:21, 26; with הרצא in the Hiphil stem: Deut 1:26, 43; 9:23, 24; Josh 1:18; 1 Sam 12:14, 15. A number of occurrences are used in connection with “the command” (Deut 1:26, 43; 9:23; 1 Sam 12:14, 15; Lam 1:18) or “word” (Josh 1:18; 1 Kgs 13:21, 26; Ps 105:28; 107:11) or “laws” (Ezek 5:6) of God.
126 “When YHWH sent you from Kadesh-barnea, saying, ‘Ascend and possess the land which I have given to you,’ then you rebelled (הרצא, Hiphil imperfect) against the command of YHWH your God. And you did not believe (סבכ, Hiphil perfect) in him and did not listen to his voice.” (Deut 9:23)
127 “And they are not like their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious (הרצא, Qal participle) generation, (that) did not prepare its heart and its spirit did not believe (סבכ, Niphal perfect) God.” (Ps 78:8)
sin of Moses is found in Num 20:10. The speaking itself is a sin or the rash words are faults. Moses’ sin can also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses’ hand in Num 20:11 consists of both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expresses that Moses deliberately disobey YHWH’s command. The raising of Moses’ hand alludes to the “high hand” in Num 15:30-31, which speaks about a man who defiantly disobeys the word of YHWH being “cut off” from his people. He misused the staff, and rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it. Num 20:12 also hints that Moses doubted God’s word. In Num 20:12 Moses is said to be failing to believe in God. We interpreted that this disbelief was that Moses did not believe the words of YHWH. He did not believe that he could tell a rock to yield water to the people. Therefore he did not do according to the command of YHWH. He had not done all the commands of YHWH. The omission of carrying out some of the commands of YHWH is also one of the sins of Moses. In addition, in Num 20:12 the removal of the leadership of Moses from his people is another way to execute the punishment of “cut off.” Strictly speaking, it is talking about the loss of the leadership office of Moses, not about his personal exclusion from the Promised Land.

We have also discussed that there are nuances on the exclusion of Moses in Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14. In Num 27:12-14 (and in Num 20:24) the sin of Moses is changed to “rebelled against the word of YHWH.” This change is due to the adoption of Num 20:24 which speaks about Aaron being gathered to his people,
and also about their rebelling against YHWH’s word. Num 20:24 is the first to interpret the sin of Moses as “rebelling against God’s word” in such incident. When the redactors use the expression “rebelling against יְהוָה יִפְךָ” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they want to signify that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers. Num 27:12-14 receives that re-interpretation of the fault of Moses and rewrites it together with the sin of failing to regard God as holy.
Chapter Seven. Moses’ Failure to Sanctify God in Deut 32

We have found that in Num 20:12 the loss of leadership of Moses is emphasised. In addition, the ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people in Num 27:12-14. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in the post-Priestly redaction in Deut 32:48-52. In this chapter, we will study the re-writing of the sins and punishment of Moses in Deut 32:48-52.

1. The reworking of the sins of Moses in Deut 32

What is the meaning of “breaking faith with God”? In Deut 32:51 the verb נָשָׁה (“to break faith”) is in the Qal stem. This verb occurs three times in the book of Numbers (Num 5:6, 12 and 27), once in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 32:52) and a total of thirty-five times in the Hebrew Bible. This verb is only used in the exilic and post-exilic literature.¹ It is commonly agreed that נָשָׁה is a late word found in the book of Ezekiel, the Priestly writings and the books of Chronicles.² The breaking faith can act directly toward human beings or towards God.³ There are only two occurrences in which the verb נָשָׁה is followed by the human object (Num 5:12, 27).

³ Ringgren, *TDOT* 8:461.
The basic meaning of this verb is seen in Num 5:12 in which “going astray” is explained as “being unfaithful.”⁴ מַעֲשֶׂהָ means to refer to the legally definable relationship of trust that exists between two persons.⁵

When this verb is used with divine object, it can be translated as “unfaithfulness toward God.”⁶ Gordon McConville thinks that מַעֲשֶׂהָ is a strong term denoting an act tantamount to apostasy.⁷ Jacob Milgrom notices that the common denominator in all the occurrences of מַעֲשֶׂהָ in the Hebrew Bible is that מַעֲשֶׂהָ constitutes a sin against God.⁸ The verb מַעֲשֶׂהָ means trespassing upon the divine realm either by poaching on His sancta or breaking His covenant oath; it is a lethal sin which can destroy both the offender and his community.⁹ The formula “to break faith with YHWH” can be found in a number of texts.¹⁰ Knierim says that the direct references to YHWH in the various genres indicate an advanced state of theological thought in which inherently inappropriate actions are further evaluated in specific reference to the relationship of trust with YHWH.¹¹

There are scholars such as August Dillmann and Carl Steuernagel who have quoted Num 5:6, 12; 31:16 and Lev 5:15 to explain the meaning of breaking faith in Deut 32:51.¹² However, these references are not suitable because they are speaking

---

⁵ Knierim, *TLOT* 2:681.
⁶ Ringgren, *TDOT* 8:461.
⁷ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 460.
¹¹ Knierim, *TLOT* 2:682.
¹² Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 413; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 122.
in very different contexts from Moses’ case. For instance, Num 5:6 depicts when a man or woman commits any sin toward a fellow man, such sin is also breaking faith with YHWH. But this is not the situation of Moses since in Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 YHWH never said that Moses had committed sin towards the people. According to Num 5:12, the breaking faith is about any man’s wife who has been unfaithful to her husband. Such breaking faith in a husband-wife relation cannot be applied on Moses’ relation with YHWH. In regard to Num 31:16, the text of MT is לָמוּטָא מִטְנָא ("to become the occasion for apostasy"). It requires emendation to make it to לָמוּטָא מִטְנָא ("to commit sin"). Besides, the breaking faith of the Israelites in this context is about their worship of the gods of the daughters of Moab with whom they indulged in sexual immorality in the incident of Peor. Thus it cannot be used to explain the nature of the sin of Moses and Aaron. Regarding Lev 5:15, the verb מִטְנָא is not used with the preposition ב, and the direct object is not YHWH. This usage is different from that of Deut 32:51. For these reasons, the meaning of breaking faith in Deut 32:51 must not correlate with Num 5:6, 12; 31:16 and Lev 5:15.

Why is “rebelling against God’s command” replaced by “breaking faith with God”?

Problematic is the replacement of נָרִיחַ כִּי ("you rebelled against my word")

---

13 HALOT 1: 608.
14 The incident is depicted in Num 25:1-3.
or (‘you did not believe in me’) by (‘you broken faith with me’). Why is the description of the sin of Moses and Aaron changed? One may think that “breaking faith” can harmonise or integrate the two different meanings of “not believing” and “rebelling.” However, in no case is “to break faith” used in parallel with “not to believe.” Nowhere can we find that “to break faith” is used in connection with “to rebel.” Therefore, “breaking faith” cannot represent an integration of both of the meanings of disbelief and rebellion.

Can the term “breaking faith” be used to explain the meaning of failing to regard YHWH as holy? Although Ringgren sees that the “breaking faith” in Deut 32:51 establishes a clear connection with the violation of what is sacred, he has not provided any argument for this interpretation. It seems that Ringgren supposes that the two causal clauses are in parallel and with similar meanings, so that the connection is established.

**Parallel structure of Deut 32:51a and 51b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>메עלתא ביכיסלאל</th>
<th>락 אשא</th>
<th>메עלתא ביכיסלאל</th>
<th>락 אשא</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:51a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut 32:51b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may be possible if we assume that verse 51a and verse 51b are in semantic equivalence. These two clauses are written with the same structure which starts with התחר ביכיסלאל (“because”) and ends with לאל קרשתא אוחי (“in the midst of the Israelites”). We may say that 메עלתא ביכיסלאל (“you broke faith with me [= YHWH]”) is parallel with לא קרשתא אוחי (“not santified me [=YHWH]”). However, verse 51b can be

---

synonymous with verse 51a, or it can extend the meaning of verse 51a. Hence, this parallel structure does not guarantee that breaking faith with God is equivalent to failing to sanctify God.

Martin Rose is not wrong in saying that the breaking faith of Moses and Aaron has affected the sacred sphere.\(^{16}\) They have not respected the holiness of God.\(^{17}\) This interpretation is possible if we apply Milgrom’s study of ממלך, which can mean trespassing upon God’s sancta.\(^{18}\) However, Rose’s reference of Biblical texts may not be suitable. He refers to Josh 7:1 and Ezek 18:24. None of these texts fits the case of Moses. According to Josh 7:1, the object of the verb חזרה is ממלך, not YHWH. So the usage is different from that of Deut 32:51 in which the direct object of the verb ממלך is “me [=YHWH].” Regarding Ezek 18:24, the verb ממלך is not used with the preposition ב, and the object is not YHWH.

The breaking faith may be used to explain the punishment of exclusion from the Promised Land. There are a number of occurrences where the verb ממלך is connected to the exile. The unfaithfulness of the Israelites is regularly punished by military defeat and exile, including the final exile of both northern and southern kingdoms.\(^{19}\) The words for the exile are different. The verb ממלך is used to describe the sin which caused the exile in Lev 26:40-41;\(^ {20}\) Ezek 17:20;\(^ {21}\) 39:23;\(^ {22}\) Neh 1:8;\(^ {23}\) Dan 9:7.\(^ {24}\)


\(^{17}\) Rose, *5. Mose Teilband 2*, 51.

\(^{18}\) Milgrom, *Cult*, 21.


\(^{20}\) “If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they broke faith [ממלך, Qal perfect] against me, and also which they acted against me with hostility, I
Most of these texts are post-exilic. After the exile, the Israelites understood their sin as a kind of breaking faith against YHWH. The exclusion has a common point with the exile. The exile forced the people to leave the Promised Land, while the exclusion prevented the people from entering the Promised Land. In both cases, the Israelites lived outside the Promised Land. As such, the two incidents are connected. It may be right that the record of Moses’ offense here serves to reinforce the connection between sinning against YHWH and taking possession of the land.\(^{25}\)

Then the reasons that led to the punishment (exile and exclusion) might also be connected. Consequently the reason for the *exile* (‘to break faith’ with YHWH) is also the reason for the *exclusion* (‘to break faith’ with YHWH). The late scribal school who redacted Deut 32:48-52 might be influenced by the theology that one of the reasons for the exclusion is due to “breaking faith” against God. The verbs “did not believe” in Num 20:12 and “rebelled” in Num 27:12 were then replaced by the verb “to break faith” in this interpretation of exile and exclusion.

Finally, the breaking faith may be used to explain the punishment of death. The

---

\(^{21}\) “I will spread my net over him, and he will be caught in my snare. Then I will bring [בה, Hiphil perfect] him to Babylon and judge him there for his unfaithfulness which he has broken faith [ל yal, Qal perfect] against me.” (Ezek 17:20)

\(^{22}\) “The nations will know that the house of Israel went into exile [ל yal, Qal perfect] for their iniquity because they broke faith [ל yal, Qal perfect] against me…” (Ezek 39:23)

\(^{23}\) “Remember the word which You commanded Moses your servant, saying, ‘If you break faith [ל yal, Qal imperfect] I will scatter [הלג, Hiphil imperfect] you among the peoples.’” (Neh 1:8)

\(^{24}\) “…to the men of Judah, the inhabitants of Jerusalem and all Israel, those who are nearby and those who are far away in all the lands where you have driven [ל yal, Hiphil perfect] them there, because of their unfaithfulness which they have broken faith [ל yal, Qal perfect] against you.” (Dan 9:7)

usage of the verb מנהל in 1 Chr 10:13 is similar to that of Deut 32:51:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Break faith</th>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שאלת במעלله באוחר מנהל</td>
<td>ירוה</td>
<td>1 Chr 10:13a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נל אטר מנהל ב</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Deut 32:50-51a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Chr 10:13  So Saul died for his trespass which he broke faith against YHWH…

Deut 32:50-51a  Die… because you broke faith with Me…

The Chronicler explains that the death of Saul is due to his unfaithfulness to YHWH. The verb מנהל is used with the preposition ב and the object is YHWH. Besides, the expression follows the death of Saul. Such sentence structure is quite similar to that of Deut 32:51, in which an explanatory subordinate clause is used to explain why Moses has to die. This similarity certainly cannot be evidence for the interdependence between 1 Chr 10:13 and Deut 32:51, or for saying that Deut 32:51 alludes to 1 Chr 10:13. It is because Saul broke faith with God by not seeking guidance from YHWH, but by consulting a ghost. Such sin is different from that of Moses. However, it opens a possibility that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 shares a similar idea of the Chronicler that death would be the penalty of breaking faith with YHWH. Therefore, the replacement is probably due to the fact that the sin of “breaking faith with YHWH” can explain why Moses has to die.

From the above discussion, we may conclude that the expression “breaking faith” can be used to parallel with the transgression against the sacred, and to
emphasize the punishment of such sin will lead to death penalty or deportation from
the Promised Land.

2. The relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32

In Deut 32:48-52 the sin of failing to sanctify God is clarified, and the death
penalty as a punishment is also highlighted. It seems that in the time of the
post-Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch, sanctifying God became an important issue
that a failing of it would lead to the death penalty. Why is sanctifying God so
important? This section will suggest that the “sanctifying God” in Deut 32:51 is not
just interpreted in an abstract sense as God is holy in himself, but rather in a
relational dimension. Such a relational dimension can give a clue to the importance
of sanctifying God.

The texts show that the verb “to sanctify” is connected to “in the midst of the
Israelites.” In Deut 32:51 we can find מנהל ימות ויהוה (“in the midst of the
Israelites”). This phrase occurs seven times in Numbers (Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20,
24; 26:62; 35:34), twice in Deuteronomy (two times in Deut 32:51) and sixteen times
in the Hebrew Bible. It is not a Deuteronomic language. In the two occurrences of
מנהל ימות ויהוה in Deut 32:51, one is used to modify the verb מנהל, the other one is
used to modify קדש:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>עלי אשה מבית יسرائيل</th>
<th>בך מבית יسرائيل</th>
<th>דעל עשה מבית יישראל</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:51a</td>
<td>קדשלא יהוהMock</td>
<td>Deut 32:51b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We cannot find any other occurrence of the phrase “in the midst of the Israelites” in
connection to the verb מנהל except here. But we can find one occurrence of

מַחְצָרָנוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל that is connected to the verb קָרָה in Lev 22:32:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>… the Israelites</th>
<th>“Santify”</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לא קרסות אוחי</td>
<td>Num 20:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בוחר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>Num 27:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ולא קרסות אוחי</td>
<td>Deut 32:51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בוחר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>Lev 22:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel texts of the verb “to sanctify” are connected to “before the eyes of the Israelites” and “in the midst of the Israelites.” The change of the expression from לא קרסות אוחי to בוחר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is aimed at clarification of the meaning of the sentence. The change of the phrase from בוחר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל to Num 27:14 is not aimed at any clarification. In addition, this change is not aimed at better connection to the book of Deuteronomy because this phrase is not used except here in Deut 32:48-52. Therefore, it is possible that the usage of בוחר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “betrays” that this passage is influenced by Lev 22:32 in which we also find such a phrase.26 When the verb “to sanctify” is used with the phrases “in the midst of the Israelites” in Deut 32:51, the importance of “sanctifying God” should be understood with its connection with the Israelites. God is not only holy in himself, but also holy for the Israelites. Holiness is understood from the viewpoint of God’s relationship to man.27

---


27 W.H. Schmidt, The Faith of the Old Testament: A History (trans. J. Sturdy; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 155. Horst Preuss also states that YHWH as a holy God is holy not for and by Himself, “meaning that He is exalted over and separated from the world and humanity; rather, He is “holy in your (= Israel’s) midst” (Hos 11:9), that is, He is the “Holy one of Israel.” See Horst Dietrich Preuss, Old Testament Theology (trans. Leo G. Perdue; OTL; 2 vols.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster
Sanctifying God in Lev 22:31-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lev 22:31-33 (MT)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>And you shall keep My commandments, and do them, I am YHWH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>And you shall not profane My holy name, but I shall be sanctified among the Israelites, I am YHWH who sanctifies you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>who brought you out from the land of Egypt, to be your God, I am YHWH.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lev 22:32 belongs to the unit Lev 22:31-33, which is a conclusion of both chapter 21-22 and chapter 17-22. The section Lev 21-22 consists of five speeches to Moses, he is to convey the first four to Aaron and his sons, the last to the Israelites and the priests. The contents of the five speeches can be divided into six parts, each with a mini-conclusion:

(i) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the priests (Lev 21:1-9);
(ii) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the high priest (Lev 21:10-15);
(iii) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the sanctuary and the offerings by contact


28 In MT of Lev 22:31 ידיוּתֶה אָתָם is followed by מְצֻוְרָה. However, LXX, 4QLev and SP omit such self identification formula. See John William Wevers, Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus (SCS 44; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1997), 363. Milgrom thinks that the self-identification formula serves effectively as the opening of an inclusio in the exhortation (vv. 31-33) and should be retained. See Milgrom, Leviticus 17-22, 1888.

29 MT has כִּיִּשֶׁה נֵּם (“my holy name”), while LXX reads τὸ ὅνομα τοῦ ἁγίου (“the name of the holy one”).


with defective priests (Lev 21:16-24);

(iv) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the sanctuary and sacred offerings by contact with impure priests (Lev 22:1-9);

(v) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of sacred offerings by consumption by ineligible persons (Lev 22:10-16);

(vi) On offerings deemed unacceptable due to physical defect or pagan origin and inappropriate time, and an exhortation as final conclusion (Lev 22:17-33).

In each section, there is a mini-conclusion with the formula wollen machen YHWH (‘I am YHWH your/ their/ his sanctifier’). Each mini-conclusion gives the reason for keeping the commandments to prohibit the desecration of priests, the high priest, the sanctuary and sacred offerings. Lev 22:31-33, as a conclusion of Lev 21-22, calls the Israelites to uphold the two roles of YHWH (sanctifier and deliverer), they should not desecrate God’s name by disregarding the commandments, instead they should sanctify Him by keeping and doing the commandments. 32

Lev 22:31-33 also concludes Lev 17-22 by using corresponding words. In Lev 17:2 the verb wollen machen (‘command’) is used to introduce the first part of the holiness code. In Lev 22:31, the term wollen machen (‘my commandments’) responds to this verb wollen machen in Lev 17:2. 33 Nihan contends that Lev 22:17-33 is conceived to build an inclusion with Lev 17. 34 The phrase wollen machen YHWH (‘I am YHWH your sanctifier’) builds

32 Walter Kornfeld, Levitikus (NEB 6; Würzburg: Echter, 1983), 89.
33 Marx, Lévitique 17-27, 137.
34 Nihan, Priestly Torah, 492.
an inclusion with both Lev 21:8 and Lev 20:7-8, a central exhortation in Lev 19-20.\textsuperscript{35}

Besides, the reference to the exodus from Egypt in a reverse sequence concludes

chapter 19 (Lev 19:36).\textsuperscript{36}

**YHWH should be regarded as holy**

Lev 22:31-33 can be seen as four commands to the Israelites and two qualifiers of YHWH. The first two commands of the exhortation are “keeping” and “doing” the commandments of YHWH. The third command is “not desecrating” God’s holy name. The fourth is an implied command that YHWH should be regarded as holy. After these four commands, two qualifiers of YHWH are given as the theological rationale for the commands. The first one is מְָּֽקֵּם מִשְׁפָּט (“your sanctifier” in Lev 22:32c). According to the context, “your” refers to “all the Israelites.” Since Lev 22:17-33 is addressed to the Israelites and the priests (v. 18) in the second person, the object of God’s sanctification is “all Israel.”\textsuperscript{37} Bertholet points out that not only the priests but also the Israelites are addressed, because the content of v.33 does not directly apply to the priests.\textsuperscript{38} YHWH is their “sanctifier.” This is the reason that He should be regarded as holy. The people should sanctify Him for He has sanctified them.

\textsuperscript{35} Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 494.

\textsuperscript{36} Marx, *Lévitique 17-27*, 137. In Lev 19:36, the sequence is : first “the exodus,” then the commands of keeping and doing YHWH’s laws. In 22:31-33, this sequence is reversed.

\textsuperscript{37} Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1889.

\textsuperscript{38} Alfred Bertholet, *Leviticus* (KHCAT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901), 78.
The second qualifier דמות לאבר ikke ("your deliverer" in Lev 22:33) refers to the delivering of the Israelites from Egypt. Although this reference back to the Exodus event occurs only sporadically in the book of Leviticus, every time it is mentioned it is emphatic.\(^{40}\) Lev 22:33 has dual function: on the one hand, the reference to YHWH as the God of the exodus serves as a motivation for the exhortation to obey YHWH’s law.\(^{41}\) On the other hand, the statement of the purpose of the exodus reinterprets the central concept of the Priestly narrative by associating it with the issue of Israel’s sanctification.\(^{42}\) In the Priestly writing, the purpose of the exodus is the transformation of Israel into God’s people, while in H, this transformation is achieved by the observance of YHWH’s laws leading to sanctification of the people.\(^{43}\) In Lev 22:31-33, “sanctifying God” is the opposite of “desecrating the holy name of God.” The ways to “regarding God as holy” are “keeping” and “doing” God’s commandments. The reasons for “sanctifying God” are that He is the sanctifier and the deliverer of Israelites.

3. YHWH as the sanctifier of the Israelites

In Lev 22:31-33 the motivation of “keeping God’s commandments,” “doing them,” and “not desecrating God’s holy name” is stated with particular emphasis by

\(^{39}\) Milgrom argues that when H intends a perfect, it uses המנתח היםם (e.g., Lev 19:36; 25:38, 42, 55; 26:13). In Lev 22:33, it is with המנתח היםם, a participial noun is intended. Therefore, it is better to render it as “deliverer.” See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1889.


\(^{41}\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.

\(^{42}\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.

\(^{43}\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.
means of the self-introduction formula coupled with the references to holiness: “I am
YHWH your sanctifier.” YHWH’s role as “sanctifier” is mentioned seven times in
the book of Leviticus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of sanctification</th>
<th>Self-identification formula</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Israelites</td>
<td>עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 20:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Israelites</td>
<td>כְּיַרְשָׁא עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 21:8:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Israelites</td>
<td>עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 22:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priests</td>
<td>עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 21:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priests</td>
<td>כְּיַרְשָׁא עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 22:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priests</td>
<td>עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 22:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The high priest</td>
<td>עַלְיוֹן יְהוָה פָרָשֶׁם</td>
<td>… Lev 21:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The object of sanctification should be deduced from the context. In Lev 20:8; 21:8

---

45 In LXX, SP, and 11QPaleoLev of Lev 21:8, the suffix of the “sanctifier” is the third person plural instead of the second person plural as in MT. The third person plural refers to the priests. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1809. The MT, however, is a more difficult reading because the sudden appearance of the second person plural suffix in the context requires a shift of the audience of the address from “Aaron and the priests” to “the people of Israel.” By the principle that a more difficult reading should be retained, so it is also possible to keep the second person plural suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:8. Therefore, the object of sanctification can be “the Israelites.”

46 Besides, Milgrom suggests that the objects of sanctification in Lev 21:23 may be the sanctums (the veil and the altar in v.23) because he thinks that God initially sanctified them by means of his glory and continues to sanctify them by his presence. Milgrom also constructs an “introverted structure” of the seven “sanctifier” phrases: the first and seventh occurrences are directed to Israel; the second, third, fifth, and sixth, to the priest; and the fourth, “probably to the sanctums,” forming thereby the following introverted structure:

A  Israel (20:8)
B, C  Priests (21:8 LXX, 15)
X  Sanctums (21:23)
B’, C’  Priests (22:9, 16)
A’  Israel (22:32)

The two phrases AA’ (20:8; 22:32) are the only ones without the particle ו. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1832, 1888-89. However, the view here is that Milgrom’s “introverted structure” is not necessary for the following two reasons: First, even though we accepted the LXX third person plural suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:8, B and C are not the same. Regarding C, the third person singular suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:15 refers to “the high priest,” which is different from “the priests” of B. Furthermore, there are a number of opinions that the third person plural suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:23 refers to “the priests.” Consequently, the “introverted structure” is not necessary.
and 22:32, the object is “the Israelites.” In Lev 21:23; 22:9 and 16, the object is “the priests.” When the “sanctifier” appears as מָנוֹרַחַם in Lev 21:15 it points to a singular object, “the high priest.”

It can be noticed that in Lev 22:31-3; and Lev 20:8, the idea of כֹּמַר ("keeping") the commandments of YHWH is connected to the phrase אני יהוה מָנוֹרַחַם “I am YHWH who sanctifies you.” The two texts bring out the reciprocal relationship of being sanctified actively and passively. The people of God are not automatically sanctified by doing nothing, instead they should keep the commandments of God. God provides, through his commandments, the means by which Israel can attain holiness.⁴⁷ Since YHWH sets His name in the midst of His people, they must conduct themselves in a way that will not defile it. For whenever they transgress any of God’s laws, they shame His name and tarnish His reputation.⁴⁸

According to Lev 22:31-33, God should be regarded as holy in the midst of the sons of Israel because YHWH is the sanctifier of the Israelites. The holiness of YHWH is the foundation of the holiness of the people. The role of a sanctifier is very important to the Israelites. God’s will is very clear: the Israelites should be holy for God Himself is holy. God not only shows the way to holiness for the Israelites to follow, but He also sanctifies the Israelites. Although the holiness of God is opposed to the profane, yet it also enters the profane world, penetrates it, and makes it holy.⁴⁹

---

⁴⁷ Milgrom, Leviticus 17-22, 1889.
YHWH’s holiness as something ultimately grounded in the moral character of YHWH, whose chief attributes of unfailing love, mercy and forgiveness mark him off as different from humankind, yet which are intended to transform humanity into what it is unable fully to achieve itself.  

Before YHWH sanctifies the people of Israel, He is regarded as holy among them, and the people should keep and observe the law of YHWH. Thus, the holiness of YHWH is also the foundation for the people to keep the law. Gorman’s point that the holiness of God is itself a construction of the community, may be correct. If divine holiness is manifested among his people, then his role as sanctifier will be understood and his people will be sanctified.

Baruch Schwartz’s comparison is useful. He has compared the views of non-Priestly (E and D) and Priestly (H) traditions regarding the nature of Israel’s relationship with God. His comparison can be summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schwartz’s comparison of concept of Holiness in Non-P and H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Priestly tradition (E and D)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Israel’s holiness is the very fact of its election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Israel’s holiness is “bequeathed to it from on high.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Israel’s holiness is passed on “genetically.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Israel’s holiness is “a quality to be”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Schwartz understands H as a section of the Priestly tradition.
In E and D, the Israelites have been elected by His grace and elevated to an exalted status as God’s own “treasure.” They are sanctified, and thus they should obey God’s commandments.\(^5^4\) In H, Israel has been singled out and separated from the peoples, which means that God removed Israel from slavery in Egypt in order to “transform” Israel into his slave. God will take the initiative to sanctify His people. God will “radiate” His holiness to the Israelites and they should obey God’s commandments \textit{in order to} be holy.\(^5^5\) Then the process of sanctification will be actualized.

Schwartz takes Lev 22:31-32 as an example to illustrate that the “performance” of commandments “enables God’s own holiness to be manifest,” while failure to “perform” them is a “profanation of His name.”\(^5^6\) YHWH sanctifies the Israelites by His presence if they keep His laws, and this in turn is what “perpetuates His own holiness.”\(^5^7\) The concept of “sanctifying God” in Lev 22:31-33 can be used to interpret “rebelling against God’s word” in Num 27:14 (and “not believing in God” in Num 20:12). In Num 27:14, the sin of “rebelling against God’s word” itself is “failing to sanctify God.” If Moses did not obey God’s command, he would not show the role of God is the sanctifier of the Israelites. Hence, God is not regarded as holy.

\(^5^4\) Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 50-52, 58.
\(^5^5\) Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 52-58.
\(^5^6\) Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 57.
\(^5^7\) Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 58.
This theology can also be applied to Num 20:12 and Deut 32:51.

Sanctifying God and the exclusion

When the people obey YHWH’s law and behave according to His will, YHWH will be regarded as holy.\(^{58}\) YHWH is sanctified when Israel obeys his commandments.\(^{59}\) The failure to obey His commandments desecrates the name of God.\(^{60}\) The context of Lev 20-22 highlights the relationship between “desecrating the name of God” and “sanctifying God.”\(^{61}\) For whenever they transgress any of

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{“I, YHWH is ... sanctifier”} & \text{“desecrate”} & \text{Text} \\
\hline
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 20:3, 8} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 21:6, 8} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 21:15} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 21:23} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 22:9} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 22:15, 16} \\
\text{יְהוָה מָרָכָס} & \text{את חֶרֶם} & \text{Lev 22:32} \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

The verb חֶרֶם in the Piel means “to desecrate.” Almost 66% of all occurrences of “to desecrate” are found in Ezek (31×) and in H (16×). See F. Maass, “חרם,” TLOT 1:427-28. To “desecrate” (or “profane”) means to make something unholy. The object of the verb is always something holy. See Wenham, Leviticus, 259. In the above seven occurrences, the object being desecrated includes:

(i) God’s name (Lev 20:3; 21:6; 22:32);
(ii) the high priest’s offspring (Lev 21:15);
(iii) the sanctuary (Lev 21:23);
(iv) the holy offerings (Lev 22:9, 15).

In Lev 22:32a, the concern is “not desecrating God’s name.” Wenham says that the desecration occurs “when his name is misused …by doing something that God disapproves.” By carrying out these actions Israel desecrates God’s name; that is, “they have given him a bad reputation among the Gentiles.” See Wenham, Leviticus, 259.

---

\(^{58}\) Nihan also believes that YHWH is sanctified among His people by the strict and literal obedience to the Torah. See Nihan, “La mort de Moïse,” 165-166; Nihan, Priestly Torah, 495.

\(^{59}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 17-22, 1888.

\(^{60}\) Schwartz, “Leviticus,” 249.

\(^{61}\) Lev 22:32 opens with a command (וְלֹא חֶרֶם הַנִּשָּׁבָה) (“and not to desecrate”) the holy name of YHWH. See Marx, Lévitique 17-27, 137. According to the context, the actions of not observing YHWH’s commandments and disobeying to His laws will desecrate YHWH’s holy name. See Nihan, Priestly Torah, 494. As the following table shows, we can find that the verb חֶרֶם always appears in the context of מָרָכָס.
YHWH’s law, they shame His name and tarnish His reputation.⁶² Since His reputation is intricately tied up with the Israelites, for YHWH has identified Himself as the God who delivered Israel from the land of Egypt.⁶³ In the waters of Meribah, Moses and Aaron did not carry out YHWH’s commands properly, and YHWH said that they did not regard Him as holy. According to the relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32:48-52 and the context of Lev 22:31-33, the most natural way of sanctifying God is obeying God’s commands and words, but not necessarily about manifesting God’s power, awefulness, otherness or glory.

Moses’ sin of “failing to sanctify God” desecrates the name of God and affects the people at the same time. If the people do not regard YHWH as holy, they will not observe His commandments. On the contrary, if God is regarded as holy by his people, his people will be sanctified by God. The sin of “failing to sanctify God” gives harmful effect to the formation of the holiness of the people. In the time of the post-Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch, sanctifying God was very important because it signified that YHWH was the sanctifier of the Israelites. Any sin of failing to sanctify God would lead to death penalty. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land.

4. Conclusion

This chapter argues that the punishment of the removal of the leadership of

---

⁶² Hartley, Leviticus, 362.
⁶³ Hartley, Leviticus, 362.
Moses in Num 20 is rewritten as a death penalty in Deut 32. According to the post-Priestly Pentateuch redaction of Deuteronomy in Deut 32, the sin of failing to sanctify God is clarified, and the command to die on the mountain is stressed. Such post-Priestly redaction brings out that Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to regard God as holy. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. The importance of sanctifying YHWH can be understood by the relational dimension of sanctifying God, and His role as the sanctifier of the Israelites.
Chapter Eight. The Death of Moses in Deut 31 and Deut 34

We have seen that the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land is related to divine anger and sanctifying God in the previous chapters. Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 contain reference to the exclusion of Moses, but it seems that no reason has been given. The purpose of the present chapter is to provide a discussion on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5.

There are differences between Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5. Firstly, they are in a different context. According to the time frame of Deut 31-34, Deut 31:2 is earlier than Deut 34:4-5. The saying of Moses in Deut 31:1-6 occurs after the covenant is renewed in Moab (Deut 29-30). Deut 34 occurs after the command of YHWH to Moses that he has to ascend the mountain of the Abarim (Deut 32:48-52), and the final blessing of Moses (Deut 33). Secondly, in Deut 31:2, Moses quotes the words of YHWH to himself, while in Deut 34:4 the narrator of Deuteronomy records the words of YHWH to Moses. Thirdly, there are different direct objects of the verb רבע (“cross”). In Deut 31:2, the direct object of the verb רבע is ‘this Jordan’; while in Deut 34:4, the verb רבע does not have a direct object, rather there is an indication of the direction, שם (“there”). According to the context of Deut 34:4, the word שם (“there”) refers to הררי (“the land”). Fourthly, according to our investigation of the chronological order of Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 in Chapter
Two, they belong to different layers of Deuteronomy. Deut 34:4-5 are later than Deut 31:2. Since the content and language of Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 are quite different, in the following two sections, Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 will be discussed separately.

1. The Exclusion of Moses in the Context of Deut 31:1-6

Deut 31:1-6 is a saying of Moses to the Israelites. He tells them that he could not be their military leader. The conquest of the Promised Land will be led by YHWH and Joshua. Moses encourages the people to be strong and to pay attention to the works of YHWH. In Deut 31:2, Moses announces his age, and then he quotes YHWH’s saying that he is not allowed to cross over the Jordan. It has been suggested that Moses is too old to lead the people to fight in a battle. Does the phrase “one hundred and twenty years” mean that Moses is very old at that time? Is there another way to understand the implication of Moses’ age?

In the saying of Moses, Deut 31:3-6 itself is a unit framed by an *inclusio*:

$אָשֶׁר יֵחָי יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵיכֶם הָעָם הַיּוֹם יִהְיוּ בְּמַאן לְפָנָיו$ (Deut 31:3a) and $יִהְיוּ לִבְרֹאָה הָעָם הַיּוֹם יִהְיוּ בְּמַאן לְפָנָיו$ (Deut 31:6b). This unit consists of eighteen verbs, ten of them are with YHWH as their subject. YHWH’s past actions on the kings of Amorites would be repeated

---

1 Commentators explain לַעֲמֹר אֲלֹהֵינוּ ("to go out and to come in") in different ways: “to engage in active undertakings,” “to exercise leading in war,” “to lead” and “exercise military leadership.” See Driver, Deuteronomy, 334; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 372; Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 107; Tigay, Deuteronomy, 289. Rose states that this expression is very common in the military field. Rose, “Empoigner,” 137. This study understands that לַעֲמֹר אֲלֹהֵינוּ means to lead the people to fight in a battle.

2 The remains are: 2 imperatives to the Israelites (“be strong,” “be courageous,” 31:6); 2 jussives to the Israelites (“do not fear,” “do not be tremble” 31:6); 2 waw consecutive perfects to the Israelites (“you will possess,” 31:3; “you will do” 31:5); 1 participle modifying Joshua (“cross over” 31:3), and 1 verb with first person subject (“I [Moses] have commanded” 31:5).
on the nations before the Israelites. YHWH will deliver the nations to the Israelites. He has also spoken that Joshua will cross before the people. YHWH Himself will cross over and go with the Israelites. Furthermore, YHWH will not fail and forsake the Israelites. Thus, the divine actions are the grounds for the Israelites to be strong and courageous.

If the main focus of Deut 31:3-6 is YHWH’s actions, can we read Deut 31:2 as it is also related to divine actions? Is verse 2 in tune with the emphasis of divine actions? The answer will be positive when we read "and YHWH has said to me” Deut 31:2d) as a divine action. This phrase refers directly to the dialogue between YHWH and Moses reported in Deut 3:23-28, it is a quotation of YHWH’s saying in Deut 3:27. The divine action in Deut 31:2d sets the spatial limit of Moses. Moses will not fight before the Israelites because the divine action has set a boundary that he cannot cross over. The end of Moses’ leadership is a

---

3 [Deut 31:3, 4] and [Deut 31:4]
4 [Deut 31:5]
5 [Deut 31:3]
6 [Deut 31:3]
7 [Deut 31:6]
8 [Deut 31:6]
9 [Deut 31:6]
10 Rose, “Empoigner,” 137.
11 It is obvious that Deut 31:2 is in parallel with Deut 3:26-27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 3:26-27</th>
<th>Deut 31:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָרָא הָאָבָא אלָו</td>
<td>יָרָא הָאָבָא אלָו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא תִּנַּבְרָה</td>
<td>לֹא תִּנַּבְרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲחַר הָלֶבָּן הָוֵה</td>
<td>אֲחַר הָלֶבָּן הָוֵה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deut 3:26-27 and YHWH said to me… Deut 31:2 and YHWH said to me…
You will not cross this Jordan. You will not cross this Jordan.
matter of divine veto.\textsuperscript{12}

However, Deut 31:2 contains not only this explicit quotation, it also has one implicit allusion. The phrase מִלְחָה עֲשָׂרָה שָׁנָה (‘one hundred and twenty years’) Deut 31:2b) is an allusion to the divine saying in Gen 6:3,\textsuperscript{13} where YHWH said that the days of the men would be מִלְחָה עֲשָׂרָה שָׁנָה (‘one hundred and twenty years’). Gen 6:3 begins with יָמָיו רָמָה חַמָּה (‘And YHWH said’). The speaking of YHWH in Gen 6:3 can also be seen as a divine action. Deut 31:2b can point to the content of the saying of YHWH as well as this speaking action in Gen 6:3. In Deut 31:2, Moses tells the Israelites that he cannot be their military leader because his life-span will be finished according to the time limit set by YHWH in Gen 6:3. Hence, it seems likely that the age of Moses does not only point to the fact that Moses is very old, but also points to the divine saying action in Gen 6:3. YHWH has a statement which limits Moses’ life-span.

This implicit allusion is followed by the explicit quotation of YHWH’s saying in Deut 3:27, where YHWH does not allow Moses to cross over the Jordan. In Gen 6:3, יָמָיו רָמָה חַמָּה, the divine saying action sets the limit on human life-span; while in Deut 31:2d, הוא אמר יהוה, the divine saying action also sets the limit of the space where Moses can live. Consequently, YHWH’s word has set the boundary on the life-span of Moses, and also the boundary on the location of Moses. There is a limit

\textsuperscript{12} Nelson, Deuteronomy, 358.
in both the space and time of Moses. The exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 can be seen as a result according to the two speaking actions of YHWH who sets the time limit and spatial limit of Moses.

2. The Exclusion of Moses in Deut 34

In the saying of YHWH in Deut 34:4, He told Moses that he was not allowed to cross over to the Promised Land. The land which YHWH let Moses see is qualified by the clause, “which I swore to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, saying, ‘I will give it to your descendants.’” In Exod 33:1, the land is also qualified by the exact wordings:

In the Pentateuch, there are eight occurrences in which the Promised Land is qualified by the swearing to the three patriarchs (Gen 50:24; Exod 6:8; 33:1; Num 32:11; Deut 1:8; 6:10; 30:20; 34:4). But the patterns of these texts are slightly different from each other.¹⁵

---

¹⁴ Schmid has observed that the land promise as an oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob can no longer be found in Joshua-2 Kings. See Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 242.

¹⁵
The qualification of the land in Exod 33:1 is the only text that is the same as that Deut 34:4. In other Deuteronomistic texts, the infinitive לָבַיָּהָ is used, while in Exod 33:1 and Deut 34:4, the imperfect חֲנָנָא is used. Besides, in the Deuteronomistic texts, the word “fathers” is placed before the three patriarchs, but the word “fathers” is absent in Exod 33:1 and Deut 34:4.16

However, the commands in Exod 33:1 have been changed in Deut 34:4. In Exod 33:1, Moses is commanded to "go", Qal) and "ascend", Qal)17 the Promised Land. The commands “go” and “ascend” to Moses generate a new beginning of the journey to Moses and the Israelites after the incidents of the golden calf and the destruction of the tablets. The destination of the new journey would be the land which YHWH has promised to give to the descendants of the patriarchs. It implies that the Israelites, who had sinned in the golden calf incident, still have a chance to receive the land. In Exod 33:1, Moses is commanded to go and to ascend the Promised Land, but in Deut 34:4, Moses is not allowed to cross over the Promised Land. Why?

In Deut 34:4 no reason is given for Moses’ exclusion. Deut 34 does not want to

---


17 Propp explains, “In the Torah’s topography, Egypt is the lowest place on Earth, Canaan the highest. One always ‘descends’ to Egypt and ‘goes up’ to Canaan.” Cf. William Propp, *Exodus 19-40* (AB2a; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 597.
side either with the Deuteronomistic explanation of Moses’ exclusion (in Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21) or with the post-Priestly explanation (in Num 20:12; 27:12-14; Deut 32:48-52). It knows both post-Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions, but it does not agree with the Deuteronomistic and the post-Priestly positions. It mentions none of these explanations for Moses’ death. Instead, Deut 34:7 offers its own interpretation: Moses is not allowed to enter the Promised Land, because his life-span of 120 years has just now run out. Deut 34:7, like Deut 31:2, is motivated by the life-span of 120 years mentioned in Gen 6:3, according to which YHWH has established it for human life. At his age of 120, Moses is still full of “vigour and strength.” So, Moses has to die not because of his weakness or sickness. The only reason for Moses’ death is that Moses has reached the age limit.

---

19 Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 249.
23 In Deut 34:7, Moses condition is described by two phrases: ולא חזה עינו ולא נס הלוח. The first phrase ולא חזה עינו is usually interpreted as “Moses eye was not dimmed.” The traditional interpretation of the second phrase נס הלוח is that “the natural moisture and freshness of his body was not reduced,” (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 424.) or “he was still full of vigor,” (Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 395.) Tigay offers another interpretation, and he argues that the verb נס means “dried up” and its subject הלוח means “moisture,” it “refers to lubricity in the sense of freshness and smoothness of the skin.” There is no evidence that הלוח means “vigor.” He suggests that the second phrase ולא נס הלוח means “the moistness of Moses’ skin had not dried up.” See Jeffrey H. Tigay, “He Had Not Become Wrinkled” (Deuteronomy 34:7),” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Ziony Zevit et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 345-50. Jeremy Schipper adopts Tigay’s interpretation and he uses this direction of interpretation in the exegesis of the first phrase ולא חזה עינו. He observes that both the subject חזה עינו and the verb נס are in the singular form. If נס refers to the eyes of Moses, it will be in the plural form as it is used in other texts, for example: Gen 27:1; 48:10; 1Sam 3:2; 1Sam 4:15; 1Kgs 14:4. By comparing the usage of the word עינו in the Priestly text, he argues that in Deut 34:7, עינו “probably refers to Moses’ skin rather than his eyesight.” Consequently, the meaning of this phrase is that Moses’ skin “had retained its shining appearance.” See Jeremy Schipper, “The Meaning of עינו in Deuteronomy 34:7,” *ZAW* 126 (2014): 419-420.
human life-span was fixed by word of YHWH, Moses will die when his age reaches
the end of the life-span. Despite Moses’ exceptional status, in the end, like all
humans, he has to submit to this limit.\textsuperscript{25} In Schmid’s wording, Moses’ death is
caused by \textit{fate},\textsuperscript{26} not by divine anger or divine holiness.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{The Meaning of }\textit{על יוהו} in Deut 34:5

According to Deut 34:5, Moses died in the Land of Moab \textit{על יוהו}. What is
the meaning of \textit{על יוהו}? This idiom \textit{על יוהו} is used frequently with reference to
YHWH.\textsuperscript{28} The phrase literally means “according to the mouth of YHWH.”\textsuperscript{29} It was
interpreted midrashically to mean that Moses died by the “kiss” of God.\textsuperscript{30} However,
this way of interpretation does not agree with the typical usage of the expression in
the Pentateuch. Of the twenty-two occurrences of the prepositional phrase
\textit{על יוהו} in the Pentateuch, one is found in the book of Deuteronomy, and the
others are found in Exodus-Numbers.\textsuperscript{31} At these occurrences, the phrase is never
interpreted literally, rather, it means “according to the word or command of

\textsuperscript{25} Edelman, \textit{Open the Books}, 173.
\textsuperscript{26} Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 248.
\textsuperscript{27} For another point of view on the death of Moses without any explanation, see Olson, \textit{Death of
Moses}, 167. Olson thinks that the straightforward narration of Moses’ death without explanation
simply underscores the inevitable reality of human death and limitation. The text allows the mystery
of human suffering and death to remain unanswered.
\textsuperscript{28} Lundbom, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 945.
\textsuperscript{29} Cairns, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 305; Christensen, \textit{Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12}, 871; Mayes, \textit{Deuteronomy},
413; Smith, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 380; Tigay, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 338.
\textsuperscript{30} Driver, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 423; Tigay, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 338.
\textsuperscript{31} Exod 17:1; Lev 24:12; Num 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18(2×), 20(2×), 23(3×); 10:13; 13:3;
33:2, 38; 36:5; Deut 34:5. There are two additional occurrences of the prepositional phrase
\textit{על יוהו} (“according to His word”) in the book of Numbers: Num 27:21(2×).
YHWH.”\(^{32}\) Therefore, the more plausible translation of יְהֹוָה בְּ時点 in Deut 34:5 is “according to the word of YHWH.”

What is the syntactic function of יְהֹוָה בְּ時点? Is the expression used to modify יָרִימוֹת (“And he died”) or בֵּית מֹאוֹב (“in the land of Moab”)? Nelson says that it is unclear whether it refers to the fact of Moses’ death or to its location outside the land.\(^{33}\) Lundbom states that YHWH did not command Moses’ death; rather YHWH commanded that Moses would die outside the Promised Land, which is here fulfilled.\(^{34}\) Lundbom’s statement, however, contradicts the factual evidence from Deut 32:50 where we find that YHWH did command Moses to die because the word בָּעֹל (“die”) is an imperative.

The syntactic function of יְהֹוָה בְּ景德 may not be a choice of “either or.” According to Deut 32:49-50, YHWH has commanded Moses to go up to the mountain which is located in the land of Moab, and die there. Consequently, יְהֹוָה בְּ景德 can be used to modify both the action יָרִימוֹת and the location בֵּית מֹאוֹב. But the expression may also refer to YHWH’s fulfillment of His own earlier prediction of Moses’ death in Deut 31:14,\(^ {35}\) where YHWH tells Moses that his time to die is near.

Then, what is the theological function of יְהֹוָה בְּ景德? We have seen that there is a high occurrence of the prepositional phrase יְהֹוָה בְּ景德 in the book of Numbers.

\(^{32}\) Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 871; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 423; Levinson, “*Deuteronomy,*” 427; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 945; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 413.

\(^{33}\) Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 396.

\(^{34}\) Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 945.

\(^{35}\) Block, *Deuteronomy*, 808.
We have also seen that Numbers highlights that both the leaders and the people have carried out the instructions according to the word of YHWH. The expression נַעֲלֵי פֶּרֶשׁ יְהוָה signifies the obedience of the leaders and the people to God. We have suggested that when the redactors of Numbers use the expression “rebellion against פֶּרֶשׁ יְהוָה” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they may want to imply that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers.36

Then, in Deut 32:50, YHWH commands Moses to die on the mountain. It seems that “a second chance” is given to Moses. Would Moses obey YHWH in this time? According to Deut 34:5, Moses died נַעֲלֵי פֶּרֶשׁ יְהוָה. This time Moses continues his obedience to YHWH. Even in his death, Moses proves a faithful servant.37 He died not because his physical power has left him, but because of the will of YHWH.38

Römer suggests that Deut 34 seems to be a more “Diaspora-oriented” text.39 There is a non-fulfillment in Deut 34. Moses is allowed to see the Promised Land but he cannot enter there. Moses dies outside the Promised Land. One can understand Deut 34 as constructing Moses as a figure of identification for people living in the Diaspora. The important thing is not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to

36 There are two occurrences where “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb הומל (“to rebel”) (Num 20:24; 27:14); and three occurrences that “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb עָשָׂר (“cross over/disregard”) (Num 14:41; 22:18; 24:13). The theme of rebellion or disregarding of YHWH’s word is depicted in these five instances in the book of Numbers.
37 Block, Deuteronomy, 808.
38 Rüdiger Lux, “Der Tod des Mose als »besprochene und erzählte Welt«,” ZThK 84 (1987), 423.
39 Thomas Römer, “The Date, Composition and Function of Joshua 24 in Recent Research,” HeBAI (2017): 211.
die according to the will of YHWH.\textsuperscript{40} Since the destruction of Israel and Judah was due to the failure to obey YHWH’s word.\textsuperscript{41} The people living in the Diaspora should remember that failure. Moses’ example can encourage the people to live and to die with the obedience to the word of YHWH.

3. Conclusion

The results of this chapter may be summarized as follows. Deut 31:1-6 focus on divine action. The divine action of YHWH in Gen 6:3 sets the limit on human life-span; while that in Deut 31:2d sets the limit of the space where Moses can live. There is a limit in both the space and time of Moses. The exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 can be seen as a result according to the two speaking actions of YHWH who sets the time limit and spatial limit of Moses. This perspective continues in Deut 34 which knows both post-Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions, but it does not agree with them. Instead, Deut 34:7 offers its own interpretation: Moses is not allowed to enter the Promised Land, because his life-span of 120 years has just now run out. Moses’ death is caused by divine veto, not by divine anger or divine holiness.

Although he has “rebelled against YHWH” in the incident of waters from the rock, Deut 34:5 shows that Moses can continue his obedience to YHWH for he died הוהי כ. Moses died because of the will of YHWH. Deut 34 seems to construct Moses as a figure of identification for the Jews living in the Diaspora. The important

\textsuperscript{40} Römer, “Joshua 24,” 211.
\textsuperscript{41} Steven L. McKenzie, “Kings (Books),” in EBR 15: 306.
thing is not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to die according to the will of YHWH.
Chapter Nine. Conclusion

This dissertation has investigated the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land in Numbers and Deuteronomy. It started with the observation of the tensions of the different versions of the exclusion of Moses. The connections between the exclusion of Moses, divine anger and sanctifying YHWH were overlooked by previous scholars. Since we have found that different redactional layers of Deuteronomy correlate with the themes of divine anger and sanctifying God, and Deuteronomy can be understood in different perspectives, the research went along these four angles to get the four different answers. The related passages in the book of Numbers were also discussed.

According to Deut 1-3*, one of the oldest layer in the Deuteronomistic History, divine anger was directed at Moses because he was the leader of the first exodus generation on whom the wrath of God was visited. Moses was excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the first generation of Israelites who left Egypt. In regard to Deut 1:37-38, we first argued that they were original, and not secondary additions. A comparison of the two versions of the spy narrative in Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 showed that the relationship between them was very complicated. There was two-way inter-dependence between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version. Num 13-14 was formed by integration of Deut 1:19-46 and an older...
tradition which might also have been used by Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors.

Since the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be first understood in its own context, we concluded that Moses was not sinful in the context of Deut 1:19-46. There was no allusion to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, but he did not suffer vicariously. Being a leader, he suffered with the people. In that passage, we have seen a coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility,” this suggested that it was difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

In Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer, and also because of the Israelites. However, Moses was not punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses was not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” was used to clarify that Moses did not sin. Since an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God, we have also carried out a word study on different expressions of divine anger in Deuteronomy, and the uniqueness of the words for divine anger has been pointed out. Twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God in Deuteronomy were due to human sin. The punishments triggered by divine anger were classified into three main principles: destruction,
measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlighted the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment on Moses was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself.

Another reason was given in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History. Deut 1-3 and Deut 4 were products of different periods because of their different stressed themes. Deut 1-3* belonged to one of the oldest layers of the Deuteronomistic History, while Deut 4 was a mixture of late layers of that History. Accordingly, Moses’ exclusion was compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. There were “anger-punishment patterns” in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History. We could find a varied “anger-punishment pattern” of the exclusion of Moses when it was compared with that patterns of the Deuteronomistic work. The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 4 was used to confess the sin of the Israelites.

The other reason was given in Deut 32:48-52, which was not written by the same hand as Deut 1-3 because of the accumulative stylistic, factual, and theological considerations. We have discussed its Priestly nature with that of Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14. Based on the persuasive arguments of Perlitt and Nihan, the solution to that problem adopted in this study was that Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 were probably post-Priestly, but their theologies might be still influenced by the theologies of the Priestly School and Holiness School.
observations of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in the three passages. It was possible that the later scribal school has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch.

In regard to the chronological order of the three passages of the exclusion of Moses in the post-Priestly redaction, it was: Num 20:1-13; then Num 27:12-14; and the last Deut 32:48-52. We proposed that Num 27:12-14 was later that Num 20:1-13 because the former presupposes the content of Num 20:1-13, and it had integrated the key expressions in Num 20:12 and Num 20:24. Deut 32:48-52 was said to be later than Num 27:12-14 because of the evidence of stylistic improvements and meaning clarifications in Deut 32:48-52. Rephrasing Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordination clauses, it changed the infinitive construction to a clause with the verb “to sanctify” in Piel perfect with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses was then clarified and emphasised in these modifications.

Since Deut 31:1-6, a passage connected to Deut 1-3, was one of the layers in the Deuteronomistic History, it was earlier than Deut 34:4-5* which belonged to the Pentateuch redaction. Therefore, the diachronic sequence of the texts are: Deut1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Num 20:12, Num 20:24, Num 27:12-14, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.

Several faults could be found in the actions and speech of Moses in the incident of the waters from the rock in Num 20:1-13. The sin of Moses was found in Num
The speaking itself was a sin or the rash words were faults. Moses’ sin could also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses’ hand in Num 20:11 had both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expressed that Moses deliberated to disobey YHWH’s command. The raising of Moses’ hand alluded to the “high hand” in Num 15:30-31. We also highlighted that the punishment of Moses in Num 20:1-13 was the removal of Moses’ leadership rather than his exclusion. Such punishment was a kind of “cutting off” of Moses who disobeyed God deliberately. Num 20:24 was the first to re-interpret the sin of Moses as “rebelling against God’s word” in the incident. When the redactors used the expression “rebelling against הוהי י’hwhy yhm” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they wanted to signify that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron was a sin which contrasted with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers. Num 27:12-14 received that re-interpretation of the fault of Moses and rewrote it together with the sin of failing to regard God as holy.

According to the post-Priestly Pentateuch redaction of Deuteronomy in Deut 32:48-52, Moses was ordered to die because of the sin of failing to sanctify God. The exclusion of Moses was a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. The punishment of the removal of the leadership of Moses in Num 20 was rewritten as a death punishment in Deut 32. Although the discussion of “sanctifying God” was very rare, we could still find that there are four ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s power, awfulness, otherness, and
glory. However, the relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32:48-52

signified obeying God’s commands as a new way to understand the meaning of
sanctifying God. The importance of sanctifying YHWH could be understood by His
role as the sanctifier of the Israelites.

In Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5, we saw that Gen 6:3 played an important role in
the exclusion of Moses. Divine action was the main focus in Deut 31:1-6. The
exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 could be seen as a result according to the two
speaking actions of YHWH who set the time limit and spatial limit of Moses. The
divine saying action of YHWH in Gen 6:3 set the limit on human life-span; while
YHWH’s saying action in Deut 31:2d set the limit of the space where Moses could
live. There was a limit in both the space and time of Moses.

This perspective continued in Deut 34 which knew both the post-Priestly and
the Deuteronomistic traditions, but it did not agree with them. Instead, Deut 34:7
explained that Moses was not allowed to enter the Promised Land because his
life-span of 120 years had reached the end. Moses’ death was caused by divine veto,
not by divine anger or divine holiness.

Although Moses had “rebelled against יָהֲנָה יְהוָה” in the incident of waters from
the rock, Deut 34:5 showed that Moses could continue his obedience to YHWH for
he died עָלֵי יָהֲנָה וַיְהוָֽה. Moses died because of the will of YHWH. Deut 34 seemed to
construct Moses as a figure of identification for the Jews living in the Diaspora. The
important thing was not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to die according
to the will of YHWH.
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