Christian Frevel

# Leadership and Conflict: Modelling the Charisma of Numbers

The Book of Numbers is crucial for structuring leadership in the context of the Pentateuch, even the Hexateuch. Unexpected as it may be, this statement holds true both in general and particular. This emphasis is not obvious according to the importance of the Book of Exodus on the one hand, and the paramount presence of Moses and Aaron in the Exodus Narrative and at Sinai on the other. However, it becomes comprehensible by pointing at the book's intermediary state between foundation and realization; or, to put it in the framework of the plot: between Sinai and the border of the promised land, that is, in short, *wilderness*. With this, wilderness is determined not only spatiotemporally, but rather conceptually as the marked space between start and destination, between inception and implementation. As the Book of Numbers is formative for the development of the Pentateuch as Torah in literary respect (Achenbach 2003; Frevel 2013b), it is also determinative in terms of social organization, hierarchy, authority, legitimization, and the emergence of office (Frevel 2013a; 2014; Pyschny 2017). To substantiate this general statement, let me point to three striking facts: First, the Book of Numbers is paramount in structuring the congregation of all Israel socially in the organizational form of twelve tribes. Second, the Book of Numbers is matchless in introducing the Levites, inaugurating them into the priestly service and implementing them as an indispensable part of the cult. Third, the Book of Numbers is exceptional in formulating an inner-priestly hierarchy and in forming a high-priestly office. On the literary level, important aspects of social structure are unfolded, implemented, and finally cemented in this book. Great portions of the text either address the organizational structure of the tribes and constituting center and periphery (Num 1–7; 26; 27; 31; 32; 36), discuss and unfold particular aspects of leadership (Num 11–17; 20; 25; 27; 35; 36), deploy office and hierarchy (Num 3; 8; 17–18; 25; 27; 31; 35), or address succession (Num 3; 17; 19; 20; 25; 26; 27; 35). Some texts render this more explicitly, others more implicitly, but one cannot escape the impression that leadership is an important and central issue in this book. That being said, I understand "leadership" not only in the broadest sense as "the power or ability to lead other people", but also more specifically as any way of public guidance, direction, management, stewardship, and governance including military-political decision making.

The aim of the present paper is to outline leadership-issues in the Book of Numbers in order to demonstrate leadership as one of the pivotal topics of this

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110543391-006

book. In particular, I will put an emphasis on Joshua and his inauguration as a test case. I will argue that there is a difference between the aspects of the routinization of charisma in the high-priestly office and the installation of Joshua as successor of Moses, which is crucial for the understanding of "leadership" and "hierocracy" in the Book of Numbers. The whole book is organized to relieve and suspend Moses in his duty to be at the head of Israel. As a consequence, Moses' authority is narrowed to his intermediary function – in short: He becomes "Torah" and implemented in institutional respect. First, my argument will consist of three examples of governmental structures the Book of Numbers focuses on: representative structures, hierarchical structures, and the unfolding of the high-priestly office. Then, I will present some observations on Joshua, his authorization, and the background of the Mosaic authority. The literary development described in that paragraph will raise questions concerning the implementation of narrative structures in social history. A summarizing evaluation of the routinization of charisma in the Book of Numbers will conclude this essay.

## 1 How Numbers Becomes Crucial Within the Leadership Plot

Moses and Aaron are both commissioned in the Exodus Narrative – explicitly so in the redactional passage Exod 6:13, but already in Exod 4:28–29; 5:1; 7:1–20; 11:10; 12:1; 16:3 etc. Until Sinai and at Sinai, Israel is led by Moses and Aaron, however, by the time the couple diverges, the whole project is put into question (Exod 32). Within these narratives, Moses and Aaron are mostly depicted as charismatic leaders without office. The term "office" is understood here as denoting a more or less institutionalized structure of certain tasks assigned to an individual independent from a particular person. Further institutions beside Moses and Aaron are not yet developed in detail. If at all, tendencies of institutionalization emerge in Exod 28–29 in the vestment of Aaron as high priest.[1] I will explain this further with regard to three crucial aspects: (a) the hierarchy of priests and Levites, (b) elders and the existence of judges, and (c) Joshua as military leader.

(a) Priests alone are set apart as cultic functionaries (Exod 28 and Lev 8), but (leaving aside the special function in Exod 32:26–28) the *Levites* as subordinated

1 For a more detailed discussion of the vestment of Aaron, see the essay by Christophe Nihan and Julia Rhyder in the present volume. For the representational aspect, see also Frevel 2017, 68–72.

cultic functionaries are not mentioned substantially before Num 1:50. Only the tax assessment in Exod 38:21 mentions the Levites and their special role under the leadership of Ithamar, the fourth son of Aaron, and Lev 25:32–33 grants the Levites a timeless right of redemption. While being related to the allotment of land and the lack of inheritance titles (cf. Num 18:23–24; 26:64; 35:2), this passage in particular is explicitly non-cultic. Until the Book of Numbers, the Levites are described as a special tribe from which Aaron and Moses derive, but which has almost no relation to cultic duties and assistance. In all Exod 25–31 and 35–40, the small Aaronide company of five and, after Lev 10, three people run the whole cult. Without the Book of Numbers, the Levites as cultic agents were almost absent. In contrast to the Books of Exodus and Leviticus, the Levites in Numbers are implemented and deeply rooted in structural respect.

(b) Elders are mentioned before the departure of Sinai, but they rather hold representative than functionary positions. The Book of Exodus frequently mentions them, but there is neither a specific function nor inauguration (Exod 3:16,18; 4:29; 12:21; 17:5–6; 18:12; 19:7; 24:1,9,13; Lev 4:15; 9:1). The most striking fact is that they do not appear in the most explicit text that speaks of the implementation of subsidiary structures in jurisdiction (Exod 18, see below). The most significant differentiation is provided by Lev 4:15, where the elders are to place their hands upon the bull of a sin-offering in a vicarious manner to cover an unintentional sin of the people. In the other texts, they function as representatives of Israel or, taking Exod 12:21 as point of departure, as clan-representatives. There, they are addressed by Moses (Exod 3:16; 4:29; 12:21) and escort him when he approaches the Pharaoh. In Exod 17:5, they accompany Moses in his attempt to get water from the rock by hitting it with his rod. He does so "before the eyes of the elders of Israel" (לעיני זקני ישראל, Exod 17:6), but no explicit function is ascribed to the elders. Although one has to acknowledge their extraordinariness (particularly as addressees in Exod 19:7 or the group of seventy in Exod 24:1,9,14), they do not act as officials. We are not informed how the elders were determined, chosen, or elected; and we are left in limbo about their rights and duties. They are something like witnesses, nothing more, and, if at all, jury rather than judges. They become related to an office only in a reception process via the reader's combination of Exod 18 with Num 11. Both form parallel stories sharing similar aspects, and both are connected by redactional rewriting (Berner 2010, 65, 125, 403, 421–422), but differ a lot conceptually (Baden 2012, 141). Mostly, they are treated together with Deut 1:9–18 (Russel 2016, 23), but for the sake of clarity, let us stick only to the Tetrateuch.

In contrast to Exod 18, where the elders are not mentioned explicitly, Num 11 introduces the group of seventy elders as chosen by Moses on behalf of God (אספה־לי שבעים איש מזקני ישראל, Num 11:16). They are said to be שטרים

office holders, officials, or administrative functionaries (Num 11:16). Although they are provided with a share of Moses' spirit that is withdrawn from his charisma by God (ואצלתי מן־הרוח אשר עליך ושמתי עליהם, Num 11:17) their concrete duty remains obscure. They shall carry a share of Moses' burden (ונשאו אתך במשא העם ולא־תשא אתה לבדך, Num 11:17), but their concrete duty is not specified here either. Only if Num 11 is read against the background of Exod 18, the elders seemingly become judges. The combined reading may be induced by the large-scale composition of the Sinai Narrative, since in compositional respect, the two stories are twins (Frevel 2003, 19–20). In the narrative of Exod 18, Jethro advises Moses to appoint chosen men to exonerate him. The narrative designates men who fear God, love truth, are incorruptible, and are held in high esteem by the people (אנשי־חיל יראי אלהים אנשי אמת שנאי בצע, Exod 18:21). They are to judge (שפט) and are designated as "officials, functionaries" (שרי, Exod 18:22). The establishment of the office of judge, which follows the advice of Moses' father-in-law prior to the Sinai Pericope, leads to the corresponding text in Num 11. Since the elders are not mentioned in Exod 18, an office of eldership that is given a share of explicit leadership can be surmised only by a combined reading of Exod 18 and Num 11. Beginning in the Talmud and Midrash (bZeb 116a; Mekhilta II: 162ff), there has been ample discussion on the disposal of these two narratives bordering the Sinai Narrative Exod 19–Num 10:10 in the scholarly history (Frevel 2003, 14–16). Should not the more elaborate one mentioning the Sinai come second and Num 11 mentioning the manna and not the Sinai come first? It is futile to discuss such options, but one aspect of Exod 18 is the paradigmatic confession of the foreigner Jethro only on the basis of God's deeds of salvation, any knowledge of Torah notwithstanding (Frevel 2003, 20–22). Another aspect is that "Moses" in his superior position *becomes* Torah in a sophisticated manner and is functionally analog to Deut 1:6, where his teaching expounds the Torah. Be that as it may, the point I want to emphasize here is that if (and *only if*) Num 11 is read against the background of Exod 18, the elders become judges. In the Book of Exodus, the elders do not have a share in institutionalized leadership.

(c) Let us now look at a third aspect of leadership in the Book of Exodus, namely the role of Joshua. Joshua is (more or less) introduced by means of a speech of Moses in Exod 17:9. He is installed as military leader in Exod 17:9–16 quite situationally, and Moses still plays a special role in the course of the narrative (Exod 17:10–12). It is Israel's first battle after the liberation at the sea where there was no struggle on the part of Israel since God himself took care of the Egyptians! This way, the story renders paradigmatic, but it is also a sort of *metatext* in terms of institutionalization (Berner 2013, 209; Oswald 2015b, 61–63). However, the commission of Joshua as a military leader remains fuzzy and his relatedness to the power of Moses remains quite sophisticated. The power of Moses is rather

the power of Torah than the power of the monarch or the prophet (pace Oswald 2015b, 66). The story takes place at Sinai/Horeb (Exod 17:6) and the "top of the hill" (הגבעה ראש) in the present text alludes to the mountain of God (Exod 18:5) (Oswald 2015b, 67). If "Moses" is understood metonymically as Torah, the story exhibits an institutional level of understanding. "Aaron" is clearly connected to the priesthood as sustaining (and safeguarding) the Torah. However, the existence of Hur remains obscure in this reading. Perhaps, his name is a play with Horeb and thus elaborately points to the institutional side of the Torah. He is not introduced genealogically (and maybe rather different from the grandfather of Bezalel who is Judean, Exod 31:2; 35:30; 38:22), and is only mentioned as accompanying Aaron in Exod 17:10,12 and Exod 24:14, but his concrete function remains unclear. Perhaps Exod 24:14 gives a clue, when Aaron and Hur are installed as situational deputies of Moses (Hur is forgotten after Exod 24): "For Aaron and Hur are with you; whoever has a dispute may go to them" (מי־בעל דברים יגש אלהם). Be that as it may, there is no institutional commission of Joshua, Aaron, and Hur in Exod 17. From the perspective of leadership, Exod 17 yields less profit. Compared to the role of Joshua in the Book of Numbers, the difference becomes apparent. Here, Joshua is installed as military leader in relation to the office of the high priest (see below). The lines between Joshua and Moses are nevertheless clear cut by the rebuke of his zeal in Num 11:28–29. He is singled out in terms of situational charisma (Num 11:28; 14:6) and institutionalized office (Num 27:18; 32:28).

Taken together, all three samples point in the same direction. In the Book of Exodus, Moses and Aaron are characterized as the charismatic leaders of Israel and the issue of institutionalization remains rather in the background than at the core of the stories. Aaron's priesthood does not play a role in terms of leadership, although his implicit institutional employment can be rendered visible beyond the veil. The general impression is that – except for the murmuring against Moses (Exod 15:24; 17:3) or against Moses and Aaron (Exod 16:2,7) – questions of leadership are not addressed in a more profound sense. It is rather the role of Torah that is established as the structuring principle in a sophisticated manner in the background of Exod 18 (Frevel 2003) and in Exod 17 (MacDonald 2012; Berner 2013). Irrespective of their relatedness to older traditions, the stories are now contextually embedded as implicit commentaries on the function of Torah as foundational principle and as provision of wisdom, power, and success rather than as a discussion regarding issues of leadership and institutionalization. This picture changes dramatically in the Book of Numbers. There is a shift in institutionalization as well as intensification in routinization and sacralization.

# 2 From Guidance to Governance – Leadership in the Book of Numbers

Within the Book of Numbers, functional differentiation, duties and offices, as well as appointment and authorization are addressed *almost* throughout the entire text. The perspective on structuring the community as society is crucial already in the first chapters of the book, when the basic organization of the camp is addressed. Without going into detail, one has to admit that issues of leadership are addressed in almost every chapter of the first two thirds of the Book of Numbers. Most notably are Num 11–12; 16–17; 20 and 27 as famous core chapters, but issues of leadership are more or less explicitly addressed in other chapters, too. Leadership is one of the topics if not the *major* topic in Numbers.

Before focussing on Joshua regarding the differentiation and relation of secular and sacral power, let me elaborate on three issues of leadership as examples: (1) the handling of representative structures, (2) the instalment of the Levites and the hierarchical priestly order, and (3) the configuration of a high-priestly office.

## 2.1 Representative Structures in Numbers

At the beginning of the book, twelve tribal representatives are elected as appointees from the community to assist Moses and Aaron in taking the census. God addresses Moses in Num 1:1, but explicitly Moses and Aaron are demanded to organize the census together (Num 1:3). The general perspective of the Book of Numbers is that Aaron is often involved, if not made responsible. Right at the beginning, the leaders are singled out, one out of each tribe, to assist the two during the census ("they shall attend you", יעמדו אתכם). Their names and patronyms are mentioned in the speech of God. Thus, there does not seem to be an election process by the tribes themselves. However, they are already part of the extended family structure (איש ראש לבית־אבתיו הוא, Num 1:4). Except for the representative of Judah, Nahshon the son of Amminadab (Exod 6:23), none of them was mentioned by name before.[2] Following the wording in Num 1:16, as well as

**2** There is a slight textual variant in Num 1:16: Within the written text (*ketîb*), they are קריאי העדה "the elected of/by the assembly". The *qerê* instead reads a passive קרואי העדה "the called of the assembly", which slightly withdraws the election process from the assembly. But strictly speaking, and notwithstanding Num 1:1–3, the construct leaves open the question of the subject of election. Is it a *genitivus subjectivus* or a *genitivus objectivus*? Strikingly, the *ketîb-qerê*-variant

the repetition of the names in Num 2; 7 and 10, the appointees are not only summoned to perform the census, but have other obligations. Traditionally, Num 1:16 is read in a threefold manner: While Rashi considers the phrase "chosen of the assembly" (קרואי העדה) to mean that they were summoned to every matter of importance before the assembly; according to Isaac ben Judah Abarbanel, the second phrase "the leaders of their ancestral tribes" (נשיאי מטות אבותם) is related to the apportion of the land (following their mentioning in Num 32:2 and Num 34:18); and the third phrase "the heads of the divisions of Israel" (ראשי אלפי ישראל הם) following Num 10:4; Josh 22:21 (and the צבא-structure in Num 2) is considered by Abarbanel to relate to military leaders (Carasic 2011, 5). The sensibility for the complexity of the wording in Num 1:16 and the interconnectedness with other passages in Numbers, where representatives are mentioned, is correct. The appointment of the representatives is connected to the new social order which is quite different to the social order in Gen–Lev. Therefore, the election of the group of seventy among the elders (Exod 24:1,9) was not related to the tribal structure. Further, the redactional compromise of the two systems in Num 11:16 by the adaptation to Deut 1:15 is particularly notable. Now, these are "democratic" representatives. The importance of this implementation of a representative structure exceeds the situational appointment to take the census (Num 1:4–44). They shall also lead the tribes according to the order of the camp (Num 2) and within the decampment in 1:14–27.

The twelve leaders, who divert as well as communalize the functions of Moses and Aaron, form the first definitive intermediary. The established order with the נשיא as the leader of a clan (מטה) is taken up not only in Num 2–3; 7 and 10, but also in the spy-story Num 13:2–16. The representative council is mentioned further in Num 17:17,21; 27:2; 31:13; 32:2; 34:18; 36:1, and strikingly, in two of the crucial crisis stories. The mixed marriage trespasser Zimri is said to be a son of Salu, the chieftain of the Simeonite ancestral house (זמרי בן־סלוא נשיא בית־אב לשמעני, Num 25:14), and the rioters in Num 16 are counted as chieftains in the very complex (and late redactional, see Pyschny 2017) introduction of the story in Num 16:1–2. These two very late passages underscore that the delegation perspective is reflected institutionally in the Book of Numbers.

in Num 26:9 is the other way around. It appears that the textual tradition wanted to separate the defiant Rubenites Dathan and Abiram from the ones who were elected by God.

## 2.2 The Instalment of the Hierarchical Order by Introducing the Levites

With the exception of the Book of Numbers, there were no Levites in the Sinaitic cult. Strikingly enough, the inauguration of Aaron and his sons as priests is demanded and performed at length in Exod 28–29 and Lev 8 without any mentioning of the Levites. The prioritization of the Aaronide priests in priestly texts is indisputable; a tendency which steadily increases in the redactional process. Harald Samuel has correctly referred to this tendency as "Aaronidisierung" (Samuel 2012, 422). It sets in at the beginning, when the Levites in Num 3 are selected to *assist* Aaron. Here, in contrast to the role of Moses later on, Aaron (or his successors) is not being substituted, but ranks clearly before the Levites in the thus installed hierarchy (Num 3:9–10). These hierarchical and functional differentiations establish a completely new level subordinated to priestly service. The Levites are consecrated in Num 8 and assigned to their service (Num 8:15), which they are to carry out between the age of 25 and 50. Numbers 8:19 again explicitly subjects them under the priestly office. There is a crucial interest in cementing the priestly authority and leadership in the Book of Numbers (Pyschny 2017, 342). The blooming rod in Num 16:5b,7aβ; 17:16–28, in which the election of the Levite Aaron as *the priestly* leader of the twelve tribes anchors his priority in an indisputable divine ordeal, can be seen as the point, in which both composition and narration culminate. Usually this increasing priority, which ends up with the political and cultic leadership of the high priest (Frevel 2013a), is linked with a degradation of Levites (Samuel 2012, 422). However, while subordination remains unquestioned in the text of Numbers, even in Num 16–17, there is no denigration, general rebuke, or disregard of the Levites (Frevel 2010; Pyschny 2017, 332–334). Their introduction into the older conflict on holiness, the so-called 250-men narrative (Num 16:2–7a*,18,35; 17:1–15*), by making the Levite Korah leader (Num 16:1a,5a*,6*,7b–11; 17:5bα.14b) emphasizes their special role as buffer between the priests and the ordinary people. Even the most explicit passage Num 16:7b–11 does not question the importance of the Levites in the cultic hierarchy, although it limits the priestly office to the Aaronides. In the Book of Numbers, there can be no well-performing cult without the implementation of the Aaronides as the superordinate Levite priests *and* the subordinate non-priestly Levites. The special status of the Levites is developed in the first chapters of the book, when they are singled out (Num 1:47,49–53; 2:17,23; 3:12,41,45) and employed in the service of the tent of meeting (Num 3:17–4:49; 7:5–6; 8:18–19). In particular, the *netûnîm*-block in Num 3:6–9 codifies the leadership claim of the Aaronides, and Num 3:32 narrates the genealogical implementation of this claim. Consecrating the Levites installs them as vicarious and buffering mediator

between the holy and the sanctuary (Num 8:10–11) (Frevel 2010). What, then, is the direction of impact of this hierarchical differentiation? On the one hand, it channels leadership in a way that the priestly prerogative is first and foremost oriented toward the cult and its needs. On the other hand, compared to the ordinary people, the Aaronides are still more exceptional than without the intermediary Levites. On the textual level, the introduction of the Levites does not only relieve the Aaronides in managing their cultic duty, but also strengthens their claim of authorized leadership. The *concept* however is open in a way that the Aaronides (who are fictive in historical respect) form the irrefutable leadership within a very small group, and the Levites (who perhaps have a historical background) form a larger pool of staff, which allows several groups in the late Persian period *Yehûd* to relate to them genealogically and thus to be included into the inner circle of the textual world (Frevel 2017). On the one hand, this reduces any cultic competences of the ordinary people; on the other, it opens the fictive wilderness-world for more cultic specialization.

## 2.3 The Emergence of a High-Priestly Office

Regarding the emergence of a high-priestly office and the institutionalization of priesthood, I have argued elsewhere that there is an implicit *concept* of hierarchical priesthood throughout the whole book, which becomes explicit at least in Num 35 (Frevel 2013a; 2014). Notwithstanding the fact that already in Exod 28–29 an office is implied by the investiture of Aaron, it is the Book of Numbers in which Aaron's role becomes political. The ordeal in 17:16–28 in which Aaron is not only installed as religious leader but also as chosen representative of all tribes and their leaders (Num 17:21) is a hallmark of this development. In addition to this implicitness of institutionalized routinization, which is characterized as essential for the survival of the people (Num 17:12–13), Num 35 entitles the leading Aaronide as "great priest" (הכהן הגדול, Num 35:25,28). In the case of asylum, the high-priestly authority is detached from the individual case and linked to the life time *office* of the high priest. It is institutionalized. While Num 20:25–28 install Eleazar as successor of Aaron without a general succession rule, such a rule is implied by the linkage of asylum to the life-time office (see below). It is not by chance that the fictive construction of priesthood in the wilderness in Numbers is restricted to a very small family that comprises Aaron, his son Eleazar, his brother Ithamar, and his grandson Phinehas. The plural כהנים is used only in Num 3:3 and Num 10:8. The most important passage is Num 3:3–4. It provides several qualifying determinations for the two sons of Aaron: They are the anointed ones (המשחים), and their hands were filled (אשר־מלא ידם) to act as priests

(לכהן) under the surveillance of their father Aaron (על־פני אהרן אביהם). Thus, a certain hierarchy is employed already at the beginning of the book. The explicit succession narrative in Num 20, in which the duty *and the paraphernalia* (בגדיו, Num 20:26,28) are handed over to Eleazar after Aaron's death, makes clear that there is only one lifetime CEO. This is emphasized also in the implicit succession in Num 25:13, where Phinehas is given an eternal right of succession (והיתה לו ולזרעו אחריו ברית כהנת עולם) acting as priest. Another hierarchical clue comes from Num 4:28,33 where the Merarites and Gershonites as the lower-class Levites are subordinated to Ithamar (note that Ithamar has *no* successor in Numbers[3], see further aspects below). As already said, the priestly family is kept very small on the narrative level. The taxation system in Num 18 reveals that the reality beyond has been much more complex. Be that as it may, the narrative level employs a successive line from Aaron to Eleasar to Phinehas. Both the distinctive paraphernalia of Aaron (Exod 28) and the investiture of Eleazar (Num 20:26,28) indicate that his position was understood as an office. Moreover, the political significance of this office is growing from charismatic leadership (Num 12:1–11; 13:26; 14:2,5,10; 16:3; 17:6–10; 20:2–13) to the office of priesthood (Num 16:11; 17:11–12,16–25; 18:1,8). However, it is noteworthy that already carrying out the census in Num 3, Aaron carries out secular duties (cf. also Eleazar Num 26:1–3). Governance and leadership are entangled and interconnected with his priestly duty. At the end of the book, the routinization of charisma has already taken place and an *office* of priesthood with political power is installed (Frevel 2013a, 2014; Achenbach 2003, 557–567; Achenbach 2010, 106; Oswald 2015a). While the title הכהן is used 69 times in Numbers (always with a definite article!), the third and second last passages employ the title הכהן הגדול in Num 35:25,28, which is used elsewhere in the Torah *only* in Lev 21:10.[4] The priest is specified as the anointed one (אשר־משח אתו בשמן הקדש, Num 35:25), and although there is no explicit succession ritual of the instalment of the high priest, seemingly it is the leading Aaronide (cf. Lev 8:12 and Lev 16:32) and not any Aaronide priest as indicated in Num 3:3. The emphasis on the juxtaposition of Eleazarides and Ithamarides in the Aaronide family seems to bear witness to an earlier stage, when the succession in the high-priestly office was not genealogically fixed. Interestingly enough, the last usage of הכהן in the book in Num 35:32 does not add the adjective גדל in the Masoretic text. A 13th century Hebrew manuscript from the Corpus Christi College at Oxford (Kennicott 1780: 77, cod. 69, Pormann 2015, 43), the LXX (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας), and the Samaritan

**3** In contrast, 1Chr 24:1–6 and Ezra 8:2 seem to employ a successive line of Ithamar as coequal.
**4** Cf. Josh 20:6; see the designation הכהן משיח in Lev 4:3,5,16; 6:15; 16:32; כהן הראש in 2Kgs 25:18; Jer 52:24; 2Chr 19:11; 26:20; 31:10, or simply הראש in 2Chr 24:6.

version (הכהן הגדל) attest to the addition of the adjective. It may have been original, because it is quite clear that it refers to the same priest as in v. 25,28, but possibly, it might also have been omitted deliberately and thus, the lack of the title is tinting the other הכהן passages with the single high-priestly office in a sophisticated manner. Anyway, the background is the law of asylum, which is revealed to Moses as the last of *new* issues in Num 35:10–34. In Num 36:1–13, in contrast, the case of Zelophehad's daughters, who were allowed in Num 27:1–11 to inherit the land of their deceased father, is resumed and adjusted; they are finally committed to marry only endogamous. The asylum seeker, who is threatened with blood revenge without having killed deliberately, may flee to the (fictive) cities of asylum and, after a trial, he *has to* live there until the high priest deceases. Thereafter, he may return to the land of his possession (Num 35:28). Let me emphasize that the linkage to the high priest's death has nothing to do with substitution of life or the high priest as representative as Jeffrey Stackert has suggested. He writes: "The high priest is chosen because of the manslayer's victim (cf. Gen 9:6; Num 35:33). The high priest is chosen because of the intrinsic value placed on his life: he is representative of the people before the deity" (Stackert 2007, 95). It is no one-to-one substitution: While there may be several victims at the time of the death of the high priest, there is only one high priest. Therefore, a vicarious role of the high priest seems unlikely to me. Instead, it is a clear indication that lawsuits and their outcome were linked to an office, namely the office of the high priest in the centralized city (in Judean perspective Jerusalem, in Samarian perspective Mt. Gerizim). The manslayer must stand trial before the congregation (עד־עמדו לפני העדה למשפט) which is the central court.[5] If releasement is possible even in case of innocent bloodshed, the authority of the office and the status of the one who bears it is already very high. Based on the assumed amnesty, which is linked explicitly to the death (and not as expected to the accession of the successor), the *high priest* is the heir of the ANE king. The practice is often linked with the *mēšarum* of the accession year or a certain practice in Egypt related to the throne accession year (Barmash 2005, 92; Traulsen 2004, 59). We may speculate whether the high priest has made the decision beforehand which would be the reason why his death is connected to the expiation of innocent bloodshed. Anyway, Num 35 evinces the consummation of the transformation from charisma to office. Although the release-practice is not related to the high priest's accession, by the linkage of the amnesty to his office the high priest is adapted to the

**5** Note the subsidiary role of the community. The manslayer shall be introduced פני העדה למשפט. Interestingly enough, the only other instance of למשפט is in Deut 17:8, in which tough cases should be decided at the top court. Cf. also Barmash 2005, 92.

king's office. Keeping in mind the hiatus between the breakdown of the monarchy in the beginning of the 6th century and the emergence of the high-priestly office at end of the 5th and in the early 4th century BCE, the high priest can be claimed to be the heir of the former king. Monarchy evolves into hierocracy. Perhaps the anointment of the high priest and the use of the designation המשיח (Num 35:25, cf. Lev 8:12; 16:32) can be seen accordingly (Oswald 2015a, 316).

Let me briefly summarize this paragraph. Leadership evinces as an important issue in the Book of Numbers. This was emphasized in three different but interrelated fields: the allegedly secular leadership (with an aspect of a sacralization of the political realm, respectively) and the question of delegation; the priestly leadership and the question of hierarchy; and finally, the emergence of a political leadership claim of the high priest. The Book of Numbers reveals a certain interest in those questions. There is a tendency to regard the topic as more important than in other Pentateuchal books both in quantitative and qualitative respect. In sum, the Book of Numbers has a clear emphasis on priestly leadership. Conceptually, the book already prefigures a hierocratic structure. This will be further illuminated by focusing on Joshua and his role in the next paragraph.

## 3 The Role of Joshua in the Leadership Concept of Numbers

The very first episode immediately before the departure of the people from Mount Sinai (Num 1:1; 10:12–13,28b,33) discusses leadership in the desert. In this episode, Hobab, the father in law of Moses, wants to go back from Sinai to Midian (Num 10:29–30, but cf. already Exod 18:27) instead of leading the people into the desert of Paran. There is a certain fuzziness regarding the placement of this episode, because Num 10:12 has already mentioned Israel's set-out (ויסעו בני־ישראל) and settling down of the cloud (וישכן הענן במדבר פארן). Notwithstanding the growth of the text from the non-priestly passage Num 10:29–33 to Num 10:11–13 $P^g$ and finally complemented by 10:14–28 $P^s$, the cascading set-up can be read as a narrative interlacing of the significant first departure. Thus, from the perspective of narration it is open how far the departure passage which starts in v. 13 extends either to v. 28b (ויסעו), or up to the itinerary in v. 33 (ויסעו). If we assume that Hobab is Jethro and that he came to Sinai, it renders plausible – also in terms of the here discussed leadership issues – that the scene takes place immediately before their decampment. It is the first and only time that Moses is implicitly said to lack expert knowledge of leadership and therefore is in need of substitution. Judg 4:11

mentions sons of Hobab (cf. Jdg 1:16), but in the short episode of Num 10:29–30, the question, whether Hobab departed or joined the people, remains unsettled. This uncertainty brings the leadership of Moses implicitly in a state of suspense apart from any challenge by the people. Note, that it is *not* Joshua who takes care of substituting Moses – to the contrary, he is even rebuked when he tries to substitute Moses in Num 11:29. His duty is understood quite differently from Moses' as can be seen in the plain verse Exod 33:11. Joshua does not accompany Moses in his revelatory teaching endeavors, but rather keeps military watch at the tent of meeting. Although one could expect the attendant to be Moses' successor, he is *not* appointed as deputy. Even though Num 13:16 introduces Joshua as a leading spy, Num 11:28–29 clarifies that he cannot act vicariously in Moses' place (cf. also Num 14:5–10a). This differs from the story in Num 25, in which Phineas, son of Eleazar, substitutes his father in the Cozbi-affair. The idea of genealogical succession implicitly lingers in the background of this story. This brings me to the question of the role of Joshua as successor of Moses in the Book of Numbers, which is paradigmatic for leadership issues.

## 3.1 The Rebuked Joshua as Subordinated Servant

It seems to me that the openness and the partial exclusion of Joshua is subtle deliberate. Joshua is mentioned eleven times in the Book of Numbers: once in Num 11:28, four times in the spy-story Num 13:16; 14:6,30,38, and then successively in Num 26:65; 27:18,22; 32:12,28; 34:17. The portrayal starts with Joshua in the role as Moses' attendant (Farber 2017, 27). In Num 11:28 Joshua is rebuked because he wants Moses to stop Eldad's and Medad's prophesying. Moses asks him: המקנא אתה לי "Are you jealous on my account"? The phrasing is most interesting (and quite different to Num 25:11,13), because Moses is not said to be jealous himself. This seems to be quite different from Num 25, where the vicarious jealousy plays a major role. One can read the rebuke as the statement that there is no necessity to take over Moses' zeal. As Num 11 addresses leadership questions, since Moses is claiming not to have enough meat for the people and he is accompanied explicitly by 70 elders to assist him "to carry the burden" (Num 11:16–17,25), the rebuke includes the context of succession in leadership. In contrast, Joshua does *not* carry Moses' burden. With the suggestion he is putting forward to Moses, he instead intends the continuation of the (one and only) charisma of Moses and not its continuation and routinization within an office. In Num 11, he is zealous for the zeal of Moses in a vicarious manner, which is rebuked by Moses himself who vindicates the institutionalization. It is *Joshua's* habit from his youth onwards to assist Moses (Num 11:28) and in Num 13:16 he is elected to

lead the spies in his function as military leader (Exod 17). This underlines his loyalty toward Moses. His positive statement toward the quality of the land to be conquered also exposes his loyalty. However, even in Num 14:5–10a, his statement cannot manage the situation which has come to a mortal crisis for Moses and Aaron.

Before we address the story of his inauguration as successor, we have to remind ourselves that Num 11 is not concerned with the designation of a successor. In contrast, it is a story of the depersonalized democratization (initially a part of the people, but see Num 11:29) of the original charisma of Moses within the framework of an institutionalization. Interestingly enough, the tendency of democratization does not imply the mediative and relative function of Moses. On the horizon the question is dawning whether Moses can have a successor at all, or, as Schäfer-Lichtenberger has put it: "Die Position des Mose hört mit seinem Tod auf zu bestehen" (Schäfer-Lichtenberger 1995, 166).

The channeling of leadership and revelation/mediation/legislation into two separate realms which were formerly combined in the overarching authority of Moses proceeds in the argument between Moses and his siblings in Num 12. Again, it is emphasized that Moses has a special role which cannot be substituted (Uehlinger 2003). Due to the constraints of this paper, we skip all the relevant leadership details regarding Num 12 and move on to Num 27.

## 3.2 Num 27 and Joshua as Successor of Moses

Moses is succeeded by Joshua after his death. This is addressed in Num 27:15–23 after the direct announcement of Moses' death (Num 27:12–14). After the itinerary notices in Num 22:1 ("Israel was staying in Shittim"), Israel encamps in Transjordan and is on the verge of crossing the Jordan. Before Israel decamps, Moses must perish. Thus, the issue of succession becomes pressing in the narrative plot. Moses solicits YHWH to appoint "a man over the congregation" (איש על־העדה). But why *Joshua*? He is an Ephraimite (Num 13:8; Josh 19:49; 1Chr 7:27) and not even a member of Moses' clan. This is the most striking difference between the genealogical succession of Aaron, Eleasar, and Phinehas. It is *not* genealogy that makes him eligible for the successorship, but his charisma. It is said in Num 27:18 that he has *spirit* (איש אשר־רוח בו, cf. Deut 34:9 מלא רוח חכמה) – whatever that means. After Num 11:29 (כי־יתן יהוה את־רוחו עליהם), the feature of God's spirit is not exclusive anymore. The charisma of Joshua is related and even tied to the appointing God, who is addressed with the very rare title "God of the spirits of all flesh" (אלהי הרחות לכל בשר). While the other passage in Num 16:22 using this phrase may emphasize God as bearer of all life (Pyschny 2017, 220), it is tempting

to see the play with Joshua's spirit in this passage. Be that as it may, the speaking of Joshua's spirit evinces that *succession* concerns also issues of charisma. However, the phrase "to lay a hand on him" (וסמכת את־ידך עליו, Num 27:18) is clearly an act of devolvement (Frevel 2000, 279). It is used to express substitution in terms of power and authority in all cases in which a person acts vicariously in place of another – mostly superior – person.[6] In contrast to an instalment as successor into an office, Moses shall invest Joshua with *some* of his authority, glory, or whatever *hôd* may mean in Num 27:20 (נתתה מהודך עליו למען, see below). His duties, nevertheless, are different to Moses'. He is not installed as judge (like Moses in Exod 18) and not even as receiver of instruction, revelation, divine speech, etc. The only instance where he gets direct instruction from Moses is Num 32:28 regarding the case of the Gadites and Rubenites, but even there he is mentioned *after* Eleazar. Finally, he is mentioned once in Num 34:17, where the instruction to allocate the land is given, and in Num 32:28 as subordinated to Eleazar. It is this side by side that provides the impression of a dual leadership in Num 27:19,22, which emphasizes that Joshua is installed before Eleazar, the priest, and the whole congregation (לפני אלעזר הכהן ולפני כל־העדה). However, this *before Eleazar* expresses a certain relatedness, and – eventually – a clear hierarchy and subordination (for v. 21, see below). The scenery of inauguration in Num 27 is crucial for the understanding of internal hierarchy. Let me emphasize three points:

(1) The range of Joshua's duty is clearly limited in the first sentence in v. 16. He shall be "over the congregation" (על־העדה), but his competence and responsibility is only to lead Israel in the military accounts (v. 17). The phrase "to go out before them and come in before them" (יצא לפניהם ואשר יבא לפניהם ואשר יוציאם ואשר יביאם) is used to denote military leadership (1Sam 16:11; 1Kgs 22:17//2Chr 18:16). Admittedly, to be a shepherd is a royal metaphor, but it is employed here not to denote the leader as political, but rather as a military chief.

(2) As already said, Joshua does only partly obtain the power and charisma of Moses. The text explicates that he gets only מהודך "a part of his glory". הוד "glory" or "majesty" is only used here throughout the Hexateuch (Num 27:20). It is doubtless a particular honor to be accredited with this feature. הוד is used for the king's majesty and often reverted to in order to describe God. The phrase that

**6** Cf. in addition only Ps 37:24. All other instances originate from the cultic context of transmission of sins Lev 1:4; 3:2,8,13; 4:24,29,33. There is a slight difference between using "the hand" in the singular (as in v. 18) or "the hands" in the plural (as in v. 23). The singular is used only here in Num 27 to express substitution, but it is difficult to tell the singular and the plural conceptually apart (see Frevel 2000, 269–290).

Israel shall not be left without רעה (1Kgs 22:17) is likewise monarchical (Jer 3:16; Ezek 34; 37:24; Zech 10:2 etc.) and utilized also for God (Ps 23:1; 80:2). Although Joshua is transferred only a part of Moses' authority, it is a marker of great leadership when "all the congregation of the people of Israel may obey" him (למען ישמעו כל־עדת בני ישראל, Num 27:20). But at the end of the day, the narrative makes nothing out of this. Moses has the full הוד, but Joshua only part of it.

(3) The autonomy and power of Joshua are quite limited. He is directed to Eleazar who decides by sticking to the divine oracle. Joshua has no direct contact to any instrumental way to come to decisions. It is Eleazar who "inquires for him by the judgment of the Urim". Further, in v. 21, all accountability is laid on Eleazar instead of Joshua who is only executor. Note that it is the same phrase with יצא and בוא which is used here and in v. 17. Here, however, it is directly related to the (divine) word of Eleazar (על־פיו יצאו ועל־פיו יבאו). Joshua is always dependent on Eleazar who has the authority and legitimization firstly by his office, secondly by means of the paraphernalia which mark the succession of Aaron, and thirdly via the media of contact with God. While Eleazar is addressed together with Moses (e.g., in Num 26:1) like Aaron was addressed together with Moses, Joshua is *never* addressed together with Eleazar in the same manner, although they do act together in organizing the allotment of the land as demanded by Moses (Num 32:28; 34:17; Josh 14:1; 17:4; 19:51; 21:1).

In the concept of dual leadership, or dyarchy, it is clearly the high priest Eleazar who has the foremost leading position and authority. The three points mentioned above indicate a clear tendency: Eleazar is the dominant hierocratic leader in Num 27 – not Joshua. This is underscored in the narrative of the Hexateuch by the fact that Joshua has no successor at all. His authority is temporarily limited until the moment the land is allocated and Israel inhabits the land. In contrast, a genealogical succession line is established with the priestly leadership. At the same time, the leadership of Eleazar is tinted politically by his responsibility for the military campaigns.

While Seebass in his commentary attributed the dual leadership to the priestly source (Seebass 2007, 230) as exilic *utopian* blueprint which was never implemented, I have argued elsewhere that the basic layer of Num 27:15–23 is clearly post-exilic and *not* part of the priestly source (Frevel 2000, 269–290). Achenbach has read the passage as consistent in literary respect and assigned it to his first theocratic layer (Achenbach 2003, 563f). "Yes", it can clearly be shown that there is a development of an institutionalization of charisma within the text which is clearly entangled with a hierocratic tendency, but "no", the text is not without redactional reworking. The tension that seems to exist between the הוד and the glorious substitution of Moses on the one hand and the clear subordination under Eleazar on the other is the result of a redactional reworking of Num 27

in v. 17aα,21,23b (see Frevel 2000, 271–282). The secondary character of v. 17 is often substantiated by the strong relation to the Book of Joshua and the use of the shepherd-metaphor (Seebass 2007, 221, 223, 228). V. 21, in which Joshua's authority is narrowed to the military leadership, is also often recognized as addition with a wider horizon (Schmidt 1993, 221–222, 246; Farber 2017, 57, 270). The secondary character of v. 23b becomes clear when one inquires who the subject of laying the hand is. In contrast to v. 18, it is now *Eleazar* who appoints Joshua. Strikingly enough, one of the two other passages using the phrase "as the LORD had said to him through Moses" (כאשר דבר יהוה ביד־משה) is Num 17:5 and directly related to Eleazar. The late phrase ביד־משה clearly indicates that Moses is not the subject.

If Eleazar was not completely absent in the original account, his authority was accentuated already in the first level ("Grundtext") in v. 19,22, but was then tremendously strengthened by v. 17aα, 21, and 23b. It shifted from a temporarily representative and testimony function in the inauguration scene to a permanent office of superior political control. Moses being the crucial source of authority and instruction in v. 19 was superseded by Eleazar in v. 21,23b. At the end – and the tendency is conspicuously similar to what we have already perceived in Num 35 above – "the high priest is the most important figure" (Farber 2017, 273).

In sum, Num 27 and the inauguration of Joshua paradigmatically show how leadership is formatted in the Book of Numbers in the later priestly layers. While originally there were two entities or institutions of leadership – namely the hierarchical and genealogic order of the cultic sphere on the one hand and the political differentiated leadership allotted to various groups or institutions (eldership, tribal representatives as chieftains, Joshua as military and political leader) on the other –, the final stage of the Book of Numbers only forms a hierocracy that is genealogically and hierarchically organized. Wondering about the timeframe in which this development took place, we face a certain lack of knowledge regarding the formation of the hierocratic idea in the politics of the 4th century. But, it is fairly certain that it took place in this time period.

## 4 Intersections of Numbers and History

So far, the argument has traced a textual development in Num 27 and 35 that can clearly be seen as an amplification of a hierocratic model that advances the high priest to the first position. This development is clearly post-exilic and rather situated in the early 4th century than in the late 6th or 5th century BCE. In her study on Num 16–17, Katharina Pyschny has shown the same tendency within the latest

priestly layer of the ordeal in Num 17:16–28 bringing Aaron in a unique leading *political and cultic* position (Pyschny 2017, 253–267).[7] Summing up the redactional process, she concludes:

> Dabei ist die im Hintergrund stehende Agenda eine durch und durch priesterliche, die nicht unbedingt eine faktisch bereits etablierte Theokratie oder Hierokratie voraussetzt, sondern vielmehr ein Plädoyer oder eine Legitimationsbasis für theokratische und hierokratische Führungsstrukturen reflektieren, die sich allmählich Bahn brechen. Dieses priesterliche Plädoyer ist sichtlich ideologisch aufgeladen und spiegelt einen Anspruch, der in einer solchen Totalität wohl zu keinem Zeitpunkt während der Persischen Periode auch de facto so praktiziert worden ist (Pyschny 2017, 323).

Facing the history of the early Hellenistic development, it seems reasonable to underscore the limitations ("in this totality", "in the Persian period", and "de facto"). Evidently, the texts do not date from later Ptolemaic or even Hasmonean times, when a high priest was the leading political figure in Jerusalem, minting coins, collecting taxes, being chief of administration, acting as representative of the people, and taking responsibility for the cult at the Second Temple as well (Frevel 2016, 339–345). From this point of view, the chicken-and-egg-question seems quite clearly answered. The texts discussed above provide a more or less *textual world* and they are not figuring societal conditions in a matching or mirroring relation. However, things are more complicated and caution is required when uncoupling text and social reality completely. Although it is fairly difficult to trace intersections between Numbers and history, in a way, the textual expansion remains a mirror of a societal development toward hierocracy and temple state – not in the way, however, that the political development shaped the text, but rather the other way around. The process of tradition and the growing normativity of the text in the 5th/4th century BCE significantly impacted the later development in the 4th/3rd century BCE. Let me develop this argument a bit further, being aware that this would require more scrutiny.

According to academic understanding, it is a truism that the narratives in Numbers are not meant to be historical. There was no sojourn in the wilderness where Israel constituted structures of leadership for the transition into the land in historical respect. Nevertheless, there is a gap between the narrated persons and their relation to leadership issues. If Moses is linked to any institutional framework at all, then, it is the Torah as regulative. It is not judiciary, monarchical, or relating to any other power in the state. This holds true even for Joshua. In contrast, Aaron and the Aaronides are linked to priesthood, temple organiza-

7 For a summary and evaluation, see also her contribution to the present volume.

tion, and hierocracy. Thus, it is natural to ask for links to the historical development. But anyway, the stories are set deliberately in the wilderness figuring as a transition time shifting from charismatic to official leadership. This transformation did take place neither in the narrated pre-monarchical time nor in the time of the narrator, given that we take the composition of Numbers as an orientation. There are reference points in the narratives, but at what point? Most commentators agree upon the assumption that the composition of the book in which the transformation of leadership becomes so lucid dates from the late Persian period via the second half of the 5th century BCE to the first half of the 4th century BCE. The transformation of "original" charismatic leadership into office leadership cannot be possibly ascribed to that time period! Obviously, some officials in Jerusalem ran the administration of the Persian province not by charismatic leadership, but rather by means of controlled social institutions. There were priests also in the First Temple period and the order of priests in the Second Temple period in principle may have been already installed, if we accept (just for a moment of our convenience) a completion of the Second Temple at the end of the 6th century (that is traditionally 515 BCE). Thus, it seems obvious that the texts do *not* directly mirror historical transformations whilst their literary composition. They perform *on the textual level* what Max Weber has called a gradient triad of legitimate authority processing from charismatic, via traditional, to rational structures (Weber 1978). According to Weber's theorem of routinization, an originally "pure" charisma is transformed in a process of depersonalization that is followed by the development of offices and functions. As we have understood the texts in the Book of Numbers, this holds quite true on the textual level (Frevel 2014). But when this process did take place in historical respect, we cannot (really) tell. What does make the aspects of routinization and institutionalization so important in the late Persian period if not the direct link between textual and social history? Time and again, we are confronted with the high priest as a political reality and its vague emergence in very late Persian times: We can safely point to the hierocratic development in the Book of Numbers which relates to the historical development of the high-priestly office in the late Persian period. But the high-priestly responsibility in the Persian period clearly seems to be limited to cultic issues; or, as Deborah Rooke puts it, "throughout the period the high priest's authority in the community was confined to matters concerning the Temple and cult" (Rooke 2000, 238, cf. Bedford 2015, 343). Up to the second half of the fourth century, possibly even later, the office was not in full bloom. The office became full-blown not before the second half of the fourth century BCE or even later; or, to put it differently, the relative financial autonomy of the temple organization was not yet born in the early Second Temple period, but can be connected to the introduction of small money (Bedford 2001, 201–202; 2015, 341–343). In the early Persian period, both Ramat Rachel rather than

Jerusalem takes on a special role in economics, and the sources rather point to the importance of the governor than to a high priest in Jerusalem. Taking the evidence from the Elephantine papyri, even the issue of the temple cult was decided by the governors Bagoas in Yehûd und Delayah/Šelemyah in Samaria together with the Persian satrap in Egypt or Vidranga. The letters of 407 BCE (TAD A4.7, A4.8) mention a certain Johanan as a decisive person, but his power still seems limited. When does the political role of the high priest turn into his main responsibility? Othmar Keel downplays or even questions this gain in power even as to the fourth century: "Auch in der letzten Phase der Perserzeit, im 4. Jh. a., scheint der Hohepriester trotz der singulären Münze des *Priesters* Johanan nur die traditionelle Rolle gespielt zu haben" (Keel 2007, 991). In his view, the conception of leadership in the Book of Chronicles corroborates this. If so, the textual world of the Book of Numbers can be reckoned to be totally fictional. As already said, we face a certain lack of knowledge regarding the formation of the high priest as the leading office in Yehûd in pre-Hellenistic times. While in Ptolemaic times, the Oniad high priest apparently has been the representative of the Jewish people (*Antiquitates Judaicae* XII, 138–146, see Frevel 2016, 339–340; Grabbe 2008, 77), we do not know much about the role of the high priest in the time from 450–333 BCE (Oswald 2015b). The authority and power need to be carved out within the space of tension between "secular" (that is Persian governance), and "religious" (that is the Jerusalemite temple) power, as Lester L. Grabbe says: "All the evidence indicates that the office of high priest expanded in importance over a period of time to fill the gap of local leadership [...], even though there was a provincial governor appointed by the Persians" (Grabbe 2004, 231). From this point of view, it is striking that there is *no information* in the Book of Numbers regarding the governor and his organization. Neither the title *pḥh* nor his duty are mentioned or alluded to. It is the priestly claim of leadership upon which this book instructively elaborates as was shown almost from the beginning to the end. In this respect, the composition of the Book of Numbers mirrors the development of the temple-state in the late 4th and early 3rd century BCE (Achenbach 2010; Oswald 2015a). A certain interplay between the provincial governor and the temple administration is characteristic not only for the late Persian period, but perhaps continues to be so in the early Ptolemaic period (Frevel 2016, 296–297).

If there was space both to discuss the evidence from Ezra, Nehemia, Haggai, and Zechariah (Hag 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zech 3:1,3,6,9; 6:11 cf. Ezra 3:2; 5:8; 10:18; Neh 3:1,20; 12:10–11,21; 13:4,28; Sir 49:12) with its titles and offices (see VanderKam 2004), as well as to take the dating of these passages into account, we would come to almost similar conclusions regarding the political function of the high priest and the development from a diarchy to a hierocratic system. Altogether, there is no clear hierocracy with a high priest as political leader during the time in

which we suggest the Book of Numbers – even in its latest layers – to be written. The hierocratic concept which was alluded to in the Book of Numbers is thus an idealized blueprint of the later development. This would strengthen the assumption of a growing normativity of the Torah in the 4th century BCE. Rather than reproducing or figuring out reality, Torah shapes it.

# 5 Summarizing Evaluation and Interpretation

The current essay emphasizes the crucial role of leadership concepts and leadership discussions in the Book of Numbers. Already the brief overview on the broad range of textual evidence revealed that guidance, governance, political power, hierarchy, and direction – in short, leadership – are important topics of the book. The examples stem from all textual genres (law and narrative), including lists and texts that structured society, organized substitution, defined roles, or recorded resistance against existing structures. Along the Weberian term and concept of charisma, I can summarize in three sections: (1) charisma and office, (2) charisma and normativity, and (3) charisma and authority.

## 5.1 Charisma and Office

The Book of Numbers addresses the routinization of charisma. "The process of routinisation is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession and does not stop when this has been solved. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is that of making a transition from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one which is adapted to everyday conditions" (Weber 1978, 253). Aspects of democratization of the original charisma were also addressed in the book as well as processes of objectification or depersonalization, and institutionalization (Frevel 2014). We can address these processes as rationalization (Riesebrod 1999, 14). Strikingly, the Book of Numbers does not only address these processes of routinization implicitly in its narrative plot, which places the evolving separation of powers in the desert between Sinai and the promised land, but also within its redaction history. In all areas of the exemplary texts, the literary growth evinced an increase in routinization and a handling of the spontaneous charisma, and its transformation into office. Far from forming a theory of the state, the Book of Numbers puts emphasis on the institutionalization of political responsibilities beyond statist structures. By this, it prefers a hierocratic model of leadership progressively in the process of

redactional growth which is not yet realized in the tradents' realities. Democratic or participative structures are pushed back by the importance of the high-priestly office. We experience a sacralization of the political sphere that may be designated as theocracy or better (with Max Weber) hierocracy. Not only the legitimacy of the political leaders – both Moses and Aaron – emerges through religion, the religious leader turns into the solitary *institutionalized* political leader. At the end of the book, there was a clear conception of a high-priestly lifetime office within genealogical succession, but the priority of the high priest was communicated throughout the book.

As an additional incidental remark let me again address the relation between literary implementation and social history. We may understand this strategy of developing a certain social structure in literature as "narrativization" (a term understood in various ways in narratology following its introduction into the discourse by Martina Fludernik); that is, the imposition of pre-established conceptions on the narrative to produce *coherence* in the time of the narrator and on the concepts he wants to impose on his present and future. Narrative structures form coherent models of narrated realities. And these fictional narrated realities have repercussions on the factual worlds to which they relate to by processes of reception. This function of the five books of the Pentateuch is part of being *Torah*. This "narrativization" of routinization reveals an implicit natural understanding of social processes within biblical literature, which could obtain more attention in further research.

## 5.2 Charisma and Normativity

Alongside the routinization of Aaron's charisma by drawing on the priestly office, we also discussed Moses' role. It is one of the most notable facts of the Torah that the authority of Moses is made unique in several ways. The Book of Numbers has a share in this process of singularization: He is explicitly set apart from Miriam and Aaron in Num 12 as well as from the elders in Num 11. The most important point, however, is the fact that his successor Joshua has only limited authority. While being more and more identified with the Torah (the mediator becomes the medium), a succession is indeed impossible. Only aspects of his leadership may be continued as the judicial authorization of the elders, the military empowerment of Joshua (and one also could add the law of prophecy here). The discontinuity is an important part of closure in terms of the revelatory setting of the Sinai and Wilderness Narrative. In other words, the charisma of Moses is institutionalized in the Torah, which becomes a normative authority as *scripture*. Even Moses as a person is intimately entangled to the revelation of the Torah. The judgement

against him and Aaron not to enter the land is also part of this strategy. This "normativization" of the Torah intensifies the emphasis on hierocracy as the preferred model of leadership. The more the Torah becomes normative, the more the hierarchical structures developed therein do so as well. There is a remarkable interplay between the late redactional phases of Deuteronomy and the priests as authorized custodians and interpreters of the Torah. The ideal world of the wilderness in the Torah shaped the world of early Judaisms in its formative phase in the 4th and 3rd century BCE. In bold terms, we may call this processes "performative normativity".

## 5.3 Charisma and Authority

The process of routinization described in this paper revealed a transformation of the original charisma into two very different forms of authority: the Mosaic Torah on the one hand and the Aaronide high-priestly office on the other. Both modes of authorization were linked to matters of institutionalization and to questions of succession in different ways. The high-priestly genealogical succession model was grounded in the narrative. In the same manner, the separation of the revelatory and intermediary aspect of the Mosaic office was implemented in the narrative world. The original charisma becomes formalized and depersonalized, structurally changing in function and institutions. Various strategies of legitimation were designed to accompany this process that lead to the necessary recognition of authority for the exercise of normativity and leadership. Particularly Aaron and his successors were authorized by ritualization (Num 5; 17; 19; 27; 31 etc.). With this, "the belief in legitimacy is no longer directed to the person, but to the acquired qualities and to the effectiveness of the ritual acts" (Weber 1978, 248). With the emphasis both on leadership concepts, the emergence of office structures as well as the formation of scriptural normativity, we have added a further aspect of the achievement of Torah in the Book of Numbers.

The Book of Numbers *is* crucial in terms of leadership. As I have demonstrated, it evinces important aspects of legitimization, authorization, institutionalization, sacralization, and routinization.

# Bibliography

Achenbach, Reinhard. 2003. *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch.* BZAR 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Achenbach, Reinhard. 2010. “Satrapie, Medinah und lokale Hierokratie: Zum Einfluss der Statthalter der Achämenidenzeit auf Tempelwirtschaft und Tempelordnungen.” *ZAR* 16:105–144.

Baden, Joel S. 2012. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Perspective*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Barmash, Pamela. 2005. *Homicide in the Biblical World.* Cambridge: University Press.

Bedford, Peter R. 2001. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*. JSJ.S 65. Leiden: Brill.

Bedford, Peter R. 2015. “Temple Funding and Priestly Authority in Achaemenid Judah.” In *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, edited by Caroline Waerzeggers and Jonathan Stökl, 336–351. BZAW 478. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Berner, Christoph. 2010. *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels.* FAT I/73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Berner, Christoph. 2013. “Das Wasserwunder von Rephidim (Ex 17,1–7) als Schlüsseltext eines nachpriesterschriftlichen Mosebildes.” *VT* 63/2:193–209.

Carasik, Michael. 2011. *The Commentators’ Bible: The Rubin JPS Miqra’ot Gedolot Numbers* במדבר. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Farber, Zev. 2016. *Images of Joshua in the Bible and Their Reception.* BZAW 457. Berlin et al.: de Gruyter.

Frevel, Christian. 2000. *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift.* HBS 23. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder.

Frevel, Christian. 2003. “‘Jetzt habe ich erkannt, dass YHWH größer ist als alle Götter’: Ex 18 und seine kompositionsgeschichtliche Stellung im Pentateuch.” *BZ* 47:3–22.

Frevel, Christian. 2010. “‘[…] dann gehören die Leviten mir’: Anmerkungen zum Zusammenhang von Num 3; 8 und 18.” In *Kulte, Priester, Rituale: Beiträge zu Kult und Kultkritik im Alten Testament und Alten Orient*, edited by Stephanie Ernst et al., 133–158. ATSAT 89. St. Ottilien: EOS.

Frevel, Christian. 2013a. “Ending with the High Priest: The Hierarchy of Priests and Levites in the Book of Numbers.” In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by Christian Frevel, Thomas Pola and Aaron Schart, 138–163. FAT II/62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Frevel, Christian. 2013b. “The Book of Numbers – Formation, Composition, and Interpretation of a Late Part of the Torah: Some Introductory Remarks.” In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by Christian Frevel, Thomas Pola and Aaron Schart, 1–37. FAT II/62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Frevel, Christian. 2014. “Transformationen des Charismas: Überlegungen zum Buch Numeri vor dem Hintergrund von Max Webers Veralltäglichungstheorem.” In *Glaube in Gemeinschaft: Autorität und Rezeption in der Kirche*, edited by Markus Knapp and Thomas Söding, 261–287. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder.

Frevel, Christian. 2016. *Geschichte Israels*. Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Frevel, Christian. 2017. “On Instant Scripture and Proximal Texts: Some Insights into the Sensual Materiality of Texts and their Ritual Roles in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond” *Postscripts* 8:1–2, 57–79.

Frevel, Christian. forthcoming. “The Texture of Rituals in the Book of Numbers: A Fresh Approach to Ritual Density, the Role of Tradition and the Emergence of Diversity in Early Judaism.” In *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch: A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, edited by Christophe Nihan and Julia Rhyder. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Frevel, Christian. forthcoming. *Desert Transformations: Studies in the Book of Numbers*. FAT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Gebhardt, Winfried. 1993. "Einleitung: Grundlinien der Entwicklung des Charismakonzepts in den Sozialwissenschaften." In *Charisma: Theorie – Religion – Politik*, edited by Michael N. Ebertz et al., 1–12. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Grabbe, Lester L. 2004. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period: 1. Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*. Library of Second Temple Studies 47. London: T&T Clark.
Grabbe, Lester L. 2008. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period: 2. The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)*. Library of Second Temple Studies 68. London: T&T Clark.
Keel, Othmar. 2007. *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus.* 2 vol. Orte und Landschaften der Bibel 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Kehrer, Günter et. al. 2015. "Office." *Religion Past and Present* (online-publication).
MacDonald, Nathan. 2011. "Anticipations of Horeb: Exodus 17 as Inner-Biblical Commentary." In *Studies on the Text and Versions of the Hebrew Bible in Honour of Robert Gordon,* edited by Geoffrey Khan and Diana Lipton, 7–19. VT.S 149. Leiden: Brill.
Oswald, Wolfgang. 2015a. "Der Hohepriester als Ethnarch: Zur politischen Organisation Judäas im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr." *ZAR* 21:309–320.
Oswald, Wolfgang. 2015b. "Defeating Amalek, Defending the Constitution: The Political Theory of Ex 17:8–16." In *The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 61–72. BZAW 460. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Pormann, Peter E. 2015. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscript of Corpus Christi College, Oxford*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
Pyschny, Katharina. 2017. *Verhandelte Führung: Eine Analyse von Num 16–17 im Kontext der neueren Pentateuchforschung*. HBS 88. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder.
Riesebrodt, Martin. 1999. "Charisma in Max Weber's Sociology of Religion." *Religion* 29:1–14.
Rooke, Deborah W. 2000. *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel.* Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon.
Russel, Stephen C. 2015. "The Structure of Legal Administration in the Moses Story." In *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture and Geoscience,* edited by Thomas E. Levy et al., 317–330. Cham et al.: Springer.
Samuel, Harald. 2014. *Von Priestern zum Patriarchen: Levi und die Leviten im Alten Testament.* BZAW 448. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Christa. 1995. *Joshua und Salomo: Eine Studie zu Autorität und Legitimität des Nachfolgers im Alten Testament*. VT.S 58. Leiden et al.: Brill.
Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Christa. 2007. "Autorität, Macht und Herrschaft – Die biblischen Gestalten von Mose, Josua, David und Salomo als idealtypische Konkretionen: Definition der Begrifflichkeit." *Wort und Dienst* 29:189–206.
Scharbert, Josef. 1994. "Amt: I. Im Alten Testament." *NBL* 1, 96.
Schmidt, Ludwig. 1993. *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. BZAW 214. Berlin et al.: de Gruyter.
Seebass, Horst. 2007. *Numeri 22,2–36,13*. BKAT 4/3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
Stackert, Jeffrey. 2007. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation.* FAT 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Stackert, Jeffrey. 2014. *A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion.* Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press.

Traulsen, Christian. 2004. *Das sakrale Asyl in der Alten Welt: Zur Schutzfunktion des Heiligen von König Salomo bis zum Codex Theodosianus*. Jus Ecclesiasticum 72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Uehlinger, Christoph. 2003. "'Hat YHWH denn wirklich nur mit Mose geredet?': Biblische Exegese zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Theologie, am Beispiel von Num 12." *BZ* 47:230–259.

VanderKam, James C. 2004. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.