

CHAPTER 3

LEADERSHIP IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST AND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ANCIENT ISRAEL

3.1. Introduction

The ancient Near East, where the Old Testament originated, was inhabited by a variety of people (Betlyon 2005:4-48). Over the centuries there were movements and migrations as a result of both political and natural developments (Boshoff et al 2000:22, 31; Beiniada 2001:157). The area concerned were Mesopotamia, Anatolia, which includes Syria-Palestine, Egypt and Transjordan (Hoerth, Mattingly & Yamauchi 1994:5ff). There were numerous references to other people in the Bible who had a direct and indirect influence on the Israelites (Ahituv 2003:57-66). Wilson (1971:89) maintains that the ancient Near East evidence was first brought to biblical attention by scholars searching for foreign influences in Israel's prophetic traditions. While Wilson pays more attention to prophesy, the researcher argues that religious, socio-economic and political traditions also play a vital part in this regard leadership (cf. Ahituv 2003:56; Miller 2004:42-47).

At various times Canaan, Egypt, Mesopotamia and Syria have all been suggested as possible sources for particular features of prophetic message (Ahlstrom 1995:587ff; Fritz 2002:28-31, 63). Like in the prophetic tradition, some scholars have argued that certain types of Israelite political background were originally borrowed from another culture (Amiran 1953:65; Wilson 1971:89). Beinaida (1997:217-233) proposed that, given the proper social conditions, cultural conditions and cultural attitudes, intermediaries can appear in any society (cf. Snell 1997:63ff). Borrowings from other people's culture and outside influences have both a positive and negative impact in one's own culture (Mobley 1997:217-233). This may have the effect to build or destroy one's own culture (Barstad 1997:37). This applies to leadership. Even though contemporary scholars have generally rejected the idea that the Israelite leadership was derived from one of the surrounding cultures, the use of ancient Near Eastern material to elucidate Israelite socio-economic,

religion and political traditions has continued (Bienkowski and Van der Steen 2001:28; Blenkinsopp 2002:169ff; Brett 2003:400-412).

Although aspects of humanity attributes much to social life like religion, education, socio-economic and many more, the debate in this chapter is based on leadership. I intended to explore the concept of leadership in the ancient Near East as this would give a clear picture of leadership in Israel. Since the term leadership is very wide and complex, it is important to focus on the king. In the ancient Near East the administration of justice was seen as a perquisite for the formation and continuation of any society (Whitlam 1979:13; Finkelstein 1999:35; Cook 1961:202; Gottwald 2008:190ff). In this context, the concept of leadership is based in religio-biblical and political context, with special reference to the king (Wood 1997:347-349). There is therefore a need to set criteria or a standard to evaluate or distinguish between effective and ineffective leadership. A standard definition therefore should include justice as obedience to God's law.

If you will fear the LORD and serve Him and harken to His voice and not rebel against the commandment of the LORD, and if both you and the king who reigns over you will follow the LORD your God, it will be well; but if you will not harken to the voice of the LORD, then the hand of the LORD will be against you and your king (1 Sam 12:14f)

It is important to know about leadership in the countries, and places listed below since they had a direct impact on Israel. The countries concerned are: Mesopotamia, Egypt and Syria-Palestine.

3.2. Leadership in the Ancient Near East

The Ancient Near East covers variety of areas, such as: Firstly, *Mesopotamia*, where countries like Sumeria, Babylon, Assyria and Persians are covered. Secondly, leadership in *Anatolia*, *Syria-Palestine* and *Egypt* is discussed. In this area(s), the Hittites, Canaanites and Amorites were the main focus. Thirdly, leadership in *Transjordan* includes the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites.

3.2.1. Leadership in Mesopotamia

The Mesopotamian region covers the following areas: Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians and Persians. The Mesopotamian concept of the king and law is paradoxical (Postgate 1992:260; Whitelam 1992:40-48). Leadership in Mesopotamia centred around three fundamental roles of the king, namely: Political (affairs of the community), cultic (high priest) and warrior (military) (Lamber 1998:55). The king was regarded as the guardian of the law and justice (Westenholz 2002:9-27; Pollock 1999). He was able to produce various 'laws' to regulate justice throughout the realm (Albright 1968; Ahlstrom 1995). However, these laws were ultimately derived from the divine or meta-divine realm: meta-divine realm: *mesarum* was the gift of Shamash²⁴ to the king (Wiseman 1953:100; Speiser 1954:13; Paul 1970:8; Gericke 2002:73). The king was regarded as subject to the law (Dandamaev 1969:296ff; Betlyon 1986:633-42; Gericke 2002:73). For the purpose of the concept "just king" Whitelam (1979:19ff) adopted the understanding of the term *cuneiform law*²⁵, a term was first used by Koshchaker (cf.1935:26; 1948:211-219).

The Mesopotamian civilisation held a remarkably uniform view of the ideal position of the king as judge. The kings were perceived as mortal beings (Nemet –Nejat 2002:217). The king viewed his own position as judge in religio-idealised terms (Whitelam 1979:19; Williams 2002:147-160). Any understanding of monarchical judicial functions must necessarily take into account the concept of the law in its Mesopotamian setting (Whitelam 1979:19). There exists no one term for "law" in Mesopotamia (Paul 1970:5; Zadok 1979a:57-66). Such a concept is covered by the complementary terms *mesarum* and *kittum* (pl. kitanu). Speise (1963:537) stated that *kittum* and *mesarum* combined express eternal verities. They spell law. The term *mesarum* literally denotes anything that is straight (Driver & Miles 1952:21) and thus comes to denote "truth and justice"

²⁴Shamash (Sun) was the most popular deity from Akkadian times.

²⁵Cuneiform law refers to all laws which were recorded by the use of cuneiform script and covers a wide geographical and temporal span. It can be subdivided into Sumerian, Old Akkadian, Old Babylonian, Elamitic, Old Assyrian, Middle Babylonian, Middle Assyrian, Hittite Suberaen, neo-Assyrian and neo-Babylonians. These laws range from 3000-1000BC.

(Speiser 1952:12). The importance of this concept with regard to the monarchy can be seen from the fact that Hammurabi refers to himself as *sa mearim* (Gadd 1975:176-227). The concept of the kingship was associated with wealth and protection.

The main function of the monarch was to see that justice was established and maintained throughout the kingdom. The establishment of justice by the king was of paramount importance for the well-being of the nation in its widest sense. In Mesopotamia leadership rested in the person of the king. The king was regarded as the guardian of the law and justice (Beck 2000:165-83). The king's leadership was also extended in religio-idealised terms (Ornan 2004:90-121).

3.2.1.1. Sumerians

The Sumerians are the only one of the thirteen groups which is not mentioned in the Bible (Bodime 1999:19). Yet their influence on ancient Israel and the ancient Near East was as fundamental as that of most of the other peoples discussed. Leadership among the Sumerians is divided into five distinctive periods. Protoliterate period, Early Dynastic period, the Kingdom of Akkad and the Ur III Dynasty,

(a) Protoliterate period

During this period, the assembly was bicameral, consisting of a council of elders and assembly of all able-bodied men. The gathering of the assembly²⁶ could be occasioned²⁷(Bodine 1994: 22). In order to deal with emergencies the assembly would choose a leader to carry out its decision (Leick 2003:79ff). Several Sumerians words are employed for offices of leadership namely: *en*, the *lugal* and *ensi* (ak). The office of the *en* included political power. The term came to mean "high priest" or "high priestess" meaning the spiritual head of the temple (Lambert 1998:56). The *lugal* resided in his own dwelling, separate from the temple, known as the *e-gal* ("big house"), which became a

²⁶ Leadership was exercised by an assembly of free adult citizens that convened on an ad hoc basis to make decisions for the good of the community.

²⁷For example, by offensive behaviour of individuals that called for punitive action, large-scale projects such as canal digging that necessitated communal or organisation, or the threat of aggression by another city –state and the consequent need for leadership in armed resistance.

palace, as the *lugal* became equivalent of the Mesopotamian king. From his role as a war leader, his position grew in importance until he was the most powerful person in the city-state, and his office became hereditary (Barrick 1996:621). A third, *ensi*, refers to a more limited position of an administrator of a city under the wide authority of *lugal*. This was when a large sphere of authority was operative. The ruler and the people alike viewed themselves as servants of the city deity. The Sumerian had as system of city-state deity. With the Sumerian system of city-states, the leading deity of the capital of a city-state held authority over the entire region, while the deities of lesser cities and towns within it were honoured locally in their own areas (Bodine 1994:24; Steinkeller 1992:725, Jacobson 1939:18).

(c) Kingdom of Akkad and Ur III Dynasty

During this period a highly organised bureaucracy made for a tight and effective administration. The administration produced prosperity and security throughout a good two-thirds of the century long reign of the dynasty (Van de Mieroop 1997:11). Building programs were extensive, arts, literature, and education flourished (Bodine 1995:36). Leadership was characterised by both political and religious arenas. Leadership was exercised by an assembly of free adult's citizens that convened on an ad hoc basis to make decisions for the good of the community. The assembly was bicameral, consisting of a council of elders and an assembly of all able-bodied men. The gathering of the assembly could be occasioned for example by offensive behaviour of an individual that called for Pemba action for large scale projects such as canal digging that necessitated communal organisations, or the threat of aggression by another city state and the consequent need of leadership in armed resistance .

3.2.1.2. Babylonians

The Babylonians were people who lived in Babylon²⁸. The Babylonians were a notable people during the Old Testament period for two reasons (Arnold 1994:43). Firstly, from a

²⁸The earliest form of the name 'Babylon' appears to have been *Babil*, the origin and meaning of which is lost to antiquity. The word may have been of Sumerian origin, since the city's existence

historical perspective, they were God's instrument for destruction against Jerusalem late in the history of His people (Lambert 1990:289-300). Secondly, they transmitted cultural and religious foundations for the Old Testament world. They and their predecessors the Sumerians established the philosophical and social infrastructure for Israel's neighbours (Arnold 1995:43).

(a) Old and neo-Babylonians

The notion of leadership was also influenced by the Amorites and the Babylonian culture. The dynasties of the various city-states became 'Babylonian' in nature (Arnold 1994:48). The 'age of Hammurabi' was portrayed as a Babylonia-centred phenomenon. This notion was transformed into a picture of cosmopolitan Near East with multi-centred base of power shared by several cities. There was no king who was the strongest. Ten of the fifteen kings followed Hammurabi of Babylon. Hammurabi (Shamash established a covenant with the famous king (Hammurabi) and revealed to him all his laws and wisdom on how to govern the society in a fair and just manner (Rogers 1908:85). The politics of the age demanded such tenuous alliances, so that a "king's success was a function of the king's skill" in manoeuvring the counters of the dangerous game (Klengel 1976:344).

Chaldeans were organised in tribal groups called "house" and were settled in the swamps and lakes of the lower course of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. During this period the king was perceived as the official representative of the deity and it was his responsibility to insure the fertility of the land through the careful observations of the New Year festivals. Leadership was marked by a balance of power among the increasingly powerful amount of city states (Arnold 1995:47). There was no king who was the strongest. Ten or fifteen kings follow Hammurabi of Babylon (Arnold 1995:48). The politics of the age demanded such tenuous alliances so that a king's success was a function of the king's skill in manoeuvring the counters of this dangerous game (Arnold 1994:49; cf. De

may be traced to just before the Akkadian Empire (2334-2193). The Akkadian form of the name, Bab-ilim ('gate of God) was a secondary development derived through popular etymology (Arnold 1994:43).

Wissenschaften 1976; De Liagre Bohl 1953:344). Traditional leadership occurred in Babylonia (Arnold 1995:49). The king was perceived as the official representative of the deity and it was his responsibility to insure the fertility of the land through the careful observance of the New Year rituals.

(b) Middle Babylonian period

Hammurabi was succeeded by five kings. The century and half in which Hammurabi's five successors ruled Babylonia (1750-1597 BC), the once great empire was reduced considerably. The north was lost to the Kassite newcomer, and the south to the so called First Sealand Dynasty. The Amorite Dynasty at Babylon came from the Hittite. Thereafter the Hittites withdrew leaving a political vacuum in the Babylonia period. The middle Babylonian was marked by a political vacuum in Babylonia (Saggs 1988:77).

(c) Early neo-Babylonians

Around the beginning of the Iron Age (1200), cataclysmic changes began to occur in the Ancient Near East that altered the political and leadership map of the region. Major powers on the eastern rim of the Mediterranean Sea collapsed. Within a century the political order that had existed for over three hundred years dissolved in the vacuum (Pitard 1987:81-89). Babylonia was not directly or immediately affected by the collapse of the powerful nations to the west (Saggs 1984:56, 61f). The initial kings of the dynasty traced family origins back to Isin²⁹, the site of a powerful dynasty earlier in the second millennium (Brinkman 1980:184). During this dynasty, the Elamites continued to plague northern Babylonia. The fortunes of Babylonia changed with the fourth dynasty, Nebuchadnezzar I (1125-1104 B.C.).

²⁹The first successor of the Kassite is known as Second Dynasty.

(d) Neo-Babylonians

Neo- Babylonians were under the leadership of the Chaldeans³⁰. The Chaldeans were organised in tribal groups called ‘houses’ (Brinkman 1977:304-25). They became the contenders for the Babylonian throne. Conflict between Assyria and Babylonia weakened northern Babylonia (Arldo 1994:58). The Assyrian Empire was temporarily halted by a weak central government, economic problem and a new threat to its north, Urartu (Yamauchi 1982: 31-35). As a result, the Chaldeans filled the political vacuum created by a decline Assyria. The ruler of Babylon marked the beginning of new era for later historians. Leadership changed faces under Nabopolassar (625-605) as he seized the throne and established a new dynasty known as Neo-Babylonian or Chaldean Empire (Wiseman 1985:5-6).

Leadership in Babylonia consisted of various stages, namely the Old Babylonian, led by the Amorites; the Middle Babylonian, who were ruled by the dominion of the Kassites, and the Early and Neao-Babylonian, who were controlled by the Chaldeans. The king was perceived as the official representative of the deity. It was his responsibility to ensure the fertility of the land through the careful observance of the New Year rituals. In the temples themselves, an elaborate priestly bureaucracy was responsible for maintaining the temple and its deity.

3.2. 1.3. Assyrians

The origins of the early Assyrian kingdom is the Assyrian king list which lists the kings of Assyria down to Sarongs’ (721-705 B.C). The first seventeen kings were identified as ‘kings living in tents’. Kingship followed the form of a single ancestral line back to the seventeen of the previous group. Then a group of six kings without patronymics appeared. Thereafter the king list gave to each king’s name his relation to the previous king; and the number of years he ruled. The original purpose for creating a list of Assyrians kings was to legitimise Samish. *Ad ad*’s claim to kingship was by tying his

³⁰The Chaldeans were more sedentary than the Arameans, who continued to plague western Babylonia as loosely organised semi-nomads.

ancestry to that of an established family of Assyria chieftains. The king himself was the leading actor in the cult of Asher during the high holy day of their religious calendar. That was during the last two months of the year and on the first month of the New Year including a key role in the *akitu* festival. A piece of the king's clothing was suggested as a substitute for him in his absence. Assyrian kings from Asheruballit I on were called "high priest" (Sumerian SANGAC= Akkadian *sangu' sanu*).

3.2. 1.4. Persians

The kings of the Persian Empire were known as Achaemenians after an eponymous ancestor, Achemenes (ca.700). This was from the reign of Cyrus II their conquest by Alexander (ca. 300 BCE). The Persians developed one of the largest of all ancient empires. It extended stretching from Hellespont in the northwest and the Nile in the southwest to the Indus in the east (Sack 1992:973-76; Yamauchi 1995:110). The Persians attacked the Babylonians whose last king was Nabonidus (555-539 BCE) (Sack 1992:973-76). The book of Daniel depicts Belshazzar the son of Nabonidus, as the *de facto* king. The Persians developed one of the largest of all the ancient empires; as its greatest extent stretching from the Hellespont in the North West and the Nile in the east (Yamauch 1995:110). Persia experienced a number of leadership transit, it ran from Cynics to Darin's and is known by instituality (instituted) the enlightened policy cult status and peoples as most rulers had done. His generosity to the Jews was not unique but was purled by his benevolence to the Babylonians and to other (Arnold 1995:112). The Hebrew copy of his edict permitted the Jews to return to the Holy land is found in Ezraa 2:4 and an Aramaic memorandum to the same in Ezraa 6:3-5 (Yamauchi 1988:4:601-2, 605,641-42). *Danu's* was credited with establishment of the 'pony express' courier system on the royal road that linked Susan South-western Persia to Sardis in western Anatolia (Herodotus 8:98) Darius was also responsible for the organisation of the empire into districts governed by satraps. Royal inspectors; called by the Greek's "the kings ears", checked upon the satraps periodically.

3.2.3. Anatolia, Syria-Palestine, and Egypt

(a) Hittites

Hittite kings left behind annalistic records of military campaigns, beginning as early as Old Hittite king Hattushili (Hoffner 1994:127). Leadership among the Hittites consisted of three kingdoms, namely, *Pre-old Kingdom*, *Old Kingdom* and the *New Kingdom*. In the Pre-old Kingdom the earliest Hittite kings, who ruled as Hattusha, identified their history with a city named Kushshar. This city remained the political centre of the Hittite government until the state finally collapsed around 1180 (Betlyon 2004:455). Kings in the Old-Kingdom were known for sacrifices to the images of the deceased royalties (Otten 1995:47-71). Foreign expansion of the Hittite Kingdom during the Old Hittite period followed several stages (Pringle 1983:207-19; Malek 2000:89-117).

At the top of the social scale was *the king* (Clarinda 1958:105-21). Hittite kings were not considered to be divine while they were still alive. When a king died, however, it was said that he became a god. These concepts reflected not only in the official cult for the spirits of deceased kings, but also in the pictorial representation of deceased kings. Living kings portrayed on their seals do not have these attributes. The king was the god's appointed regent. The fate of the land and the people was at the hand of the god's and executed his role as administrator (Arnold 1995:140). That secured great respect for the person of the king and placed upon him exacting requirements of behaviour. As the land's supreme priest, the king's person was sacred and had to be protected at all times. When presiding at religious ceremonies the king carried a crook (Hittite karamus) and wore the role and cap of the sun god. As the land's supreme judge (Huffier 1963:325-26), the king heard cases of the gravest nature, requiring the death penalty. Even stray live stock found in 'the vicinity of Hattusha had to be driven to the king's gate' (royal tribunal) in order for legal custody to be given to the finder (Arnold1995:141). Persons who believed themselves unjustly treated in lower courts could appeal to the king or the magistrate whose verdict brought extremely serious consequences.

During the New Kingdom *the queen* exercised great influence (Goetz 1957:92, 95). The king and the queen used a joint seal that portrayed the king on the right and the queen on the left both standing under the winged solar disk and facing each other with the hereof glyphs that identified them. Some if not all queens held the office of chief priest, corresponding to their husband's office of chief priest. In this context 'the term *prince* did not mean only young sons of the king. Rather, it included all male descendants of kings, regardless of age. At some point during his reign the king designated one of his son's usually the oldest, as crown prince (Hittite *tuhukantish*). This designation could always be changed as in fact it was on a number of accessions. The term great family (Hittite *shallihatter*) already in the early old kingdom designated the extended family that is, blood relations of the king. It was from this pool that the king supplied all the high officials of his realm (Arnold 1995:142). It was they who made up the *pan Kush* (ruling class) that in the Old kingdom constituted an advisory body for the king. They did not make laws, but they did have the power to convict and execute a king for murdering a fellow member of the great family (Sturtevant & Bechtel 1935:190-91). They were responsible for the safety and education of one who succeeded to kingship while still a child (Extreme *et al* 1992:295-304). While a Hittite king should always be characterised by mercy, his judicial clemency was appreciated towards a member of his great family.

Leadership among the Hittites consisted of three kingdoms, namely Pre-old Kingdom, Old Kingdom and New Kingdom. In the Pre-Old Kingdom, the earliest Hittite kings who ruled a Hattusha, identified their history with a city named Kushshar. This city remained the political centre of the Hittite government until the state finally collapsed around 1180 (Betlyon 2004:455-78). Kings in the old -kingdom were known for sacrifices to the images of the deceased royalties (Otten 1951:47-71). Foreign expansion of the Hittite Kingdom during the Old Hittite period followed several stages (Pringle 1983:207-19). The ideal view of the king as judge in Syria-Palestine is extremely limited in comparison with the Mesopotamian material (Mendelsohn 1954:25, 30; Whitelam 1979:24). The king (at Ugarit) was, in a practical sense, the focal point of the legal system (Buccellati 1967:302; Boyer 1955:283-300). The king's function as a judge and guarantor of justice was known throughout the realm (Whitelam 1979:24). The king in Canaan was subject to the

law (Gray 1969:302). Among the Hittite, leadership was exercised in different levels, namely the king, queen, princes and nobility.

(b) Canaanites and Amorites.

Two ancient peoples figure largely in the early history of Israel. They were the Canaanites and the Amorites (Schoville 1995:157). The Bible is replete with references to the land of Canaan and the Israelites (Gen 11:31; Joshua 5:12; Num 13: 2, 17, 23). The Canaanites developed from a tribal organisation into a city-state form of government. That government was well adapted to the physical environment of the region. Ugarit was one of the ancient Canaanite cities (Day 1998:72-90). Although Ugarit is not mentioned in the Bible, it is important to the Biblical student because of the archaeological discoveries made at this site (Lockyer 1986:1079). The term 'Canaan' and 'Israel' are difficult to define. Each word was employed by ancient writers in several ways. Canaan³¹ was a geographic term designating the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea (very roughly modern Lebanon and Israel). However, ancient writers often used Canaan as an ethnic term, designating not the land but the people who lived on the land. The concept of kingship, language and religion plays an important role in the history of Israel.

As far as kingship was concerned, there was a close relationship between kingship and priesthood (Wyatt 2002:177; cf. Merrill 1968:5ff). Canaanite kings controlled the political and commercial enterprises as well as extensive property. Kings and their subjects were mutually obliged to each other (Miller 2004: 42-47). The people supported their kings, while the kings were charged with defending the widows and the orphans (Clifford 1990:55-64). Israel inherited the material culture of Canaan, along with the language of the Canaanites and their simplified writing system. The king was regarded as

³¹Biblical writers speak of Canaanites as only one of the many ethnic groups in Canaan, along with Amorites, Hittites, Hives, Girgashites, Jebusites and Perizzites, to name just few. This way of writing was imprecise, to say the least. Neither the Bible nor any other ancient source enables a modern archaeologist to distinguish clearly between such groups in the material remains of Palestine (Noll 2001:15). Since the ancient Israelites lived in the land of Canaan, they were also 'Canaanites'. Everyone who lived in ancient Canaan was a Canaanite. Gradually, the term shifted in meaning, so the people who lived on the coast of the lands now called Syria and Lebanon. Leadership in Phoenicians, Arameans and the Philistines had an impact in Israel.

the son of god and the god himself was part of the royal ideology (Kim 2008:35). The ideology of kingship in Canaan had a great influence in Israel (Days 1998:72ff).

(c) Egypt³²

The word Egypt has a remarkable history, derived from the name of the temple of the patron deity of Memphis, the temple of the *Ka* (spirit) of Ptah (Hoffmeier 1994:251). The kings of Egypt were not called Pharaoh by the ancient Egyptians. This word was used by the Greeks and Hebrews, and today is commonly used for the ancient kings of Egypt. It is unknown how many kings ruled in Egypt, for at times in its ancient past the country was split up, and there were at least several kings at the same time (Baines 1998:16-53). There were kings who ruled regions of Egypt before recorded history. Several ancient historians record legendary Pharaohs who became Egyptian gods (Hoffmeier 1994:253-255). The title “Pharaoh” came to be known from the Greek language and its use in the Old Testament. It originated in the Egyptian *Per-aa*, meaning ‘Great House’ (Lockyer 1986:828). It was a designation of the palace, which first came to be used as a label for the king around 1450 BC. It became common usage centuries later (Dunn 1999). For most of the time, the usual word for the king of ancient Egypt was *nesu*, but a whole range of titles were applicable to any full statement of a king’s names and titularity. Later on history the Egyptian kings were called pharaoh (Wilson 1954:1; White 1979:26). Egyptians regarded pharaoh as divine this provides an immediate demarcation

³²Egypt, “the gift of the Nile” is strategically located at the north-eastern tip of Africa, bordering on Sinai and Palestine. Surrounded by deserts on the east and west naturally defended by a series of cataracts in the south, Egypt is an oasis sustained by the Nile and somewhat cut off from the rest of the world.

from Mesopotamian and Syro-Palestinian cultures (Thomas 1986:7). Egyptian kings (*Pharaohs*) were called to defend³³ Egypt (Hoffmeier 1994:252).

Appointment to a kingship position was the responsibilities of the sun god to sustain *ma'at*: order, harmony, and righteousness versus all threats of *isfer*: disorder, chaos, and evil. The role of the king was significant. Three fold roles are identified: as a warrior, as the incarnation of the god Horus (the son of Re), and as a high priest of the major cult centres (Hornung 1997: 283-314). Such roles made the pharaohs extremely powerful. As a *warrior*, the king's responsibility was to defend. Throughout Egyptian history, the Pharaoh was responsible for the defence of the two lands: Pharaoh from the earliest dynasties down to the Hellenistic period is regularly pictured in the defensive posture (Peack 2002:203-209). The last king to be shown defending Egypt in the same manner is the Roman Empire Titus (79-81) A.D. The king was viewed to be the only authority to defeat enemies and to keep order, stability and harmony in the land (Atwell 2004: 16ff).

Egyptian king(s) were perceived as the *incarnation of the gods*. The Pharaoh, as divine, was regarded as the image and representative of Re (Bleeker 1969:57). The king had a dual nature. He was regarded as a god and as a priest (Rice 2003b:95). Because of the divine nature of the king, the monarch initiated massive building projects for gods and for himself (De Moor 1996:213-247). The king plays an important role in ancient Egypt (Rice 2003b, Smith 1997:83; Hornung 1990: 283). He was regarded as a god who deals with people's lives and deserved to be worshipped. The king was the father and the mother of all men without an equal (Singer 1994:284ff; Morkot 2005:152). In Egypt the central role of the king, frequently called "the god" or the "great god", gave a unique character and stability to Egyptian civilisation (Robinson 1989:105-116). Kingship descended from father to son. If that was not possible a suitable claimant played the role of *Horus* in the funeral ceremonies (Thomas 1986:25). In certain instances, the right to the throne was strengthened by the theory of divine birth, which a ruler claimed to be the

³³As early as Dynasty I, Pharaoh Dan is pictured bashing the head of a foreigner, an accompanying inscription read "the first occasions of smiting the easterners" (i.e tribes from Sinai).

child of a sacred marriage between a god, who had assumed the form of the king, and the queen (Thomas 1986:25). The divine king brought prosperity to his country. The king was *the high priest* of every cult and temple and the sole officiate in the ritual. In practice he could not officiate everywhere in person and would be presented by a priest (Thomas 1986:26).

When the king died, he was thought to join the god and was particularly associated with Re and Osiris. His body rested in his mortuary temple (Watson 1996:315ff; cf. David 1986:22). The king was appointed by the sun god. The Egyptian pyramids were associated with the burial of the kings (Rice 2003b:172ff). The royal funeral cults had a significant role in socio-economic situation among the people (Shirai 2005:149ff; Malek 2000:105-108; Kemp 1983:85-159). Therefore his health and power were vital (David 1986:22). In very early times of Egyptian history if his powers weakened a king would be ritually killed (Thomas 1986:26).

In the Ancient Near East, warrior, peace, harmony, social well-being of the people remained the crucial aspects of kingship. The ideology of kingship in Egypt was categorised by bringing harmony, security against the forces of nature and enemies, ensuring the economic and social aspect of the community.

The fact that Egypt regarded the Pharaoh as divine provides an immediate demarcation from Mesopotamian and Syro-Palestinian cultures (Thomas 1986:7). From the dawn of history, the Pharaohs were called upon to defend Egypt. Throughout Egyptian history, the Pharaoh was responsible for the defence of the two lands. Pharaoh from the earliest dynasties down to the Hellenistic period is regularly pictured in the defensive posture (Peack 2002:203-209). The king's role as warrior, as the incarnation of the god Horus (the "son of Re"), and as high priest of the major cult centres made the Pharaoh extremely powerful, especially in the Old Testament (2700-2200 BCE).

In theory the king also owned all the land. The crown possessed vast estates but lands were assigned to temples and to individuals. In a barter economy the collection of taxes and distribution of goods were done by royal officials (Shirun-Grumah 1985:173-201). That brought the ruler to a highly centralised administration, where he ruled by *Ma'at*

(White lam 1979:26), the established divine order (Thomas 1986:27). *Ma'at* was thought of as a concept denoting "world order", and also personified as a goddess, the daughter of (Bleek 1969:57).

The ideal view of the king as judge in Syria-Palestine was extremely limited in comparison with the Mesopotamian material (Whitelam 1979:24; Mendelsohn 1954:25, 30). The king (at Ugarit) was, in a practical sense, the focal point of the legal system (Buccellarti 1967:66; cf. Boyer 1955:283-300). He was regarded as an immortal god (Healey 2006:235-235). The king in Canaan was patently subject to the law (Gray 1969:302). Kings were not only males, and unlike in modern monarchies, the ruler of ancient Egypt, whether male or female, was always called a king. That differed from the Mesopotamian view of a king, where a king was a designated male only. Egypt however had some noteworthy female rulers such as *Hatshesust* and others (Dunn 1999). In ancient (Pharaonic) Egypt, the pinnacle of Egyptian society, and indeed of religion, was the king. The king's role was recognised in the Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, and in the intermediate period, round about 2686-1552 (Kempt 1983:71-182).

3.2.4. Leadership in Transjordan

3.2.4.1. Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites

The Ammonites, known from both biblical and extra-biblical sources were an ancient people who inhabited the central plateau from about the middle of the second millennium until the middle of the first millennium (Younder 1995:293). They are best known for their numerous encounters with the biblical Israelites. *Moab* refers to a people and their territory, just as for example, the name *Israel* was used to designate a land and its population within a specific period in history (Mattingly 1995:317). Moab was part of the Transjordanian plateau located immediately east of the Dead Sea Valley (Emerton 2002:483-92; Bartlett 1989). While the southern border of Moabite territory was fixed by the biblical Brook Zered, with Edom to the south, Moab's northern boundary changed from time to time.

Kingship was not invented by the Israelites. Throughout the Ancient Near East the king played a distinctive role, not only in politics, but also in religious affairs (Schmidt 1996-1998:247-249). According to Ancient Near Eastern concept, the king was seen as the representative of god(s). The king, though there were differences in various countries like Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Israel's understandings of their king(s), he was generally regarded as an intermediary figure between god and people. In Egypt the king was responsible for creating order in the life and for expelling chaos. This fighting against in nature and society was done in order to preserve the order set by god(s). To maintain order in nature and in society was, therefore, a high priority for the king. In society his office mainly included obligations at the cult as well as the maintenance of juridical justice among the people (Assman 1970:48). He had to bring offerings to the gods in order to satisfy them and to establish their presence in the cult.

In Egypt, the king also embodied the unity of god and man; he was regarded in his office as god. According to the ancient Near East worldview, the gods ordained kingship. A god chose a king and gives him mercy to reign (see also 1 Samuel 10: 24; 16:8ff). By the divine commission the king then become the representative of the god. This divine legitimisation was necessary so that the king could act on behalf of the god. There was a symbiotic relationship between the earthly and divine kings. The earthly king became the legislator/lawmaker who promulgated laws for justice and righteousness in the socio-political spheres of life.

3.2.5. General features of kingship

3.2.5.1. The king and worship

The fact remains that the king, sanctified by his anointing and adopted by a deity (Yahweh in the case of Israel), is a sacred person and seems thereby empowered to perform religious functions (De Vaux 1961:113). The kings of Egypt, Assyria and Phoenicia were priests. In the Bible, Melchizedek is both a king of Salem and priest of El-Elyon (Gen 14:18).

3.2.5.2. Accession to the throne

In the Ancient Near East, an eldest son succeeded his father to the throne. In the case where a younger brother succeeded his father, was beyond human control. That was seen as an act of divine's choice (Engnell 1943; Gray 1952:193ff). The idea of divine choice was universal in the ancient Near East (De Vaux 1961:100). In Mesopotamia, a son succeeded his father as (a) king. The practice was regarded as an ordinary rule. At all the periods, 'Marduk chose his name for the kingdom over the world' (Mowinckel 1956:45-67). A comparison with Isaiah 44:28 is a perfect example: "*It is I (Yahweh) who say to Cyrus My shepherd*". Thus says Yahweh to Cyrus His anointed' (Johnson 1950:39). In Egypt every king was known to be the son of *Ra*, the sun god (De Vaux 1961:100). In the Aramean kingdom of Syria, Zakir, king of Hamath and a *La 'ash*, says: 'Ba'al Shamain called me and stood by me and Ba'al Shamain has made me king". That Zakir was a usurper, but Bar-Rekub, king of Senjirli, was a legitimate heir, yet he said: 'my master Rekub-el has made me sit on the throne of my father'.

In Egypt and Syria the king was usually, though not always succeeded by his son. The king appointed the heir and took him as a partner in the government during his lifetime (Johnson 1950:40; De Vaux 1961:101). Similarly, at Ugarit the king appointed the heir among his sons. In Israel too, primogeniture was a title to succession, but appointment by the king was also required (2 Chron 21: 3, cf. Rosenthal 1958:1-18; Balwin 1988). The prophets played a vital role in succession process. The prophet Samuel anointed Saul (1 Sam 10:1) and David (1 Sam 16:13) (though 1 Kgs 1:34) speaks of Sadoq and Nathan, a priest and prophets) and Joas (2 Kgs 11:12).

3.2.5.3. King by divine adoption

The king was regarded as the son of son of *Ra* the creator to Osiris (De Vaux 1961:111). The divine character was expressed in the royal titles and in religious literature. Despite the fiction of divine son ship and the fact that a certain supernatural power was ascribed to him, the king remained a man among men (De Vaux 1961:111).

Historical and ritual texts from *Ras Shamra* say nothing of any divinisation of the king. It is only by a forced interpretation that the methodological poems can be invoked as witnesses of it (De Vaux 1961:112). The notion of a divine king was not shared by all the peoples of the ancient Near East. In Israel, the notion of a divine king was deduced as extremely flimsy. In Israel, the anointed king was in special relationship to Yahweh (2 Sam 14:17, 20). The words of that flattery excluded the idea that he was a god (1 Sam 29:9). In granting that the king was adopted by Yahweh, did not mean that the king was equal to Yahweh. Israel never had any idea of a king who was a god.

3.2.5.4. Coronation of a name

In the ANE, at the coronation of a name of a Pharaoh his full set of titles was proclaimed. Comprising five names, of which the two were the names of accession and of birth. In ancient Mesopotamia an old coronation text of Uruk states that the goodness of Ishtar takes the king's name of lowliness' and calls him by his 'name of lordship'. The Assyrian royal ritual says nothing of change of name. One must not draw too sweeping a conclusion from expressions like those of Assurbanipal in inscriptions: 'Assur and Sin have pronounced my name in power.' Marduk has pronounced his name, Cyrus of Anashan (De Vaux 1961:107) it is not proved that the kings of Assyria took a new name when he becomes heir-apparent, but the name was hardly used in his reign (De Vaux 1961:105). Coronation of a name was highly considered in the Ancient Near East.

3.2.5.5. Anointing

Anointing plays an important part in the Ancient Near East as well as in extra biblical documents with regards to Canaan. A text from *RasShamra* contains an allusion to the anointing of the Baal as king, but the text is mutilated and it's meaning uncertain (De Vaux 1961:104). One of the Amarna letters tells that the kings of Syria and Palestine were anointed as vassals of the Pharaoh, and an Egyptian balsam vase found in one of the royal tombs (De Vaux 1961:104). The facts suggest an Egyptian practice rather than a native custom. It is known that the high officials in Egypt were anointed on appointment to office, but Pharaohs were not. The kings in Mesopotamia do not seem to have been anointed (De Vaux 1961:104). Hittite kings on the other hand were anointed with 'the

holy oil of kingship', and in their titles these sovereigns are styled, Tabarna, the anointed, the Great King, etc'. Anointing is a religious rite. It is accompanied by a coming of Spirit. In ancient Israel the King was the Anointed of Yahweh (1 Sam 24:11, 26, 9, 11, 2 Sam 22:51; 26:19, 22).

3.2.5.6. Functions of the king

Throughout the entire Ancient Near East, cultic responsibilities devolve upon the king (Riley 1993:58; cf. Keel 1978:278-79). The function of the king was in four folds namely: Firstly, to *ensure the safety* of his people by "force of arms" against threats of rebellion or external threats of invasion. Secondly it was to *ensure the well-being* of the nation, through the establishment of justice. Throughout the Ancient Near East the king played a distinctive role, not only in politics, but also in the religious life of the people. The dual function of the king as both warrior and judge is evident throughout the Ancient Near East. Scholars have recognised the importance of the concept of the king (Whitelam 1979:17). Thirdly, the king was *ipso facto* a redeemer or *saviour*. It is a common idea among primitive peoples that the king embodies the good state of his subjects: the country's prosperity depends on him, and he ensures the welfare of his people (De Vaux 1961:110; cf. Widengren 1951; McKenzie 1957:33). Good government, days of justice, years of righteousness, abundant rains, powerful floods, good commerce, feeding the hungry etc, were classified as a sign of effective leadership (De Vaux 1961:110; Riley 1993:58; cf. Keel 1978: 278-79).

3.3. Leadership in the Old Testament and in ancient Israel

3.3.1. Introduction

In the royal theology of ancient Israel, the kingship was similarly rooted in the worldview of Ancient Near East (Days 1998:72-90). Despite a negative attitude towards kingship through the presence of anti-monarchical tendencies (1 Sam 8-12; Launderville 2001:119-128), this office was introduced. Yahweh commissioned the king for his tasks. This becomes an indirect event in Psalm 72:1, where the supplicant requests God to authorise the king's reign by giving him divine laws: "*O God, endow the king with your*

justice, and the son of the king with your righteousness”. Having discussed leadership in Ancient Near East, it is proper to discuss leadership in the Old Testament and in Israel. The Old Testament and ancient Israel are marked by many different stages, events and transitional periods. Those periods can be discussed under the following: The primeval period; patriarchal; the Exodus, the conquest and settlement, the judges, the monarchy, the divided kingdom, the foreign rule, the exilic, post-exilic and the restoration periods. In each of these periods, the main focus will be based on the following level of leadership: national, regional, and religious and local communities. Although the focus is on these four-fold natures of leadership, it is not always to have all of them at the same.

3.3.2. Leadership in the primeval period

3.3.2.1. Introduction

The primeval period covers the creation narratives, including Adam and Eve, and their fall, Cain and Abel, the spread of evil on human race, the story about individuals like Seth, Enoch, Noah and the Flood, Nimrod and the tower of Babel. In this document, the focus is on leadership.

3.3.2.2. Adam and Eve

More than half of the creation account is about man’s beginning (Dye 1966). In this context, the term “man” or “humankind” is used in a general sense referring to both Adam and Eve, men and women, the human race (Kidner 1967:27). Humankind is both the crown of creation and a distinct creation. God made the earth to provide a home for man (Kidner 1967:27). The creation account shows us three aspects of man’s unique status (Allis 195:12), namely: human’s dignity; authority and God’s concern for man’s need. *He* stands apart from the rest of creation because *he* has been created in the image of God and has been given authority (leadership status) over nature. Human beings were given authority and responsibility (Dewer 1943).

Human beings have been given great dignity. God made human beings over the animal world by giving him dominion over every living creature (Gen 1:28). Also the vegetable

(plants) kingdom was to serve man for food (1:29-30). From the start, mankind was entrusted with a leadership position. Authority and privilege were not to be abused. In God's plan man is to be God's responsible representative and steward on earth. Not only was human beings to subdue the earth (cultivate it), *he* was also to care for it (1:28, 2:15). This implies that he must not squander natural resources nor want only to (without reason or excuse) kill god's creatures. God gave human beings the opportunity to develop morally and spiritually (Kline 1970:33). As a leader (human beings) needed the opportunity to express his love and trust by choosing to obey God. If human beings disobeyed, he would need an enlightened conscience- the ability to distinguish between good and evil (Flannagan 1957). Obedience would have led to growth in character and divine favour. Disobedience led to spiritual ruin and physical death. Genesis 3 contains the story of man's fall and because of his disobedience (Guthrie 1970).

3.3.2.3. Noah: preacher and ship-builder

Noah portrayed an ecclesiastical and industrial leader (Gen 6:1-7:5). Noah lived in a time when the whole earth was perceived to be filled with violent and corruption. During Noah's lifetime *sin* reached its climax. Moral barriers were broken down. Violence filled the earth. Against this dark background shines the character of Noah. His name, Relief, speaks of hope and of a work that God has for him to do. Noah found favour in the eyes of the Lord" (Gen 6:8). Noah was God's witness to his generation by his life, his proclamation, and was his work of faith in building the ark.

3.3.2.4. Nimrod: hunter, king and builder

Nimrod was a son of Kish and the grandson of Ham, the youngest son of Noah (Gen 10:8-12; 1 Chron 1:10). The record of the nations gives special attention to Nimrod. He was a "mighty one on the earth"- a skilled hunter/warrior who became a powerful king (Gen 11:1ff). He is the first mighty hero to be mentioned in the Bible (Lokyer, 1968:759). Nimrod founded the early Babylonian kingdom and built several cities. Nimrod means, "We will revolt". He believes it was a title given to him by the people and not his personal name (Babylon (Babel), where Nimrod has his kingdom, later became the symbol of the world system in revolt against God and of the oppressor of God's people.

Noah was God's witness to his generation by his life, his preaching, and was his work of faith in building the ark.

3.3.2.5. Synthesis

The subject of leadership has been a centre of discussion from the time of immemorial. Human beings have been given the mandate of leadership from the beginning. From the start human beings were entrusted with leadership position. Adam and Eve were to tend and cultivate the land. In other words, they were to look after the resources. In God's plan, human beings were to be God's responsible representative and steward on earth. Authority and privilege were not to be abused, but for the betterment of human development.

3.3.3. Patriarchal leadership

3.3.3.1. Introduction

The term *patriarch* is the traditional name given to each of the three fathers of the Jewish nations: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In Jewish tradition it is customary to add the Hebrew *epithet Avin* ("Our father") to each name (Starr 1974:146). They were seen as spiritual prototypes of the nation of Israel (Sarel 1997:17). The Israelite family was headed by a patriarchal leadership (De Vaux 1961:20). The proper word to describe it is *beth 'ab*, (the house of one's father). The genealogies were given in the father's line, and women were rarely mentioned. The nearest relation in the collateral line was the paternal uncle (cf. Lev 25:49). In the normal type of Israelite marriage the husband was the "master", the *ba'al* of his wife (De Vaux 1961:20). The father had absolute authority over his children, even over his married sons if they lived with him, and over their wives. In early times this authority included the power over life and death (Heaton 1968:157, 210, 256). The patriarchs were not lone individuals, but chiefs to sizeable clans (Bright 1959:93). The Bible depicts the patriarchs as men of peace, willing (e.g. Gen 26) to go to great lengths to avoid friction with their neighbours. Roth (1936:7) is of the opinion that Abraham was simply an outstanding character, whereas Isaac and Jacob were regarded as semi-symbolic figures, representing a tribal motif.

3.3.3.2. Family leadership

The family pattern consisted of nuclear and extended units. The nuclear family covered three generations, extending to four, with a number of further additions at the periphery. In the extended family, family law was the order of the day. The social basic unit of early Israelite society was the extended family (Ellinger 1955:1-25). The extended family was Exodgamic. Noll (1979:229) stated that studies on this subject are undecided as to whether or not the extended family was originally Exodgamic. The extended family consisted of grandparents, parents, children, both married and unmarried, along with such additions of unmarried uncles, aunts, and cousins (De Geus 1976:134f; Porter 1976:10). The “limited” extended family of a peasant population consisted of one or two grandparents known as elders, one married son, his wife and children (Frick 1977:105, cf. Sjoberg 1960:159). The size of the family was based on whether their land holdings were sufficient to support a large family unit (Noll 1979:229). The boundaries of the family were extended to include slaves and strangers (De Geus 1976:135). The structural locus of the extended family was centred on the male head of the family the *paterfamilias* and it was there that the leadership rested and the jurisdiction of internal disputes laid (Noll 1979:40). The evidence for the judicial authority of the *paterfamilias* was based mainly upon two texts in the book of Genesis (Salom 1969:28-30).

The authority or leadership of the *paterfamilias* over internal family affairs was seen in the light of Jacob, Leah and Rachel from Laban (Gen. 31). In this specific case, Jacob’s marriage to Rachel brought him under the leadership or jurisdiction of her father (Noll 1979:40). The statement of Laban, “*It is my power to do you an inquiry*” (Gen 31:29), as noted by Clark (1969:266-278), implied not simply the physical ability, but also the judicial authority to deal with Jacob. Salom (1969:26ff) has shown that the judicial leadership of *paterfamilias* operates on two different levels in the story. In the first instance, it demonstrates the authority of Laban over Jacob, his wives and children. Secondly, it appears that Jacob takes upon himself the role of the judge, and so by implication appears to be forming his own extended family (Noll 1979:40).

3.3.3.3. Clan leadership

The extended family did not exist in isolation but was a constituent part of a much wider social structure, described by the term *clan*. It has to be noted that the geographical conditions of Palestine were an important factor in the history of Israel and the development of its social structure (De Geus 1976:138; Frick 1977:116). The clan would be resident in particular towns (Noll 1979:43). The tribes appeared mainly to have been some form of territorial designation (De Geus 1976:138). In the case of the *pater familias* (as stated) possessed jurisdiction over internal disputes within his own extended family. However, if disputes concerned members of different extended families then authority, leadership or jurisdiction passed to the clan (Noll 1979:43).

The administration of the clan and the town was in the hands of the *elders*. It was not always easy to determine the actual status of elders, but their relationship to the town assembly, or their exact function (Salom 1969:305-427). The majority of elders were the heads of families (cf. Willis 2001). Those elders had jurisdiction over various disputes between clan members. Judicial authority thus lay in the hands of the clan council. Where the clan coincided with the town the place of jurisdiction become the town gate (Kohler 1956:149ff; McKenzie 1964:100-104). The most important part of clan jurisdiction extended over the right of *blood vengeance*. Blood vengeance was a belief that the blood of a kinsman must be avenged by the death of the killer or one of his families (Noll 1979:44).

3.3.3.4. Synthesis

Leadership in the patriarchal period was discussed. The term ‘patriarchal’ is exclusively referred to the traditional name given to the three fathers of the Jewish nations: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob respectively. In the patriarchal period leadership was marked by two important leadership levels, namely the family and clan head. In the family category, the father exercised authority over the whole family. Elders had a double role of leadership. In the first place, they were responsible in the affairs of the clan in which are referred in this research as the local communities. Secondly the elders were responsible for the affairs of the town, which can be referred as regional affairs.

3.3.4. Theocratic leadership

3.3.4.1. Introduction

Theocratic leadership maintains the view that Yahweh is the king. The people of that period appreciated Yahweh their God as king in abstraction from the particularities of their national history (Brettler 2009:219; cf. Pixley 1981:10). The celebration of God as king was a common motif in ancient Near Eastern religion. Yahweh's kingship was combined in Psalm 74:12-17. In the religion of Israel as in those of the Near Eastern people, it was common to worship God as heavenly king (Pixley 1981:10). That was the beginning of theoretical leadership. Theoretical leadership covered, from the period of the Exodus to 1 Samuel 7. Four levels of theocratic leadership are identified, namely: Exodus, conquest, settlement and judges, which include the transitional period. This leadership can be classified as: national leadership and religious leadership. Thereafter, leadership during the transitional period will be highlighted. Two contradicting viewpoints regarding the establishment of the monarchy will form part of the discussion. Each view bases their argument on their fundamental grounds.

3.3.4.2. Theocratic leadership in the Exodus period

3.3.4.2.1. Introduction

Leadership in the Exodus period is discussed in different levels, namely, community, national and religious. God's rule was exercised through Moses and his siblings, Aaron and Meriam including Jethro, his father-in-law.

3.3.4.2.2. National leadership

In the Exodus period, God's rule was expressed through human agents like Moses³⁴ and Aaron (Sarel 1977:18; Roth 1936:6). Moses was the leader of the Israelites in the Exodus from Egypt and in their wandering in the wilderness (Rathey 1931:32). Born of Hebrew

³⁴Moses was the son of Abram and Jochebed, of the tribe of Levi (Sarel 1977:18). Roth (1936:6) was convinced Moses was from the tribe of Ephraim and adapted to the tribe of Levi.

stock, he grew up among the Egyptians (Zeitlin 1984:78). He was equipped technically (Roth 1936:6). He was assisted by his brother Aaron as he was not an eloquent speaker (Exod4:10). Moses was nevertheless a great religious leader (Jansen 1982:79; Vosloo 1989:29). Moses' importance was not personal but political as a leader of the people or mediator between the people and God. That was political history (McCanville 2007:1ff; Walzer 1985:12). It was about slavery and freedom, law and rebellion (Albertz 1994; Bartlett 1965; Bright 2000; Chapman 2000; cf. Auld 1983). During this period, three levels of leadership were expressed, namely national level, community level and religious leadership. Leadership at national level was exercised by Moses and Aaron.

3.3.4.2.3. Community leadership

During the Exodus Moses has been the sole leader of the people. He was exhausted by solving cases among the people ranging from simple to complicated cases. As a result, being exhausted made it difficult for him to lead the entire nation. Jethro and the rest of Moses family joined Moses in the wilderness near Mount Sinai (Exod18:5). During his visit, Jethro taught Moses to choose some capable men and appoint them as leaders of the people: leaders of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (Exod18: 14, 21-22). The criteria of those leaders were explained. They were to be God-fearing men who could be trusted and who could not be bribed. Their job description included serving as judges for the people on a permanent basis. They were to bring all the difficult cases to Moses, but they themselves could decide all the smaller disputes (Exod18:24-26). In the face of some evil the people cried to God, blaming their leaders and sometimes God for the trouble that came upon them (Coggins 2000:58; cf. Childs 1979). But Moses, guided by God, promised that the problems, be it an enemy army, or lack of food and water, would be resolved (Coggins 2000:58).

3.3.4.2.4. Religious leadership

Moses and Aaron continued to lead the Israelite people in religious matters. They constantly reminded the people about the act of God. While the Exodus was the fundamental act of God for Israel (Dorsey 1999), the Sinai event acquired the significance of the revelation of Yahweh without qualification (Schmidt 1983:39). The

arriving at Sinai, God told Moses that He intended to make a covenant with Israel. That would confirm the LORD's ownership of Israel (Vosloo 1989:33). The elders of the people agreed to that, whereupon God set before them the provisions of the covenant in the form of the Ten Commandment (Vosloo 1989:33; Jansen 1982:82). The covenant was a consequence of election (Hinson 1997; Weinfeld 1990:187-203). Yahweh had chosen Israel to be His people; through the covenant that relationship was given form and permanence (Jansen 1982:82-83). The people were to live in peace without fear (Emerton 1990; 45-71). Israel repeatedly failed to have faith in their God (Kamm 1999). They broke the commandment and rejected God's leadership in rebelling against Moses and Aaron through whom leadership was manifested (Num 14:4, 10, and 16:41ff; Weinfeld 2004).

3.3.4.2.5. Synthesis

During the Exodus period, three forms of leadership were noted: national, community and religious leadership. Moses, Aaron, Meriam and Jethro were the main characters to ensure that there was leadership within the people. Each of these individuals exercised specific leadership in their own right. Moses was responsible to exercise leadership for the whole nation, dealing with every case. Aaron was a religious leader, he was responsible for religious ceremonies and the nation adheres to God's command. Although Meriam's leadership cannot be singled out as not a specific, her presence and service cannot be ignored. Her actions qualified her to be a servant thus servant leadership. On the other hand, Jethro's role in the Exodus is unique and significant. After observing Moses' leadership style which according to him was tiring Jethro intervened by advising him (Moses) to appoint leaders to help him. Through Jethro's advice, community leaders were appointed. Therefore, Jethro exercised intellectual leadership.

3.3.4.3. Theocratical leadership during conquest and settlement

3.3.4.3.1. Introduction

The main character during the conquest and settlement is Joshua, the son of Nun (Josh 1:1ff). Like Moses, Joshua was a national leader, while community leaders were responsible for the affairs of the people in the camps (Joshua 1:10ff). He was presented as

both a military and spiritual leader (Lapp 1967:283-300). Tradition has it that Moses died within sight of the Promised Land, leaving the conquest of that land to his successor Joshua (Moscat 1957:126). The great leader “who had known God’ face-to-face”, passed before the nation crossed to the other side. It was Joshua’s task to carry the work of Moses one step further and to establish the nomadic tribes in Canaan (Rathey 1931:46). According to his name Joshua was made great for the saving of *God’s elect* that he might give Israel their inheritance. Joshua was able to divide the country among the twelve tribes who settled down peaceably upon the territory assigned to them (Castel 1985; Wood 2005:475-89). As a young man Joshua, from the tribe of Ephraim, had been appointed by Moses to guard the Tent of the Meeting (Thompson 1992; Nelson 1997). He distinguished himself as a leader of the Hebrew forces in a desperate battle with a body of Amalekites who tried to hinder their march northwards to Kadesh (Ex 17:8-16). Three types of leadership are identified, namely warrior, political, and spiritual leadership.

3.3.4.3.2. Warrior leadership

The statements “... *Get ready now, you and all the people of Israel Israel, and cross the River Jordan into the land that I am giving them*” (Joshua 1:2b) and *Be determined and confident, for you will be the leader of these people as they occupy this land which I promised their ancestors* (Joshua 1:6)...*Don’t be afraid or discouraged, for I, the LORD your God, am with you wherever you go*” (Joshua 1:9b) bear every indication that warrior leadership is to be exercised. Indeed, Joshua was ready for the action. Throughout the conquest and settlement, Joshua demonstrated military skills. Joshua ordered the leaders to prepare the community for the battle (Josh 1:10-15), and the people responded positively (Josh1:16-17). As a warrior Joshua he attacked Jericho (Josh 6:1-26), he and his men captured and destroyed Ai (Josh 8:1-29), he defeated the Amorites (Joshua 10:1-43) and King Jabin of Maron and his allies (Joshua 11:1-15).

3.3.4.3.3. Political leadership

The conquest of the land of Canaan by the Israelites begins with the crossing of the river Jordan at Gilgal, but it should be noted that not all the tribes crossed the river (Sarel

1997:20; Hamilin 1983:3). In Deuteronomy 31:2-8 the task of leading the Israelites into Canaan was assigned to Joshua (Zeitlin 1984:128). Joshua was promised that he himself would accomplish full conquest of the land to the edge of the Euphrates (Rathey 1931:43; Josh 1:1-6). The Old Testament describes the conquest of the land as a single campaign under the leadership of Joshua, son of Nun (Alt 1967; 135-169). A campaign that begun with the great capture of Jericho and ended with the great battle against Jabin, the king of Hazor, by the waters of Meron (Sarel1997:20).

3.3.4.3.4. Spiritual leadership

Joshua was not only presented as a military commander and strategist, but as the spiritual leader of God's people (Hamlin 1983:28). Joshua's spiritual leadership is expressed in various forms. In constant communication with God, he instructed the officers as to what they should say to the people (Josh 1:10, 3:2-4). He called on the people to sanctify themselves (Joshua 3:5). He explained the meaning of events about to happen (Josh 3:9-13), directs the priests (Josh 3:6; 4:17-18), and the twelve men (Joshua 4:4-5), and personally sets up the memorial stones (Joshua 3:4, 20). Joshua prepared the parents for the task of educating their children in the faith (Josh 4:6-7; 21:24). His role as liturgist was different in some ways from that of Moses, who had to act as a 'nurse' (Num 11:12) for undisciplined children (Hos 11:1-3). The narrators presented Joshua as the leader of trained and disciplined adults, "causing them to inherit the land" (1:6). According to Mendenhill (1970:100-120) the conquest of Palestine was a dramatic as the Israelites advanced in Canaan.

3.3.4.3.5. Synthesis

Three types of leadership are identified in the conquest and settlement, namely warrior, political and spiritual leader. The main character in this section is Joshua, the son of Nun (Joshua 1:1, 3). As a *warrior* Joshua he attacked Jerico (Joshua 6:1-26), he and his men captured and destroyed Ai (Josh 8:1-29), he defeated the Amorites (Josh 10:1-43) and King Jabin of Madon and his allies (Joshua 11:1-15). *Politically* Joshua's leadership is seen as he captured and taking the enemies lands (Josh 7:28-19, Joshua 11:16:-23, Josh 13:1-7) as well as dividing the land among the tribes of Israel (Josh 13;8-22, 24-28, 29-

33, 14: 1-1-5, 6-15, 15:1-19, 16:1-10; 17:14-18; 18:1-10, 11:-27; 19:1-9, 10-16, 17-23, 24-39, 40-48, 49-51; 21:1-42). Furthermore, *spiritual leadership* is traced in various occasions in the conquest and settlement. Throughout his leadership, Joshua was leading the nation of Israel under God's instruction. He advised the people to purify themselves as they would cross the Jordan River (Josh 3:1-13), he set up a memorial stone which would serve as a reminder of what the Lord has done (Josh 4:1-10). He circumcised Israelites men as commanded by the Lord (Josh 5:2-12). Joshua built alter to the Lord the God of Israel at mount Ebal (Joshua 8:35) and by the Jordan which serves as witness that the LORD is God (Joshua 22:10-34). In his farewell address, Joshua encouraged the Israelites to be faithful to the Lord (Josh 23:1-16) at all times. Furthermore Joshua gave the people of Israel an opportunity to choose whom they preferred to serve, but he made a solemn promise that he and his family would serve the Lord and to serve (Josh 24:15). Mendenhall (1970:100-120) described the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine as dramatic.

3.3.4.4. Theocratic leadership in the period of Judges

(a) Introduction

The period of the Judges was the period between the death of Joshua and the establishment of the monarchy (Morris & Cundall 1968). Each tribe was in its own territory, while the ties between them remained weak (Coote 2006:35-49; Webb 1987). The central sanctuary located at Shiloh within the tribal allotment, served as the symbol of national unity, but its power as a unifying force was limited (Binz1955). The wars during that period were mainly ones against neighbouring powers or insurers who infiltrated the land to pillage and destroy. Under these conditions there developed a system of rule by local leaders who were called "judges" (Sarel 1997:22). There was no king in Israel (Hackett 1998:177-218).

(b) Federal leadership

The narratives in the Book of Judges presented the federation of tribes as a body without any organised government and lacking real political cohesion (De Vaux 1961: 93; Bendor 1996). The members formed one people and shared worship but they had no common

head (Lindars 1979:95-112). The Judge was a chieftain of a tribe, or of several neighbouring tribes. Usually, he/she was called on to lead in an hour of great danger (Yee 2007:138-160). After he succeeded in overcoming the enemy and distancing the threat, he would be recognised as a leader in times of peace, to ‘judge’ Israel (Sarel 1997:22).

(c) Charismatic leadership

The ‘judge’ was a chieftain of a tribe, or of several neighbouring tribes (Flanagan 1981:47-73). Usually, he was called on to lead in an hour of great danger. After he succeeded in overcoming the enemy and distancing the threat, he would be recognised as a leader in times of peace, to ‘judge’ Israel (Sarel 1997:22). When the crisis was over the people appealed to the judges for the settlement of local disputes and thus they really became judges and acquired a local jurisdiction which, however, was not handed down from father to son (Rathey 1931:48).

Judges were the national heroes who were sometimes called ‘deliverers’ (3:9, 15). Israel was warned (Josh 23:4,7,12) that *if Israel should cleave to these remaining nations then Yahweh would no more drive these remaining nations from out of your sight; but they shall be a snare and a trap unto you... until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you (Josh 23:13)*. But what appears as a mere warning in Joshua was transformed in Judges into a punishment for sin - the sin of the Israelites in cleaving to the remaining nations and permitting themselves to become ensnared (Zeitlin1984:129).

The history of almost two centuries is here summarised, indicating the principles behind God’s dealings with Israel (Morris 1968:66). During this period there was a recurring cycle of four phases: apostasy, servitude, supplication and deliverance (Morris 1968:66). The nation forsook the Lord, a crime that involved disloyalty to their forefathers and a willful overlooking of the mighty works of the Lord on their behalf, especially the deliverance from Egypt Judges 2:12, states that Yahweh is accusing the people of not hearkening to His voice. This effectively marked the recognition of the fact that the total conquest of the land has become problematic and conditional, and that it may never be

realised (Zeitlin 1984:128). The aspiration of total conquest was eliminated entirely from the religio-ideological framework of the Book of Judges. Instead we hear the recurring:

And the children of Israel, did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, and served the Baalim. And they forsook the Lord... and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and worshipped them... And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them, and He gave them into the hands of their enemies round about (Jdg2:11f.).

In Judges 2:21 to 3:4 we learn why Joshua is said to have failed in his mission to dispossess the entire land of Canaan (Zeitlin 1984:130). The people enumerated in Judges 3:3 (cf. Josh 13:2-6) were left in the land to test the Israelites, whether they will keep the way of the Lord or not. They failed the test. Disregarding Joshua's command, they intermarried with the remaining people and worshipped their gods (Jdg 3:5-6). They were also influenced by other neighbouring people (Jdg 10:6-16) and it is for this reason that the Lord turned them over to their enemies round about (Jdg 2:11-15). In their distress the Israelites cried out to the Lord and He rose up judges, who saved them out of the hand of those that spoiled them (v16). However, as Israel's repentance was only temporary, so was her salvation (Zeitlin 1984:130). The judges were unable to purge Israel from her idolatrous ways. On the contrary, corruption increased from generation to generation (Jdg 2:17-19) (Herrmann 1975:115).

(d) Synthesis

The period of Judges covers the incidences between the death of Joshua and the establishment of the monarchy. Each tribe was on its own, while the ties between them remained weak. Two types of leadership have been identified: federal authority where every tribe stands on its own without common head but shared worship. On the other hand, charismatic leader referred to a hero or heroine whose bravery and charisma cherished the whole nations. He or she was regarded as a charismatic leader. These judges were the national heroes/heroines and were sometimes called deliverers.

(saviours). During this period, there was a recurring cycle of four phases: apostasy, servitude, supplication and deliverance (Morris 1968:66). The judges were unable to purge Israel from her idolatrous ways.

3.3.4.5. Transitional leadership

3.3.4.5.1. Introduction

Theocracy was the form of leadership known to Israel. During this period, leadership was exercised by individual heroes. Here was no need of human king (Jdg 21:25). God's rule was demonstrated through a judge known as a warrior rose in the time of need. The war with the Philistines demonstrated that the institution of the judges may have served Israel in the past but was now proving inadequate (Coote 1987:53-76). An inspired leader, arising in a moment of emergency to mobilise several tribes was no way to cope with a powerful Philistine menace (Zeitlin 1984:148; Roth 1936:14). Transactional period entails the change of leadership from theocracy to human rule.

3.3.4.5.2. The concept of kingship in Israel and her desires for a king.

For early Israel Yahweh's kingship was taken to mean politically the exclusion of all human sovereigns. It was this rejection of human kingship that made Israel different from its neighbours (Pixley 1981:20). The issue was succinctly stated by the Manassite hero Gideon:

Then the men of Israel said to Gideon, "Rule over us, and you and your son and your grandson also, for you have delivered us out of the hand of Midian".

Gideon said to them, "I will not rule over you, and my son will not rule over you, Yahweh rules over you" (Jdgs 8:22-23).

The text is clear: If Yahweh was the King of Israel, it would be rebellion to pledge loyalty to human rulers (Ritterspach 1967:193; Von Rad 1953:45; cf. Eissfeldt 1931:262). The implication of Yahweh's kingship was never drawn for the kingship of Marduk, or that of El or Baal (Pixley 1981:21). In most of the Ancient Near East God's kingship was as ideological support for earthly states. In Israel exactly the opposite

conclusion was drawn from Yahweh's kingship. God's rule was demonstrated through a judge known as a warrior who rose in the time of need. The most detailed presentation of any judge of the period was Samuel (Dumbrell 1984:130). The details of Samuel's function are mentioned. Samuel was born into an Ephraimite family of Rama (though of Levitical stock, according to 1 Chron 6: 33f.). His parents were Elkanah and Hannah. While a boy, he experienced the prophetic call, and in due course, was established as a prophet of the Lord (Isa 3).

During that time Israel was under the leadership of Eli and his sons. The sons of the priest Eli were corrupt (1 Sam 2:12-17, 22-25) and were not concerned the wellness and moral life of the nation. They were concerned for their own profit, and not for the correct performance of the will of Yahweh (Zeitlin 1984:149). Samuel, on the other hand, found favour in the eyes of both Yahweh and the people (cf. McKane 1963). Justice and peace were far from them (Weinfeld 1985). The Philistines, Israel's number one enemy inflicted a terrible defeat upon Israel and captured the Ark of the Covenant (1 Sam 4:10f.). It was evident that what was recorded there was a period of transition (Zeitlin 1984:149). The war with the Philistines demonstrated that the institution of the judges may have served Israel in the past but was now providing inadequate leadership. An inspired leader, arising in a moment of emergency to mobilise several tribes was no way to cope with the powerful Philistine menace (Ysur-Landau 2003: 34ff; Zeitlin 1984: 148; Roth 1936:14). Temporary leadership prompted the Israelites to seek another form of government. The monarchy was a better solution. This was the main consideration behind the people's request for a king (1 Sam 8:4ff.).

3.3.4.5.3. Views regarding the monarchy

(a) Introduction

Two outstanding traditions regarding the institution of kingship in Israel are noted, namely, the tradition that was in favour of kingship and the tradition that was hostile to kingship. Robinson (1993:49) maintains that most scholars take the pro-kingship tradition to be the older of the two traditions. It was held that the pro-kingship tradition may well have come from positive experiences of kingship during the United Monarchy. The anti-

kingship tradition had arisen out of negative experiences during the later period in the Divided Monarchy. This tradition has strong roots in the prophetic traditions.

(b) Anti- kingship tradition

The anti-kingship tradition is found in 1 Samuel 8; 17-27; 12: 6-25 and 1 Samuel 15. Birch (1976:1) refers to it as the “late” source. In this tradition it was repeatedly stated that the people’s demand for a king was an act of apostasy against the LORD, a rejection of the LORD as King over Israel (1 Sam 8:7; 10:19). That was an act of wickedness (1 Sam.12:17). In requesting a king for themselves the Israelites had thereby added to their sins (Ritterspach 1967:184; Gunn 1985:13). The anti-kingship trend was present among certain prophetic circles as an undercurrent even the pro-kingship ideology was dominant. People belonging to these traditions tolerated kingship, though they were critical of it. To support the view was that the king was conceded, though reluctantly, and finally appointed with divine sanction. Those opponents of kingship could have felt that their stand was finally vindicated when they saw evils happening in Israel during the later period of the Divided Monarchy. According to anti-kingship tradition, Yahweh was the King of Israel, capable of saving His people from all their calamities and distress (1 Sam.10:19; 12:8ff). It was for this reason that Gideon rejected the offer to become king over Israel (Jdgs 8: 22-23). As far as Hosea’s view is concern, Yahweh gave Israel kings in anger and took them away in His wrath (Hos 13:11). Ezekiel maintains the same opinion, Yahweh would never again entertain such a demand as before (“Let us be like the nations...”), but He alone would be King over Israel (Ezek 20:32, 33).

(c) Pro-kingship tradition

The pro-kingship tradition is found in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16; ch.11; 12:1-5 and 1 Samuel 13-14 (Robinson 1993:49; Polzin 1989:81). According to this tradition, the appointment of kingship was the act of Yahweh in response to the cry of His people Israel (Hinson 1990:87; De Vaux 1961:94). Yahweh’s statement “I have seen the suffering of My people and heard their cry” (1 Sam 9:16) deserves attention. The statement is a perfect example that Yahweh was prepared to intervene in Israel’s leadership crisis. I am tempted to ask questions on Yahweh’s intervention to the situation of His people. Apart from

Exodus3:16b “... I have watched over you and seen what has been done to you in Egypt...” it seems as if Yahweh only intervened in the situation when people cry for help. Why does He have to wait until the people are in trouble? Surely this action could cause confusion and contradiction to Yahweh’s character. Whatever type of interpretation is given, Yahweh’s actions are sometimes strange to mankind. The holiness of God is beyond human understanding (cf. Wright 1992:237-49).

While looking for an alternative model, the Israelites were attracted by the kingship model of their neighbours. They could not foresee the pitfalls in this model. In the Canaanite model of kingship, the king, instead of becoming the servant or shepherd of the community, could easily arrogate power to himself and become the ruler or oppressor of the community, as among Israeli’s neighbours. That was what the prophetic tradition feared and what later proved to be true in Israel (Robinson 1993:50).

History has proved that governments of world power(s) were necessary evil in human society based on its or their style of leadership. God permits those for the service of His people. In this sense, Israelite kings were meant to be Yahweh’s shepherds, His servants. But when those powers drifted away from God and became self-seeking (Deut 17:14-17), they become anti-God and anti-people. This danger is present in every form of human power. Therefore the prophets, the spokesmen of God, were called to serve as watchdogs at all times to warn people when these powers become oppressive and destructive (1 Sam12:23).

(d) Expectation from human king

1 Samuel 8:4-5, 10-17 reveals the classic Israelite perspective on kingship. To have a king meant to become slaves (Pixley 1981:24). The king imposes military conscription on the young men for his army. The king also has his civilian bureaucracy, which includes the conscription of women for domestic service to his place. And then there are the taxes that the king requires to support the army and the civilian bureaucracy (Pixley 1981:24). From the perspective of the freedom of the tribes of Israel, monarchy was viewed as unnecessary and added up to slavery.

(e) Synthesis

A period between Judges and the monarch is significant. In this discussion, it is called a period of transition. It involves the change from theocracy to human leadership. For early Israel Yahweh's kingship was taken to mean politically the exclusion of all human sovereigns. The rejection of human kingship made Israel different from its neighbour (Pixley 1981:20). Although Israel was governed by 'theocratic' leadership, it did not imply that God in Person was the ruler. It was still human beings who exercised leadership. Two contrasting views regarding the monarchy have been discussed. They are: anti-monarchy and pro-monarchy. The former view maintained that the people's demand for a king was an act of apostasy against the LORD, and a rejection of the LORD as King. The latter view states that the appointment of kingship was the act of Yahweh's response to the cry of His people (Hinson 1990:87). As a result, the monarchy was regarded as God's proven leadership. The consequences of human leadership were also stated. Among them, he would impose military conscription on the young for his army, he would also have his civilian bureaucracy and that he would require taxes to support the army and the civilian bureaucracy.

3.3.4.6. Circumstances that led to Israelite monarchy

(a) Introduction

Three features that led to the establishment of monarchy are identified, namely inadequate leadership, pressure from the Philistines and social pressure.

(b) Inadequate leadership

Inadequate leadership was the main contributing factor contributing to the demand of the king during the time of judge's (1 Sam 7:8-5). The sons of the priest Eli were corrupt (1 Sam 2:12-17, 22-25). They were concerned only for their own profit, and not for the correct performance of the will of Yahweh (Zeitlin 1984:149). The power that the sons had as judges brought with it pressure to compromise and temptations to sell favours (Chafin 1989:73-74). Their father had the same opportunities and temptations that they had, but he had resisted them. Their personal greed caused their sense of justice to erode.

Israel was being ruled by judges who were for sale, and there was contempt for the law. When people do not receive justice, whether caused by prejudice or payoffs, it was hard to respect the law. The sin of the perversion of justice was a central theme in the preaching of the prophets (Amos 5:7).

(c) Pressure from the Philistines

Equally important pressure from the Philistines and other surrounding enemies add to Israelites' plight of longing for a central leadership. In the Philistines the Israelites faced a heavily armed well-trained, professional force. The Philistines succeeded in establishing garrisons at key points. They dispatched raiding parties into Israelite territory to collect tribute (Zeitlin 1984:150). Israel's enemy imposed a forced levy on agricultural products of the Israelites (1 Sam 23:1) and disarmed them, by creating a monopoly on iron for themselves (Alt 1927:59-81).

(d) Social pressure

Internal impulse as a result of social pressures operating at the period of the Judges eventually led to kingship and to the transition from a basically patriarchal type of society to the emergence of a monarchical state (Dumbrell 1984:132). The two books of Samuel demonstrate a time of great political and social change in Israel (Alt 1927:59-81). The covenant relationship was to be modified by the addition of kingship. The books commence with a detailed account in the first three chapters to the nature of the debased worship in Shiloh (Zeitlin 1984:150). This was a situation for which Eli, the High Priest, was primarily responsible by his inability to control his two sons Hophni and Phinehas (Dumbrell 1984:133). In particular, the resulting loss of the ark was seen as an appropriate punishment meted out on corrupt leadership that had reduced Israel to such sorry straits. In these circumstance Samuel (1 Sam 1-3) became the man to rescue Israel from the crisis of leadership (Campbell 1975:203-5).

(e) Synthesis

The demand of having a human king continued to gain ground in Israel. Both internal and external circumstances were the major contributing factors to Monarchy. Among them,

the following are heightened. Firstly, *inadequate leadership*: The sons of Eli and of Samuel were corrupt (1 Sam 2:12-17, 22-25). They were concerned only for their own profit, and not for the correct performance of the will of God (Zeitlin 184:149).

Secondly *social pressure*: Internal impulse as a result of social pressure operating at the period of the Judges led to kingship state and to the transition from a basically patriarchal type of society (Dumbrell 1984:132). Lastly, *military attack* by the Philistines and other surrounding nations. Military pressure from the Philistines and other surrounding enemies add to Israelites' plight of change in leadership. The Israelites wanted a king who would lead them to war. The king was admired to ensure the safety of the people.

3.3.5. Monarchy leadership

3.3.5.1. Introduction

The United Monarchy is the term ascribed to the kingdom of Israel in the days of kings Saul, David and Solomon. Unlike the Judges before them and the kings of Judah and Israel after them, those three kings ruled over all the twelve tribes of Israel (Chaney 1986:53-76). The Monarchy arose as a result of the people's demand to crown a king, in order to cope with the Philistines' threat. The United monarchy lasted for about one hundred years and was divided after the death of Solomon (Sarel 1997:23).

Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah, and said to him, "Behold; you are old and your sons do not walk in your ways, 'now appoint for us a king to govern us like all the nations'"(1Sam 8:4-9).

Upon hearing the peoples' demand, Samuel was sure to remind them of what has already being stated in the Deuteronomy 17:14-21. Among others, the king would: appoint their sons in his chariot, appoint commanders of thousands, hundreds and of fifties; daughters would be perfumers, cooks and bakers. The king would take the best of their fields, vineyards and orchards (Gerbrand 1980). He would take the tenth of it to his officers and his servants (1 Sam 8:4-5, 10-17). By stating such remarks concerning the king, Samuel confirmed his disapproval of the idea.

The verses reveal the classic Israelite perspective on kingship. To have a king means to become slaves (Pixley 1981:24). The king imposes military conscription on the young men for his army. The king also has his civilian bureaucracy, which includes the conscription of the women into the domestic service of his place.

3.3.5.2. Criteria for the institution of a king

(a) Election

Election is an act of choice whereby God picked an individual or group out of a larger company for a purpose or destiny of his own appointment. The Hebrew word for this is the word *barah*, which expresses the idea of deliberately selecting someone or something after careful consideration of the alternative (e.g. sling-stones, 1 Sam 17:40, a place of refuge (Deut 23:16); a wife (Gen 6:2); good rather than evil (Isa 7:15f); life rather than death (Deut 30:1, 15, 19ff).; the service of God rather than of idols, Joshh 24:22). The word implies a decided preference from, something positive pleasure in, the object chosen (Isa 1: 29). Israelite faith was founded on the belief that Israel was God's chosen people, starting with Abraham (Gen 11:31-12:7; 15; 17; 22:15-18; Neh 9:7; Isa 41:8). God chose (Exod3:6-10; Deut 6:21-23; Ps 105). Israelite faith looked back to these two acts as having created a nation (cf. Isa 43:1). Within the chosen people, God chose individuals for specific tasks designed to further the purpose of the national election.

Israel's had her own enjoyment of God's blessing and ultimately the blessing of the world. God chose Moses (Ps 106:23), Aaron (Ps 105:26), the priest (Deut 18:5), the prophets (cf. Jer 1:5), the kings (1 Sam 10:24; 2 Sam 6:21; 1 Chron 28:50, and the Servant Saviour of Isaiah's prophecy ('my elect', Isa 42:1; cf 49:1,5), who suffers persecution (Isa 50:5ff), dies for sins (Isa 53) and bring the Gentiles light (Isa 42:1-7; 49:6).

(b) Anointing

Persons and things were anointed in the Old Testament, to signify holiness, or separation unto God: pillars (Gen 28:18); the tabernacle and its furniture (Exod30:22ff.); shields (2 Sam 1:21; Isa. 21:5 to consecrate them for the "holy war", as in the case of Deut 23:9ff; kings (Jdg 9:8; 2 Sam 2:4; 1 Kgs.1:34; priests (Exod28:4); prophets (1 Kgs 19:6).The

importance and solemnity of the anointing was shown. First in relation to holiness (sacred oil or food (Exod30:32-33). Secondly, by the authority the anointing carried (2 Kgs 9:11-13). Thirdly, by the effect produced in the anointed (Exod30:22-33) and sacrosanct (1 Sam 24:7, etc.). Fundamentally the anointing was an act of God (1 Sam 10:1). The word ‘anointed’ was used metaphorically to mean the bestowal of divine favour (Pss 23:5; 92:10) or appointment to a special place or function in the purpose of God (Ps 105:15; Isa 45:1. Further, the anointing symbolised equipment for service, and was associated with the outpouring of the Spirit of God (1 Sam 10:1, 9; 16:13; Isa 61:1; Zech.4:1-14).

3.3.5.3. Functions of the king

Samuel wrote “the rights and duties of the kingship... and laid it up before the LORD”. The institution of the kingship was placed in the context of the covenant between the LORD and His people (Robinson 1993:63). The terms of the covenant, the constitution of the kingship, were written in a book and kept in the temple (before the LORD). It was not said what “the rights and duties of the kingship” were. Deuteronomy17:14-20 gives some indication as to what they could have been (Robinson 1993:63). The biblical description and evaluation of politics were entirely cast in a religious voice. It was difficult to grasp the specific political character of ancient Israelite life (Gottwald 2001:1). The success or failure of every political regime hinged on the religious policies and practices honoured or violated during their incumbency (Gottwald 2001:1). Political leaders were declared good or bad on the basis of religious standards that were not in force in their day. Thus, there was a two-fold blow to an understanding of Israelite leadership: Not only is the politics obscured by religion but the reformist religion used to assess political leadership was known to the political leaders on whom it was unfairly foisted (Gottwald 2001:2).

3.3.5.4. The first monarchy leader

The story of Saul’s appointment is recorded in 1 Samuel 8-12, and the story of his rule is told in the remaining chapter of the book (Brockingson 1962:327). 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 tells how Samuel anointed Saul (Hinson 1990:90; cf. Ackroyd 1971). In 1 Samuel 10:17-27 Samuel’s doubts about the king’s appointed are stated (Hinson 1990:90; Chafin

1989:87). Reason given for his reluctance to appoint a human king was that God was already a King over Israel (1 Sam 8:7; 10:19). Samuel feared that the king would misuse the power given to him by God, and would rule the people in selfish and violent ways (1 Sam 8:11-18; cf. Albright 1969:149ff). Nevertheless, Saul was anointed the first king in Israel. Saul's leadership in Israel was fully accepted, when he proved that he could be an effective leader in warfare. That prepared Israel to understand and accept Saul's authority (Alter 1999:58). The people were willing to give their leader more permanent authority, and recognised him as a king in Israel (De Vaux 1961:95; Polzin 1989:101; Menahem & Sternberg 1968:275).

Saul was constantly leading his soldiers into battle. The physical and emotional strain of that situation was too hard for him. He began to give way to moods of deep depression (1 Sam 16: 14-23), and came into conflict with Samuel. Samuel rebuked him for acting too independently. Saul had claimed the right to make sacrifices before the battle (1 Sam. 13:8-9; Cooke 1961: 202ff). He decided for himself what to do with people, animals, and property taken in warfare (1 Sam 15:9), instead of obeying God's will as interpreted by Samuel (Bright 1951:450ff; cf. Buber 1967: 228; Caird 1953). Samuel felt that his doubts about appointing a king in Israel had proved to be right. Saul was failing to serve God as he ought (1 Sam 15:22-23). Samuel declared that Saul has lost God's favour (1 Sam 13: 14; 15:11). Saul's greatest fault was that he became bitterly jealous of David. Instead of working hard to overcome Israel's enemies, Saul turned his attention to pursuing David. That incident drove him out of the territory he ruled (1 Sam 27:1). Saul's reign came to an end when the Philistines once more set out to conquer Israel. The battle was fierce. Saul's three sons were killed (1 Sam 31:2), and Saul took his own life (1 Sam 31:3-4). The Philistines gained control of the whole of Palestine and even had power over the land east of Jordan as well (Hinson 1990:91; Mauclain 1971).

3.3.5.5. The second monarchy

When Saul died, Israel needed a new king. David was the sensible choice (Cazelles 1955:165ff; Blenkinsopp 1966:207ff; cf. Carlson 1964: 304). He had already become well known among the tribes of Israel. He had killed Goliath, a Philistine leader (1 Sam

17:48-18:12-16). He had been a successful leader in Saul's army (1 Sam 18:12-16). David had shown himself an honourable man in his attitude to Saul the king (1 Sam 24:10; 26:9). He had gathered a large band of men around him and had trained them as an effective army (1 Sam 22:2). David had gained the approval of the Philistines, without betraying his loyalty to his own people (1 Sam 27:8-12). All those things made David a suitable choice as the next king in Israel (Gray 1956:277; Irwin 1941:113ff; Jackson 1965: 187). The second book of Samuel tells the story of David's reign (Hinson 1990:91; McKane 1963; Nicholson 1967: 117). The people of Judah welcomed David as their new king (1 Sam 2:1-4). They had anointed him at Hebron, a place which reminded them of Abraham (Gen 13:18).

In contrast to the rule of Saul, David's reign was one of unification and development of the kingdom (McCarthy 1965:131-138). David brought the tribes together and established an efficient government. He organised the priesthood and maintained an army that scarcely lost a battle. He inherited a divided, war-torn land and when he died, left an empire. David was not only a strong king in contrast to his predecessor; he was the strongest king Israel ever had. He became the measure of others. To be a king like David was the highest accolade a successor could have (Wood 1970:260). A just king was all the nations wanted, both in the Ancient Near East and in Israel (Whitlam 1979; Bellenfontain 1987:47-72).

The world view of the Israelites could not have helped but change radically during the reign of David. Before his rule, the Israelites had been the object of attack, for they had been weak compared to other nations, especially the Philistines. But now matters were reversed. They had become the dominant nation, and those nearby feared them. God's promise to their father Abraham had at last come true (Wood 1970:273). King David was the central figure in the new status of power. He was responsible for it. The people of Israel had followed and marvelled as he led the way. Israel was David's kingdom more than David's was Israel's king (Wood 1970:273). David is regarded as a man of all seasons (Bassler 1996:154-169). Little information is given as to the administrative measures David enacted. There was an indication that he placed general supervisors over each tribe, with the exception of Gad and Asher, though their duties are not described (2

Sam 27:25-31). High taxes had to be imposed to support the program, though considerable foreign tribute was received (Wood 1970:273).

3.3.5.6. The third monarchy leader

Solomon became the ruler of Israel at a time when it was powerful with few enemies. The story of his reign is told in 1 Kings 1-11. Solomon prevented any division within the kingdom by killing potential threats (1 Kgs 2:19-25). Solomon strengthened the kingdom by fortifying cities which were likely to be attacked (1 Kgs 9:15-17). He introduced the use of chariots into Israel (Hinson 1990:96; 1 Kgs 4:26). Solomon made agreements with kings of neighbouring countries, and strengthened those ties by marrying daughters of the kings concerned (1 Kgs 11:1-2). He divided the land into twelve areas, different from the old tribal districts, and included the Canaanite towns which he controlled. Solomon appointed officers over these twelve areas to collect food from the people for use at the King's court (1 Kgs 4:7-19).

Solomon's leadership was marked by four main features: *building projects, extravagant life style, forced labour* and *polygamous marriages*. His most important *building projects* were in Jerusalem with special emphasis on the temple (1 Kgs 6:37). Other buildings included the House of Forest of Lebanon which was used for the storage of weapons (1 Kgs 7:2; 10:16ff), the Hall of Pillars used as the store house for the king's treasure (1 Kgs 7:6), the Hall of Judgement where the king sat to settle disputes (1 Kgs 7:7). Apart from those distinguished buildings, Solomon built his own palaces (1 Kgs 7:8). Solomon became *extremely ambitious*. He was satisfied with only the best and the greatest wealth and glory. He imposed heavy taxes on people in addition to foreign trade. Solomon got into debt, and found it difficult to settle his account with Hiram, the king of Tyre. Eventually he gave Hiram twenty villages in Galilee in payment of his debt (1 Kgs 9:10-14). Solomon *imposed forced labour* among the people. Solomon demanded that the men should work on his building projects, serve in his army, and help with the work of the court (1 Kgs 9:15-22). At first the rougher tasks were given to the Canaanites, but gradually as Solomon's plan grew bigger he began to use the Israelites too. That was so unpopular that one of Solomon's sons, Jeroboam, believed he could lead a revolt. Ahijah,

a prophet, encouraged him, but Solomon was too powerful and Jeroboam fled (1 Kgs 11:28-40).

Solomon did all the things which Samuel had described when he warned the Israelites of the dangers of having a king (1 Sam 8:10-17). The people gradually become more and more discontented with the way in which Solomon was ruling. But he was a well known king, and the people remembered that he was David's son. When Solomon died, however, there was open rebellion against his son (Hinson 1990:98).

3.3.5.7. Synthesis

The dawn of monarchy leadership received with mixed reactions, such as those in favour and those against. The view against monarchy based their argument on the fact that God was the ruler of His people and any attempt to have a human leader was regarded as disloyal to Him. On the other, those in favour of the monarchy support their claim by stating that kingship was God's response to their plight against social and political ills in their land. The continuous pressure in and outside Israel reached an intolerable state. As a result, monarchy leadership was the only solution at that time. Like other nations, Israel had its first king, Saul who was expected to lead them. As the first monarchy leader, Saul was placed on the scale of the prophets, but was found wanting. Leadership in monarchy consisted of three kings, Saul, David and Solomon. The success or failure of monarchy was based on whether the king adhered to God's law. Saul's failure to keep God's law proved that human leadership was inadequate. Under David leadership, the monarchy regained its status and the kingdom was established. As David's son, Solomon enjoyed and benefited the comfort of this form of leadership. It was during Solomon's reign where the king's demand stated by Samuel was mostly felt.

3.3.5.8. Three important offices of leadership

3.3.5.8.1. Introduction

Kings, prophets, and priests were the most important offices of leadership in the Old Testament. Israel's religious and leadership concepts are well understood based on these offices.

3.3.5.8.2. King

When the first kings were appointed, Israel became a nation, in which religion became more efficiently organised than it had been in the past. The first kings appointed in Israel had political responsibilities. Their work was to unite the twelve tribes, and make them strong enough to overcome Israel's enemies. But their work had religious purposes too. The Israelites believed that God had given them the land of Palestine, and that He intended them to have freedom to live there in peace. When the Judges failed to gain permanent victory over their enemies, the Israelites were willing to choose a king, in the hope that he might be more successful (Hinson 1990:100). He would be working to achieve God's purposes in Israel. So the king was to have God's approval as a leader. Although kingship was not originated in Israel, it was a highly recognized office.

3.3.5. 8.3. Prophets

Prophecy played a significant role in the society (Wilson 1980). The Hebrew term for prophets has been used to describe several different sorts of men, who played different parts in the religious life of Israel (Wilson 1980:1ff). Those were: the seer and the prophets, both in groups and as individuals. The first of these groups to appear in Israel were *the seers*. These were men who could 'see' and interpret the truth about the past, present or future more fully than other people (Hinson 1990:101). Those seers were often employed for a fee or present (Num 22:7; 1 Sam 9:6-8). They were expected to have answers for everyday problems and to foretell the future. Sometimes they gave important messages about God's purpose for Israel (Num 23:22-24; 1 Sam 10:1). They did not cast lots, or seek omens. Their special insight was a gift from God (1 Sam 3:15-18). At times there were no seers and the Israelites believed this was a sign of God's displeasure with them (1 Sam 3:1, 28:6). These seers who received their revelation from God felt bound to pass on the truth to other people (1 Sam 3:19-21). Because people found that these seers' words were true, they were respected in Israel (Hinson 1990:101).

The *bands of prophets* were a group of men who lived together at the usual places of worship like Gilgal and Gibeah (2 Kgs 4:38; 1 Sam 10:10; 2 Kgs 2:5). They shared together in a feast of ecstasy stimulated by music (1 Sam.10:5f). Among pagans it was

usual for such prophets to inflict injuries. Those bands of prophets (or sons of the prophets as sometimes they were called) claimed to be able to present a message from God which they all accepted as the truth (1 Kgs 22:6). Such men were not always highly respected (2 Kgs 9:11; 1 Sam 10:11; Amos 7:14). At their best those men prophets were truly used by God, and were only able to prophesy when inspired by Him. Then their message was of national importance, and was often expressed in poetic form. But such bands of prophets joined in a corrupt form of ecstasy and prophesy without true inspiration (Hinson 1990:101), chiefly to please the people and obtain payments for their work (Isa 28:7; Jer 5:31; 6:13; Deut 18:20).

Individual prophets were another group. Those were the men whom the title ‘prophet’ or ‘prophets of God’ is most often used: such people as Nathan, Elijah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, and Malachi (Hinson 1990:101). They first came to a prominent position in Israel when kings had to be appointed. The kings were chosen to lead Israel in the service of God, but very often turned aside from doing His will, and used their authority for their own pleasure and gain (Hinson 1990:102). The prophets were men who spoke up in God’s name at such times, so to rebuke the kings and to point out the way in which God wanted them to go. They were guides and counsellors to the king, when he wished to know what God wanted him to do. Nathan was a good example (2 Sam 7:1-7; 2 Sam.12:1-15; 1 Kgs 1:11, 14; 1 Kgs 1:38-40). The early prophets were spokesmen for God, and people remembered only those parts of their work which affected the history of Israel (Hinson 1990:102). The words of later prophets were recorded for them by their disciples, and some actually wrote books themselves. But always their function was to learn God’s will for His nation, and warn or encourage the people of their time accordingly (Hinson 1990:102).

(a) Message of the prophets

There were three tones to the message of the prophetic message: rebuke, an invitation to repentance and the threat of tremendous punishment (Garbini 1986:87). The most serious of the rebukes that the prophets directed to the people was that they were *idolatrous*, that they were *prostituting*, as the prophets loved to say, and making themselves idols, but it

was foolish to worship pieces of metal or wood. The prophets issued some calls to pursue moral behaviour inspired by justice. Their interventions in matters of foreign policy were more numerous. The kings were utterly mistaken and immoral if they chose to ally themselves with Egypt or recognised Babylonian supremacy (Garbini 1986:88). In that remarkable mixture of religion, ethics and politics, all the people were judged guilty, but the prophets deliberately stressed the responsibility of the ruling class.

Though moving almost always within the sphere of the royal palace, the prophets had a markedly anti-monarchical attitude: the king was in fact the pivot of religious ideology which the prophets fought against, in that it was his personal relationship with the deity that guaranteed the well-being of the people (Garbini 1986:89). Fighting against the king meant fighting against the religion which he represented; and since, for obvious reasons of opportunity (or opportunism), the king could not be attacked directly, attacks were made on his foreign economic policy, in this way concealing the real aim of the criticism (Garbini 1986:89). Garbini (1986:89) pointed out that it is no coincidence that the attack on the monarchy took place in Israel at the very period when there was a crisis in other areas of the eastern Mediterranean, as is evident from an acute study by Cristiano Grotatnelli (cf. 1982:649-70).

3.3.5.8.4. Priests

The duty of a priest was to lead people in the worship of God, and to ensure that they worshiped in a suitable and orderly manner. In Israel the most important part of worship was sacrifice. But the priest was not the only one who could offer sacrifice (Jgs 5:22-24; 13:19, etc.). His duty was to learn and interpret the regulations governing sacrifice, and to advise and instruct others about it. Notice how the priests were condemned, in such passages as Hosea 4:6, Jeremiah 2:8, and Ezekiel 7:26, for knowing ‘the Law’. Very early in the history of Israel the priestly duties became the special responsibility of the Levites (Deut 33:8-10). Detailed knowledge of the regulations for worship was passed on from generation to generation within that family (Hinson 1990:102). The *Thummim* and the *Urim* have been objects which were used to cast lots in order to answer questions arising in the conduct of worship (Num 27:21; 1 Sam 14:41).

3.3.5.8.5. Synthesis

Kings, prophets, and priests were the most important offices in leadership in Old Testament. Power, politics, and prophecies had a significant role in Israel's leadership (Heller 2006:1ff). Based on the nature of his duties, the *king* was declared good or bad on the basis of religious standards. He would be working to achieve God's purpose in Israel. They were expected to rule in justice and peace. *Prophets* played different parts in the religious life of Israel (Emmerson 1997:9-15). They were categorised in three groups, namely: *the seer* were men who could 'see' and interpret the truth about the past, present or future more fully than any other people (Hinson 1990:101). They were expected to have answers for everyday problem and foretell the future (Num 22:7; 1 Sam 3: 1, 15-18; 9: 6-8). The *bands of prophets* lived together at usual places of worship like Gilgal and Gibeah (1 Sam 10:10; 2 Kgs 2:5, 4: 38). *Individual prophets* were another group (Hinson 1990:101). They first came to prominent position in Israel when kings had to be appointed (Levison 2003:503-521). They were men whom the title 'prophets of God' is mostly used such as: Nathan, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai and Malachi. Prophets spoke up in God's name at such times as to rebuke the kings and appoint out the way in which God wanted them to go. They were guides and counsellors to the king (2 Sam 7:1-7; 2 Sam 12:1-15; 1 Kgs 1:11, 14; 1 Kgs 1:38-40; Jer 34:1-5; 37:1-10). The message of the prophets was in three fold: rebuke, an invitation to repent and the threat to tremendous punishment (Garbin 1986:87). The most serious of the rebukes that the prophets directed to the people was that they were idolatrous and prostituting

The office of *the Priests* was another form of leadership. The duties of the priest were to lead people in the worship of God, and to ensure that they worshipped in a suitable and orderly manner (Num 27:21; 1Sam 14:41), to learn and interpret the regulations governing sacrifice, to offer sacrifice (Deut 33: 8-10; Jgs 5:22-24; 13:19). Both the prophets and priest had high influence in Israel's kingship (Hendel 1995:185-198).

3.3.6. Leadership in the divided kingdom

3.3.6.1. Introduction

The division of kingdom that God predicted to Jeroboam through Ahijah had a background in history (Wood 1970:302). Firstly, *early signs for split* between the tribes became one of the contributing factors. The tribes of Judah and Ephraim had been mutually jealous since the days in Egypt. Judah was the largest, and had been honoured *with the lead position* as the tribes moved through the wilderness (Wood 1970:302). Ephraim, in contrast, was one of the smaller tribes, but had been descended from Joseph and had been given precedence over Manasseh by Jacob.

Secondly *at the founding of the monarchy* the existence of the basic cleavage was recognised in God's choice of Israel's two rival tribes (Wood 1970:302). The split was accentuated after Saul's death, when the tribe(s) of Judah crowned David and the northern tribes turned to Ishbosheth (Wood 1970:302). Another incident was marked by Absalom's rebellion and David's return to rule, when the northern tribes once more went their own way, led by Sheba of Benjamin, though this time only for a few days (2 Sam 19:41-20:22).

Thirdly *the burden of monarchy during Solomon fuelled the division*. Solomon's reign had been depicted in a rather favourable light. But there was more to be said. The other side of Solomon's reign reveals that the Golden Age was not all gold (Bright 1959:216). To some it brought wealth, to others, slavery. Its price to all was an increase in the powers of state and the burden, a burden quite without precedent in Israel. Solomon laid a heavy hand on his subjects in the form of taxation. Apart from taxes, labour gangs were levied and forced to work in relays in Lebanon felling timbers for Solomon's projects (1 Kgs 5:13ff). That was both a severe drain on manpower, and a bitter dose for free Israelites to swallow. Solomon's financial predicament drove him to yet one further measure of desperation. This was his cession to the king of Tyre of certain towns along the frontier near the bay Acre (1 Kgs 9:10-14). Solomon's oppressive policy had

completely alienated the northern tribes of Israel from the government in Jerusalem. Only the king's command or military defeat had prevented serious rebellion.

Lastly, *Rehoboam's ignorance* reached the climax of division. Rehoboam had taken the throne in Jerusalem, and been accepted as king in Judah, without incident. But since the monarchy was a dual one, a union of *Israel* and *Judah* in the persons of a king, it was necessary for Rehoboam to journey to Shechem to be acclaimed as king of Israel by the representatives of the northern tribes. The people demanded that the heavy burdens imposed by Solomon, particularly the *corvee*, be abated (Bright 1959:226). Had Rehoboam yielded, it is possible that the state could have been saved. But he was apparently ignorant or contemptuous, of the true feelings of his subjects. Spurning the counsel of wiser heads and acting on the advice of young men, like himself, born to the purple, he insolently rejected the demands. As a result, Israel's representatives angrily announced their secession from the state (Bright 1959:226). The northern tribes then elected Jeroboam, who had meanwhile returned from Egypt, as their king.

In the reigns of David and Solomon, Israel dominated Palestine and the land beyond the Jordan for more than half a century. The great nations of Egypt and Mesopotamia were too weak to intervene (Hinson 1990:105). The smaller nations close to Israel surrendered to the power of the united Israelites. But when Solomon died, the situation changed. The Israelite nation was split by revolution into two unequal parts. The northern territory continued to use the name Israel, but the southern territory became known as the kingdom of Judah. Because of this division, the Israelites, after Solomon's time were unable to maintain their rule over neighbouring countries (Hinson 1990:105).

3.3.6.2. Leadership in Northern Kingdom (Israel)

Jeroboam was the first ruler of the new ten-tribe nation of Israel. He faced the challenge of establishing a new kingdom and exercised good leadership. A working government was put into operation (Wood 1970:304). The capital was established at Shechem (1 Kgs 12:25), and established his permanent capital at Tirzah (1 Kgs 14:17; 15:21, 33; 16:6, 8,

9; etc). He led the people astray by apostasy³⁵. Jeroboam showed ability but forfeited God's blessing because of sin. Jeroboam was succeeded by a series of individuals whose leadership did not last long. There was a time where Israel divided into two. The divided rule existed for four years. This happened during the time of Zimri and Omri.

3.3.6. 3. Leadership in Southern Kingdom (Judah)

The promise of kingship from the line of Judah had a long tradition, going back to the prophecy of Jacob (Stevenson 2000:1). Reuben³⁶ (Gen 29:31-32; 35:23), the firstborn of Jacob, has sinned against his father and has lost the birthright. As the firstborn, Reuben should have been a leader to his brothers and should have received the birthright- a double portion of the inheritance (Deut 21:17). Simeon (Gen 29:33; 34:2, 25, 30; 42:24) and Levi (Gen 29:34; 37:4; 49:5-7), had also disqualified themselves from leadership. The promise of leadership had come to Judah³⁷ (Gen 29:35; 37:26-28; 44:14-45:1; 46:28; 49:3-10; Stevenson 2000:1). In the blessings he received, Jacob foretold the rise of Judah: *"Your father's children shall bow down before you... the sceptre shall not depart from Judah...until Shiloh comes"* (Gen 49:8, 10). Judah was the tribe from which David came. Because of that, when the other tribes split off and went their own way, Judah remained faithful to the lineage of David. Even though Jerusalem was brought to be a neutral city, it was still the boundaries of the lands of Judah (Wimmer 2003:80-87). Furthermore, Judah had been exempt from the forced labour which Solomon demanded of the rest of Israel. The history of these two kingdoms run in parallel course, they both rebelled against God. Judah's history would be marked by occasional periods of repentance and return (Stevenson 2000:1).

The Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler indicate clearly that the activities of all of the godless kings of Judah were responsible for the disaster that was coming to Jerusalem.

³⁵The Deuteronomist warned Israel's leaders against apostasy (the worshiping of false gods).

³⁶Reuben was the firstborn son of Jacob, born to Leah in Paddan Aram. Leah named her first son Reuben because the LORD had looked upon her sorrow at being unloved by her husband.

³⁷Judah was the fourth son of Jacob by his wife Leah and founder of the tribal family out of which the messianic line came (Gen 29:35; Num 26:19-21; Matt 1:2). Judah was one of the prominent of the 12 sons of Jacob. Judah, rather than his older brothers, received Jacob's blessing.

Among them, two are singled out for special condemnation: Manasseh and Zedekiah. Both are known for leading the nation into apostasy (2 Kgs 21:1-8, 16; 2 Chron 33: 1-8). The people were led astray by the king's actions and spiritual life in Judah fell to an all time low (2 Kgs 21:9; 2 Chron 33:9). In response the LORD brought judgment upon Judah as He had the Northern Kingdom (2 Kgs 21:9-15; 24:3-4; Jer.15:1-4).

Manasseh's repentance would not change God's judgment to send the nation of Israel Exile (2 Chron 33:10-17). After his reign God's judgment in the form of defeat and Exile was inevitable (cf. 2 Kgs 22:14-20; 2 Chron 34:22-28). Zedekia's rebellion caused Judah into captivity in Babylon (Ezek17:11-21).

3.3.6.4. Synthesis

The division of the kingdom had a long background in the history. This division was influenced by a number of factors: early signs of splits between the tribes, at the founding of the monarchy, the burden of the monarchy during Solomon and Rehoboam's ignorance reached the climax of division. Israel was divided into two kingdoms, namely the Northern Kingdom known as Israel. The histories of the kingdoms run parallel to each other. The criteria for both kings were evaluated on the basis whether they adhered to God's command or not. Unfortunately most of these kings of both kingdoms did not lead as they were expected. They were known for leading people astray by apostasy. Though both of kingdoms rebelled against the Lord, Judah's history was marked by occasional periods of repentance and return (Stevenson 2001:1).

3.3.7. Leadership under the domain rule

3.3.7.1. Introduction

The kingdoms of Israel and Judah were not strong enough to pursue any independent foreign policy as they were of small significance in the the international politics of the Ancient Near East (Heaton 1968:9; Prichard 1955). When the nations round about were preoccupied with their own problems, the Hebrew kingdoms were free to develop their commerce and expand their territory. When they were threatened by external aggression,

they agreed to sink their differences and enter an alliance. At times, that basic pattern was complicated by an insolent attempt on the part of the minor states to involve the great powers in its own disputes. They ended up being the losers, paying heavily either way - to a victorious foe or victorious friend. Through their history, the two Israelite kingdoms were trapped in a complex international situation. Israel and Judah (Wifall 1975:319ff) were left as two of the half-dozen or so minor kingdoms in Palestine. Their future was to be determined by greater powers from outside - Damascus, Assyria, Egypt and Babylon. They shared a common faith from a religious point of view (Isa 8:14). Politically, however, they were independent (Heaton 1968:8).

3.3.7.2. Northern Kingdom (Israel) under domain rule

The entire history of Israel through the five hundred years of her existence had been spun out in a great power vacuum (Bright 1959:269). Assyria took the path of empire in earnest. The Northern Kingdom (Israel) snapped before the blast and went crashing down. Though Judah managed to survive for yet a century and a half, outliving Assyria, she was not safe to know political independence again (Bright 1959:269). A major source of information is the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler. Israel was in a leadership crisis. The 'ship' of state, leaking at every sea, without compass or competent helmsman and with its crew demoralised was sinking. The words of Hosea, revealed the gravity of her plight (Hos 7:1-7; 8:4; 10:3ff). Bright (1959:272) stated that a graphic picture of the plots and counter - plots had turned the politic asunder (Hos 7:1-7; 8:4, 10:3f). The frantic adjustment of the national policy *this way and that* as one faction and then another seized power (Hos 5: 13; 7:11; 12:1). And also glimpses of a complete collapse of law and order where neither life nor property was safe (Hos 4:1-3; 7:1)³⁸.

³⁸The social crimes that Amos denounced had rent the fabric of society. Setting brother against brother, class against class, section against section, till Israel no longer held together as a nation. The removal of the strong hand of Jeroboam (Bright 1959:272) and the developing Assyrian threat was laid bare. The paganism continued to be practised. Hosea's burden bore its bitter fruit in drunkenness, debauchery, and sexual license under the aegis of religion, all of which corroded the national character (e.g. Hos 4: 11-14, 17f; cf. Isa 28:1-4). With little left on the stern morality

The external decay both expressed itself in, and was aggravated by, the political crisis. Yahweh's covenant with its cohesive power and its sanctions was forgotten (Bright 1959:272; Dumbrell 1984), jealousy, bitterness, and unbridled self-interest had free reign. Israelites turned on Israelites like so many cannibals (cf. Isa 9:19ff), exhibiting a barbarity that shocked even the heathens (2 Kgs 15: 16; cf. Amos 1:13). The state, ever shakily based, completely lost control.

Though Israel, lacking a stable dynastic tradition, had always been liable to revolution, she had preserved the fiction of leadership by divine designation and popular acclamation. Hosea regarded as a sign against Yahweh and a sign of His wrath against the Israelite's monarchy as such (Hos 8:4; 10:3f). With neither internal cohesion nor theological under girding, the state found itself incapable of intelligent or concerted action. Each turn of the helm brought the ship a state closer to the rocks (Bright 1959:273). However, God's grace, which would bring Israel back from the wilderness of catastrophe (Hos 2: 14f; 12:9) heal her faithfulness, and restore once more the covenant bond between people and God (Hos 2: 16-23; 14:1-7). Under Pekah (737-732), Israel made a fatal misstep, and brought the wrath of Assyria down on her head (Cook 1964:121-135). That was Israel's suicide. The Assyrian occupied the land. Israel's political history had ended. The last remnant of her territory was organised as the province of Samaria under an Assyrian governor (Sarel 1997:27). Foreign people brought their native customs and religions with them (Heaton 1968:107).

3.3.7.3. Southern Kingdom (Judah) under the domain rule

The throne of Judah witnessed as many kings as those of Israel, nineteen, but the Southern Kingdom outlived the Northern by about a century and third (Hitti 1951:198).

of Yahwism, there was no integrity, no principle, and no common faith that furnished the basis for disinterested and public –spirited actions (Bright 1959:272).

King Ahaz of Judah's refusal to join the anti Assyrian coalition made Judah escape the calamity that overtook Israel (Bright 1959:276). Ahaz lived long enough to see the fall of Samaria (Roth 1936:34). Year after year, the great armies of the Assyrian warlords devastated the country (Herrmann 1975:254; Roth 1934: 34). Even Hezekiah of Judah was finally involved. That compelled the Assyrian king to intervene, and on whom he proved successful. Not the least of the consequences of Ahaz's policy lay in the realm of religion (2 Kings 16:18; 2 Kgs 16:8, 17; Noth 1943:8-38; Bright 1959:277).

Worse than that, there were signs that the social and moral decay that had destroyed Israel had set in Judah (Bright 1959:277). The national economy, which had been placed on a firm basis by Uzzah, continued sound in Assyrian exactions. Judean towns of the late eighth century had a remarkable homogeneity of population, and given few signs of extremes of wealth or poverty (De Vaux 1961). The disintegration of social patterns and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few had clearly not yet gone to extremes in Judah, as it had in Israel (Bright 1959; Whitlam 1979). Such tension as existed was more between smallholders and villagers on the one hand, and the aristocracy of Jerusalem on the other, than within the fabric of local society itself.

Judahite society was not free of the catastrophes that had destroyed Israel. The situation worsened during the pagan reaction under Ahaz (Bright 1959:278). The wealth class in Judah was no better than its counterpart in Israel; both Amos (Amo 6:1) and Micah (Micah 1:5) went so far as to bracket the two together. The great landholders callously disposed the poor, often by dishonest means (Isa. 3:13-15; 5:1-7, 8, Micah 2:1f), and the judges being corrupt, the poor had no resources (Isa 3: 21-23; 5:23; 10:1-4; Micah 3:1-4; 9-11). Meanwhile the rich lived in luxury, without integrity or concern for the plight of their less fortunate brethren (Isa 3: 16-4:1; 5:11 f., 20-23). Further again, as in Israel, the official religion seems to have offered no effective rebuke (Bright 1959). Supported by the state and devoted to the interests of the state, it was in no position to criticise either the policies of the state or the conduct of the nobles who guided it. The clergy, at least as Micah pictured them, were corrupt: the priests, time-oracles to the size of the fee (Mic 3:5-8, 9-11). Even here debauchery had penetrated (Mic 2:11; cf. Isa 28:7f).

When the prophets pointed out similar sins in Judah and threatened her with divine wrath because of them (Rowley 1967), the feeling had grown that Judah would have to reform if she wished to escape the fate of her northern sister (Herbert 1959). Yet as long as she was subject to Assyria no satisfactory reform was possible. The worship of Assyrian gods (Moscati 1957), which hopelessly aggravated the socio-economic ills of populace (Bright 1959:279), discontinued (cf. Herrmann 1975). Reforming zeal joined hands with patriotism to produce a ground swell of discontent (Zeitlin 1984).

3.3.7.4. Synthesis

The division of the kingdom had a negative impact upon Israel and Judah. Their kingdoms were not strong enough to resist attack from the enemies and to pursue any independent foreign policy. Although both Israel and Judah shared a common faith from a religious point of view, politically they were independent. Their independence was limited and regulated by foreign powers. By secular standards the people of God was a small significance in the international politics of the ANE (Heaton 1968:9). Their freedom was guaranteed when the nations round them were preoccupied with their own problems. When they were threatened by external aggression, they agreed to sink their differences and enter an alliance. Their wellbeing and future were determined by greater powers from outside: Damascus Assyria, Egypt and Babylon. Both kingdoms were burdened by tributes that they were obliged to empty their treasurers and strip the Temple and shrines to meet what was expected.

3.3.8. Circumstances leading to exile

Following the Exodus from Egypt the people of Israel under the leadership of Moses entered into a Covenant relationship with Yahweh (Exod24:3-8). Yahweh was to be their God and they His people. In common with the standard pattern of covenant between suzerains and vassals in the Ancient Near East during that period, a covenant brought the vassal blessings if it was kept and cursing if it was broken. The Israelites were well aware of their responsibilities which were set down for them by Moses in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy (cf. Jer 7:21-26). If they refused to obey Him and went their own way then they would find themselves scattered amongst the nations (Lev

26:27-35; Deut 4:25-31, 40; 8:19-20; 28:36-37, 62-68). When the people later broke this promise, they were called by their leaders to renew their oath (2 Kgs 23:3). Although continually warned by the prophets about where their actions would lead them (Isa 6: 8-13; Jer.1:13-15; 5:14-18; 6:11-12, 22-26; 7:32-34; 8:1-3; 9:13-16; 10: 17-22; 12:14-17; 13:20-27; 17:4; 20:4-6; Ezek 7:21-26; 16:16:59-62; 44:5-9; Mic 4:10) the prophetic books make it clear God's charge against the people of Israel: they had broken every one of God's Covenants. The writers of kings and prophets were in no doubt that the Northern Kingdom fell to Assyria because of the worship of other gods (2 Kgs 17: 7-23; Jer 19: 1-15). Both Ezekiel and Josiah had actively sought to purge Judah of idols, but the death of Josiah at the hands of Pharaoh was deities (Beeking 1997:21-23). The books of Kings and Chronicles indicate clearly that the activities of all of the godless kings of Judah were responsible for the disaster that was coming to Jerusalem (Begg 1982:128-148).

3.3.9. Leadership during evacuation

(a) Introduction

The death of Josiah at the hands of Pharaoh's forces at Megiddo or Mediddo brought to an end his programme of religious and political reforms (2 Kgs 23:33; 2 Chron 36:3). Necho, Egyptian King, set up Eliakim, son of Josiah as his puppet king and changed his name to Jehoiakim as a sign that he was under Pharaoh's authority (2 Kgs 23:33; 2 Chron 36:3). Like his younger brother Jehoahaz, whom he replaced, had none of his father's godly character (2 Kgs 23:32, 37; 24:4; 2 Chrono 35:27). His leadership (reign) was characterised by evil and bloodshed (Jer 22:13-19; 26:20-23). The exilic period was characterised by four types of deportations (Younger 1990:201-27). During that period, four kinds of leadership are identified: Military, vassal leadership, integrated leadership. Superpower leadership was exercised by King Nebuchadnezzar.

(b) Military leadership

Nebuchadnezzar³⁹ captured Jerusalem, destroyed the Temple. To strengthen his empire, Nebuchadnezzar and his army deported members of the royal family as well as some of the golden articles from the temple. That was the *first deportation*. Included in the deportees were Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah who were to be trained in the Royal academy of Babylon (2 Kgs 24:1-25:22; Jer 21-52; Dan 1:1-5:18; Ezra 1:7-6:5 and Ezek 26:7-30:10). In this way Nebuchadnezzar sought to enrich his Empire with the best minds that his empire had to offer (Archer 1985:31-33).

(c) Vassal leadership

Jehoiakim⁴⁰ was a son of the good king Josiah. During his reign Pharaoh Necho of Egypt executed heavy tributes from the people of Judah (2 Chron 36:3, 5). Jehoiakim was forced to levy a burdensome tax upon his people to pay the tribute. The prophet Jeremiah described the arrogance of Jehoiakim in great detail (Jer 1:3; 24:1; 27:1, 20; 37:1; 52:2). He censured Jehoiakim for exploiting the people to build his splendid house with expensive furnishings (Jer 22:13-23). Unlike his father Josiah, Jehoiakim ignored justice and righteousness. He had no intention of obeying the LORD, he did evil in the sight of God (2 Kgs 23:37). His 11 year reign was filled with abominable acts against God (2 Chron 36:8). Jehoiakim's most cynical act was his burning of Jeremiah's prophecies (Jer 36:22-23). He made an agreement with Nebuchadnezzar to serve as his vassal king on the throne of Judah. He later rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, but the rebellion failed and Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians. During this period, Jerusalem was under Jehoiachin, the son and successor of Jehoiakim⁴¹ as king of Judah, about 598 BC (2 Chron 36:8-9; Ezek 1:2). Jehoiachin did evil in the sight of the LORD, like his father. He had little opportunity to influence affairs of state, since he reigned only three months

³⁹Nebuchadnezzar was the king of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (605-562 B.CE). He was the oldest son of Nabopolassar, the founder of the Neo-Babylonian, or Chaldean, dynasty of Babylon.

⁴⁰He was Jehoiakim and was 25 years old when he succeeded to the throne. He reigned 11 years in Jerusalem, from 609 B.C to 598 B.C.

⁴¹In about 602 B.C, after being Nebuchadnezzar's vassal for three years.

(Lockyer 1986:539). His brief reign ended when the armies of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon besieged Jerusalem and the city surrendered (2 Kgs 24: 6-25).

The *second deportation* took place when Nebuchadnezzar reorganised himself against the rebels until the city surrendered (2 Kgs 24: 12-16; Jer 22:24-27). Nebuchadnezzar made Jehoiachin's uncle Mattaniah (renamed Zedekiah) the new vassal (2 Kgs 24:17).

(d) Weak or indecisive leadership

Zedekiah was the last king of Judah (597-586 BC). Nebuchadnezzar installed Zedekiah on the throne as a puppet king and made him swear an oath that he would remain loyal (2 Chron 36:13; Ezek 17:13). Zedekiah was weak and indecisive ruler. He faced constant political unrest. He was under constant pressure (Lockyer 1986:1120).

The *third deportation* was caused by a number of factors in Judah. All those factors were the results of improper leadership by Zedekiah and his counsel. First, the land was in high shortage of skilled people. Second, he had lost most of the experienced men who had served in predecessors. Third, on the other hand he was never accepted as the legitimate ruler by the people, who continued to look upon Jehoiachin as their king. The exiles in Babylon, for example, dated events from the exile of Jehoiachin (Ezek 1:2). Four, the false prophets in Jerusalem confidently predicted that Jehoiakim and the other captives would soon return (Jer 28:3-4). Five, the Babylonians too weakened Zedekiah's position by referring to Jehoiachin as "king of Judah" even after his deportation (Pritchard 1955: 308). Jerusalem was besieged for almost two years from January 587 until July 18th 586. A collection of ostraca (inscribed postcards) addressed to the commander of Lachish (known as the *Lachish Letters*) reveal the desperate state in which the defenders found themselves in the year 588 (Pfeiffer 1962: 37-41; Pritchard 1955: 321-322). In order to ensure that the city would never rebel against him again Nebuzaradan⁴², the commander of the Imperial Guard, ordered that the walls be demolished.

⁴²Nebuzaradan was the captain of Nebuchadnezzar's body guard who played an important part in the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E He was an important Babylonian official. When

All who survived in the city were carried off into exile in Babylon, with the exception of the very poor of the land (2 Kgs 25:8-21; Jer 39:8-10; 52:12-23; cf. 9:11; 26:18). The book of Lamentations paints a sad picture of Jerusalem at this time. The starving population exchanged whatever riches they had left for food (Lam 1:11), its leadership and priesthood were gone (1:19) and the Temple burnt (2:6-12; 4:3-10). The Babylonians soldiers oppressed the survivors and forced them to work for their food (5:11-18). In 581 BC Nebuzaradan deported a further 745 people in retaliation for the murder of Gedaliah and the soldiers of the Babylonian garrison at Mizpah (Jer 52:30).

The government of Judea was incorporated within the province of Samaria and so it effectively ceased to exist as a separate state (Bruce 1987:94). This is the fourth deportation.

(e) Synthesis

The Israelites were well aware of their responsibilities which were set down for them by Moses in the Pentateuch (Jer 7:21-26). If they refused to obey the Lord and went their own way then they would find themselves scattered amongst the nations (Lev 26:27-35; Deut 4:25-31, 40; 8:19-20; 28:36-37, 62-68). When the people later broke this promise, they were called by their leaders (prophets and priests) to renew their oath (2 Kgs 23:3). Although continuously warned by the prophets about where their actions would lead them (Isa 6: 8-13; Jer 1:13-15; 5: 14-18); 6:11-12, 22-26; 7:32-32; 8:1-3) they turned a deaf ear to the advice. Both the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler and the message of the prophets made it clear that the activities of all the godless kings were responsible for the disaster that was coming upon them.

Indeed, the continuous refusal to listen to prophets' advice led the two kingdoms to be evacuated from their land. Israel was evacuated by the Assyrians hundred and twenty years before Judah. Later Judah faced the same fate when the Babylonians advanced in 586

Jerusalem fell to the Babylonians, Nebuzaradan came to the city (2 Kgs 25:1, 8) and took charge of destroying it (2 Kgs 25:9-11).

BC. During the evacuation period, three types of leadership are noted: military, vassal (weak) and misguided leadership.

3.3.10. Leadership during exilic period

3.3.10. 1. Introduction

During the exilic period, the people can be traced in three geographical areas, namely, in Judah, Babylon, Assyria, Egypt and elsewhere. Evidence about the day to day life of the ordinary Israelite during the period of the Exile, can be traced from a few scattered references in Scripture. In this discussion, leadership in Judah and Babylon are noted.

3.3.4.10. 2. Leadership in Judah

Nothing is known about what happened in Judah during the fifty years that followed after (Bright 1960:344). Gedaliah⁴³, the son of Ahikam (who had protected Jeremiah - Jer 26:24) was appointed governor and set up his residence in Mizpah, 12 km (8 miles) North of Jerusalem in what had once been the territory of Benjamin. The remaining people of Judea intermarried with the Samaritans to the North, a practice not followed by the exiles in Babylon and one that was to cause many problems during the Restoration (cf. Ezra 4:1-24; 9-10; Neh 13:23-28) (Pfeiffer 1962:44-45). The biblical account of the depopulation of Judea is supported by archaeological evidence that demonstrates that during the exilic period no site in Judah was continually inhabited (Hoerth 1998:369; Miller & Hayes 1986: 416-417; Pfeiffer 1962: 43-44). This much reduced population was probably able to survive quite comfortably and at the end of that season they harvested "wine and summer fruit in great abundance" (Jer. 40:12). From this the Babylonians probably received a portion as tribute (Hoerth 1998: 369). With them lived Jeremiah, who had been spared by Nebuchadnezzar and entrusted by him into the safekeeping of

⁴³ Gedaliah was the son of Ahikam (who had protected Jeremiah - Jer. 26:24) was appointed governor and set up his residence in Mizpah, 12 km (8 miles) North of Jerusalem in what had once been territory of Benjamin. He was appointed governor by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kgs 25:22-25). He governed Judah from Mizpah, where after only a two- month rule was assassinated by a Jewish nationalists led by Ishmael. Gedaliah's father had protected Jeremiah, and Gedaliah did the same.

Gedaliah the new ruler (Jer 39:11-14; 40:5-6). It is possible that Gedaliah was actually made king by Nebuchadnezzar and not "governor" as some translations describe him. The writers of kings may have been reluctant to accept him as such because he was not of the line of David, but references to the "Kings daughters" at Mizpah in Jeremiah's account makes more sense if they refer to the children of Gedaliah than those of Zedekiah (Jer 41:10). On this line of reasoning Jeremiah 41:1 would refer to Ishmael being one of Gedaliah's chief officers, rather than Zedekiah's (Miller & Hayes 1986:423). However, the textual evidence is ambiguous and the verse could be translated to support either view.⁴⁴

3.3.10.3. Leadership in Babylon

The Jews living in Babylon represented the cream of their country's *political*, *ecclesiastical*, and *intellectual* leadership (Bright 1960:345). Their number was not large. Though few in number, there were those who would shape Israel's future, by both giving her faith a new direction and providing the impulse for the ultimate restoration of the community in Palestine (Bright 1960:345). These exiles were naturally distressed when they arrived in what was to be their new homes, such as the settlements at Tel-Abib on the Chebar River (Ezek 1:1; 3:15), Tel-melah, Tel-harsha, Cherub, Addan and Immer (Ezra 2:59; Neh 7:61). Donald E. Gowan describes the psychological trauma that the people must have suffered as devastating (Gowan 1998:122)⁴⁵.

Psalm 137 most probably expresses the exiles' grief when they were taunted by their captors concerning their former home that few, if any, were to see again. Yet in many

⁴⁴NIV and NASB translations of Jer41:1.

⁴⁵Many must have been isolated individuals, still in shock from seeing their loved ones die, or frantic with anxiety because they did not know what had become of husband or child, wife or parent. And they walked, day after day, for months. The route from Jerusalem to Babylonia is about 700 miles. They walked, and more died, and then found themselves in a strange and forbidding land, not hilly and wooded like Palestine, but a flat alluvial plain, marked only by great rivers and an extensive network of canals watering fertile fields; and here and there what seemed to them to be immense walled cities, with temple towers looming into the heavens.

ways their condition was better than those who remained in the land. Jeremiah had promised that the LORD would be with the exiles and gave instructions that they settle down and serve the Babylonians as best they could until the Lord restored their descendants to the Land (Jer 24:1-10; 29:4-14). It is assumed that they had to render labour to the Babylonians, but generally they enjoyed a great deal of freedom (Noth 1996:296; Younger 2003a:36-45ff). Some of the exiles, like Daniel and his three friends rose to positions of power within the Royal Court of Babylon (Dan 2:48-49) and many others became wealthy (cf. Ezra 1:4, 6; 2:68-69). Daniel and his friends portrayed intellectual leadership. Later, during the Persian period Jews like Mordecai (Esther 2:19-23), Esther (7:1-10) and Nehemiah (Neh 2:1-10) all found themselves in key positions in the government and were able to act on behalf of their people because they took Jeremiah's advice. Mordecai and Esther portrayed political leadership. Nehemiah and Ezra portrayed ecclesiastical leadership.

One of the most significant changes brought upon the Jews in exile was their forced introduction to a new language: Aramaic. Although Hebrew remained a living language learning Aramaic allowed them to communicate with their neighbours and engage in business. It remained the *lingua franca* of Syria and Palestine until the seventh century AD. After the exile Aramaisms and text in Aramaic is found in the Old Testament writings (e.g. Ezra 4:8-6-18; 7:12-26; Dan 2:4b-7:28) (Pfeiffer 1962:54). It also became necessary to translate the text into Aramaic for those in the congregations who did not know Hebrew (e.g. Neh 8:8). These were written down and became what we know today as the Targums.

3.3.4.10.4. Leadership in Assyria, Egypt and other environment

It should be taken into consideration that apart from the Babylonian captivity, the children of Israel were scattered among their nations as well. The Israelites were captured by the Assyrians, some sought refuge in Egypt. And other places. Leadership in those places cannot be traced with certainty due to limited information available.

3.3.10.5. Synthesis

During the exilic period, the people can be traced in three geographical areas, namely, in Judah, Babylon, Egypt, and elsewhere. Leadership vacuum in Judah caused instability among people who remained in the land. Leaders such as Gedaliah were appointed by Nebuchadnezzar. The Jewish living in Babylon represented the 'cream' of their country's political, ecclesiastical and intellectual leadership (Bright 1960:345).

3.3.11. Leadership during post-exilic and restoration periods

3.3.4.12.1. Introduction

Leadership during post exilic period consists of two faces. Leadership during post-exilic period covers the period when the Jews were in a foreign land. Although they were still in a foreign land, most Jews were comfortable (Williams 2002). Leadership during restoration covers the period when the children of Israel returned to their native land.

3.3.4.12.2. Leadership during post-exilic period

The transitional leadership in superpower land had a great influence in reshaping leadership in Israel during post-exilic period. Cyrus' policy was to win the favour of his subjects by reversing the policies of the Elamites, Hittites, Assyrians and Babylonians. Instead of deporting conquered populations and their gods he allowed them to return home and practice their own religions. In line with this policy Cyrus issued a decree allowing the Jews to return to their own land in 539 BC (Ezra 1:1-4; 6:3-5) (Bright 1980: 360-362; Yamauchi (1990:89-92). In doing so he set in motion the fulfillment of the prophecies made many years before (Deut 30:1-5; Isa 44:24-28; 45:11-13; 48:20-21; 51:9-11; 61:1-7; Jer 12:15-17; 16:14-15; 29:10-14; 30:1-24; 31:1-40; 32:6-15, 36-44; 33:6-26; Ezek 20:39-44; 36:8-15, 19-38-37:1-23; 39:25-29). Although only a small percentage of the people actually returned (Neh 7:4-69; cf. Isa 6:13; 10:20-23) the period of the exile was technically over.

3.3.4.12.3. Leadership during restoration

(a) Political leadership

During the years of Persian history, significant events transpired for the Jews. The principal among those were the three separate returns from captivity under influential leaders, namely: Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah. The first return was under Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1:1) in 538 BC. The second return was under Ezra (Ezra 7:6-10) in 458 BC, and the third return was under the leadership of Nehemiah (Neh 2:1) in 444BC. Three types of leadership can be identified namely: Political, spiritual and charismatic. These types of leadership are demonstrated by Cyrus, Ezra and Nehemiah.

Politically, Cyrus was a powerful king of Persia (ca 559-530). He was regarded as ‘Cyrus the Great’ (Lockyer 1986:272). As a political leader, he allowed the Jewish captives to return to their homeland in Jerusalem after he led the Persians to become the dominant nation in the ancient world (2 Chron 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-4). This restoration was prophesied by Jeremiah (Jer 29:10-14, 44:28). After becoming king of Persia Cyrus expressed his leadership skills by conquering the Medes, Lydians, and Babylonians (549, 547, and 539, respectively). Cyrus is praised mostly, in the Old Testament (Isa 44:28, 45:1) where he is called God’s ‘shepherd’ and ‘anointed’. He was known to be a wise and tolerant ruler (Lockyer 1986:272). Reports on the progress of the work related to the decree of Cyrus are recorded (Ezra 3:7; 4:3, 5; 5:13, 14, 17; 6:3,14; Dan 1:21; 6:28; 10:1). Cyrus played a significant role in the building of the Temple in Jerusalem. In Ezra 6:1-12, Cyrus exercised his authority by giving some ideas in relation to the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem (Lockyer 1989:272).

(b) Religious/spiritual leadership

Ezra, a scribe and a priest who led the second group from the Babylonian captives in Jerusalem to make a new commitment to God’s law demonstrated religious (spiritual) leadership. The second group came eight years later, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (458 B.C.; Ezra 7:7). There were fifty-eight years between the completion of the Temple and the second return of the Jews of Judah. Ezra was a descendant of Aaron,

skilled in teaching the Law (Ezra 7:6, 10). Ezra was known to Artaxerxes, for this Judean had attained a position of some standing at the court. He held an office like Minister of Jewish Affairs (Wood 1970:395). In some undisclosed manner he persuaded the king to permit him to travel to Judah for the purpose of effecting needed religious reforms.

As a skilled scribe and teacher with an extensive training in the Pentateuch, he did a lot of work on the Hebrew Bible of that time (Ezra 7:6, 12). Ezra modernised the language, corrected irregularities in the text, and updated and standardised expression in the passages. His task was to copy, interpret and transmit the books of the Law (Lockyer 1986:370). Through Ezra's leadership, the Jewish people celebrated one of the greatest festivals, the Feast of Tabernacles, to commemorate their sustenance by God in the wilderness following their miraculous escape from Egyptian bondage (Neh 8). Ezra proved he was a capable leader who could point out shortcomings while leading the people to a higher commitment of God's law (Ezra 7:9).

(c) Resourceful leadership (Charismatic leadership)

Nehemiah was the governor of Jerusalem who helped rebuild the wall of the city (Neh 1:1; 8:9; 10:1; 12:26, 47). Nehemiah's leadership character was revealed by his zeal to rebuild the wall in Jerusalem. After learning of the deplorable condition of the returned exiles in Jerusalem (Neh 1:2-3), Nehemiah decided to act. His influential skills persuaded King Artaxerxes. By leading the third group of captives from Babylon to Jerusalem and starting a building project, Nehemiah demonstrated charismatic leadership.

Nehemiah's determination is portrayed as he stood against opposition from enemies (Neh 2:10, 19; 6:1-14). Neither the enemies' ridicule (Neh 4:3) nor could their conspiracy to harm (Neh 6:2) could stop the project. Against overwhelming odds, he encouraged the people to 'rise up and build (Neh 2:18). The building of the wall was completed after 52 days (Neh 6:9). Apart from rebuilding the wall, Nehemiah's leadership was expressed by leading many social and political reforms among the people.

(d) Synthesis

Leadership during post exilic period consists of two stages namely post and restorations. The transitional leadership in superpower land had a great influence in reshaping leadership in Israel during post-exilic period. Cyrus' policy was to win the favour of his subjects by reversing the policies of the Elamites, Hittites, Assyrians and Babylonians. The restoration was marked by dramatic events. It consists by a number of separate returns. Three types of leadership have been identified: Cyrus a powerful king of Persia demonstrated political *leadership* when he allowed the Jewish captives to return to their homeland in Jerusalem and other places (2 Chron 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-4). *Spiritual leadership* was exhibited by individuals like Ezra. Ezra, a scribe and a priest led the second group from the Babylonians to make a new commitment to God's law. Furthermore, charismatic leadership can be traced through Nehemiah's (re)building projects. As a governor at Jerusalem he revealed that he was a capable leader (Neh 1:1-3, 8:9; 10:12; 26, 47).

3.3.4.12. Synthesis

The concept of leadership in the Ancient Near East and in Israel and the Old Testament has been traced. The exploration of leadership in the Ancient Near East was crucial to give a clear picture of leadership in Israel and the world of the Bible. There has been a set criteria or a standard to evaluate or distinguish between effective and ineffective leadership. A standard definition therefore should include justice as obedience to God's law. The main function of the king was to see that justice was established and maintained throughout the kingdom. The establishment of justice by the king was of paramount importance for the well-being of the nation in its widest sense.

Leadership in the Old Testament underwent different stages in different periods: the primeval, patriarchal, theocratic, transitional, monarchy, divided monarchy, foreign domain, exilic and post exile as well as restoration period. Each period or stage was characterized by leaders whose leadership was either good or bad. Some leaders ruled according to God's standards while others chose the opposite. In Israel, the criteria for

good leadership were to obey God's command and lead the nation to worship Him. Four outstanding features were of paramount importance in both the ANE and in Israel: (a) *to lead the people to God/deity*, (b) *to ensure the safety and security of the people against outside enemies*, (c) *to seek justice and peace in his /her reign* and (d) *to manage the resources of the land*. The David discussed in this study will be evaluated on these crucial criteria in order to attain him as an ideal leader. The question is: will he qualify?