

CHAPTER 4

NARRATIVE-CRITICAL AND THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON DAVID'S LEADERSHIP CHARACTER

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter narrative-critical and theological perspectives on David's leadership will be explored. David, king of Israel was, possessed by every flaw and failing of which a mortal is capable. Men and women favoured him, and God showered him with many blessings. A charismatic leader exalted as a "man after God's own heart" (1 Sam 16:3b, 12c). David was capable of deep cunning and bloodthirsty violence (Throntveit 2003:375; cf. Halpern 2001:479). Weaving together biblical texts with centuries of interpretation and commentary, as well as the startling discoveries of modern biblical archaeology and scholarship, Jonathan Kirsch (2001:1) brings David to life with extraordinary freshness, intimacy, and vividness of detail, revealing him in all his glory and fallibility. At the centre of this dramatic narrative stands a hero of flesh and blood - a man as vibrant and compelling today as he has been for millennia (Kirsch 2001:1).

A theological perspective on aspects of David's leadership is portrayed in two traditions, namely in the Deuteronomistic History and in the Chronicler or Chronistic History (Ezra-Neh; 1-2 Chron). Equally important, these traditions are found in biblical and Old Testament theologies (Goldingay 2009:2ff). In order to give a balanced theological perspective on some of David's leadership qualities, the following theologies are to be discussed: Biblical Theology, Old Testament Theology, traditions that portray David's character, with special emphasis on Minimalism, and Deuteronomistic and Chronistic Theologies.

4.2. Theological perspective on David's leadership

4.2.1 Biblical Theology

Biblical Theology seeks to discover what the biblical writers believed, described, and taught in the context of their own times (Miller 2000:3). This theology is based on Bible texts. Furthermore, Biblical Theology assumes that the canon was provided through the instrument of human authors (Stone 2001:57 cf. Friedman 1987:107). Biblical texts convey different meanings to different people: this theology is regarded primarily as a theological tract, a set of religiously mandated laws of behaviour and ritual; A theological record of a nation's history; and a collection of myths or literary fiction (Hilleli 2006:5). Biblical Theology is described as "that discipline which sets forth the meaning of the books of the Bible in their historical settings (Bullock 2003:97ff). Biblical Theology is a descriptive discipline". Theology of this kind is not concerned with the final meaning of the teachings of the Bible or their relevance for today; this is the task of Systematic Theology (Carson 2000:89; Stone 2001:57). Biblical Theology has the task of expounding the theology found in the Bible in its own historical setting, and its own terms, categories, and thought forms (McConville 2007:7). The intent of the biblical texts is to tell a story about God and His acts in history for humanity's salvation.

The reality of the presence of God stands at the centre of biblical faith (Wells 2000:5; cf. Schmidt 1983:15). His presence is elusive. This deity of the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures escapes man's intellect and manipulation (Lyle 2009:2ff; cf Terrien 1978: xxvii). In order to examine the Hebraic theology of God's presence and its direct influence upon the birth of Christianity, one has to analyse those biblical traditions and poems that describe the encounter of God with men (Terrien 1978: xxvii). David remains an important character in biblical theology. Both the Old and New Testament refer to David in their teachings about God's people who advanced His kingdom. David's musical talents are expressed throughout biblical texts. Since Biblical Theology continues to play (a) vital role(s) in the understanding of early Israel's faith, and of Jewish-Christian faith from the time of immemorial to date, conclusions will be drawn to examine the importance of this theology in relation to leadership. Having gone through Biblical Theology as an umbrella

body, this study tries to focus on Old Testament Theology with the aim of highlighting some influential views of the time.

4.2.2. Old Testament Theology

Old Testament Theology portrays what is revealed about God and His creation, including His people in the Old Testament (Gerstenberger 2002:13). The system of Old Testament theology takes various truths that Old Testament books portray about God and presents them in an organised fashion (Kitchen 2003:1). God's portrayal of Himself begins in Genesis 1:1: "*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth*" This statement is a presupposition that people accept by faith and is based on the study of God throughout all the Scriptures from Genesis to Malachi. Since God is made known through His character, His attributes are portrayed in the Old Testament (Craig 2005:392ff, cf. Friedman 1987:107). Then a theological study can be made of these texts. It is discovered that the Old Testament reflects an application of theology to a relationship that God established with a created people, the Israelites (Barstad 2001: 47ff).

The term 'theology' refers to 'words' or 'thoughts' about God (Gerstenberger 2002:1). Throughout the Old Testament there is a progressive revelation of God to His people. The application of the word 'testament' carries one beyond the fact of books or writings to their main theme (cf. Klement 1999:439-459). The Old Testament contains the idea of a covenant between God and man, first made with Adam (Gen 2:15, 21-25; 3), then with Noah (Gen 9) and also with Abraham (Gen 12; with the nation of Israel) and with David (Kratz 2000:14). The differences and similarities of these covenants can not be ignored. Each covenant has its unique emphasis based on time and space as well as on the people involved. The Scripture refers time and again through the history, the psalms, proverbs and prophecy, to this covenant into which God entered with His chosen people (Brettler 2007:7ff).

Though Old Testament theology has a close relationship to the New Testament they both have a discrete witness of their own (Barr 2000:20-27). Old Testament theology portrays

the Old Testament's unique picture(s) before a Biblical theology incorporates the New Testament perspective. The ultimate goal is to produce a Biblical theology to unite the testaments at the proper moment (Barton 2007:3). Students of the Bible now recognise that the people of the Ancient Near East have largely influenced Israel's beliefs and cults. It is also believed that at the same time, a number of scholars tend to ignore the fulcrum milieu; the Hebrews developed a unique theology of the presence of God (Gerstenberger 2002:13; cf. Terrien 1978:1).

The text of the Old Testament contains portrayals of Israel's faith journey and its application of the tradition to life. Literature of the Hebrew Bible is the product of a God-fearing community (Cate 1994:4). People who wrote the books of the Old Testament composed them as an expression of their faith experiences and because they judged that this writing might inspire faith in God, courage and understanding God's dealing with His people (Barton 2007:83). The community grounded its experience of God in their history and believed that His commitment to them provided security in a threatening world. But their world never stayed the same (Bandstand 1995:9).

In the Ancient Near East empires rose and fell. Israel had to adapt to their changing environment. Part of the adaptation was applying the traditional guarantees of God to an uncertain future. Part of what is meant by reading the Old Testament theologically is to read the text as the *record of the faith of a community* that was defined by its theological traditions. From the Torah to the Writings, the history of the text composition reveals the community's record of how they had heard God speaking to them (Obad 2001:25). The Old Testament contains the record of a creative tension between religious traditions and the need for change. Old and new, stability and change, tradition and innovation, text and reinterpretation –these are all the parameters that order our reading of the theology of the Hebrew Bible. It should be kept in mind that the Old Testament theologies were influenced by various ideologies such as religious, political and socio-economic factors. The Old Testament theology has to do with how God revealed Himself to the nations in the Ancient period and on how people responded to His demand.

4.2.2.1. Traditions that portray David's leadership

4.2.2.1.1. Introduction

Three different versions of David's life story are offered in this discussion, namely the Deuteronomistic History, the Chronistic History, and the Minimalist Theory. The portrayal of David's story is based on the Deuteronomistic History (1 Sam-2 Kgs) and the Chronistic History (1-2 Chron). The Deuteronomistic History emphasises the negative aspects of the monarchy and the partially positive aspects of the Davidic dynasty (Fouts 2003:283ff; Baines 1998:46). The negative and positive aspects are influenced by a redactional approach (Auld 2000:19-28) as well as the traditional critical (Campbell 1986:17-21). The Chronicler, however, concentrates more on the positive aspects of kingship. The 'David' of Chronicles is portrayed as a spotless holy king who delivers solemn oration. He and his sons do not rule in Israel, but in the 'kingdom of Yahweh' (1 Chron 23:5; 29:23). Solomon occupied the throne of Yahweh (Kratz 2000:87). The Deuteronomistic History on the other hand turns its attention to the 'David', who would dominate the story until his own death in 1 Kings 2 (Polzin 1993:1; Edelman 2000c:67ff). Both the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Chronicler present theological views about David. These portrayals help us to shape the life of David in a balanced scale. The 'minimalists' historians deny that David existed at all (Throntveit 2003:375).

4.2.2.1.2. Minimalist view

The Minimalist school of thought within Biblical Studies is of the view that the various David and Solomon stories, as well as the wider Deuteronomistic History are late (late post exilic) and largely fictional (Finkelstein and Silberman 2007:261). This Minimalist view maintains that the compositions about David in the Deuteronomist are motivated by theology and contain vague and unreliable historical information about the origins and early history of Israel (McKenzie 2000:34-35, 155-161). Opinions differ among the minimalists about when ancient scribes wrote these texts. They are however confident that it took place many centuries after the kingdom of Judah ceased to exist (Finkelstein and Silberman 2007:261). For Finkelstein, a biblical writer was not actually describing the period about which he was writing (narrated time), instead he was inventing history

about that period (time of narration). Finkelstein has not denied the existence of either David or Solomon, but he is not concerned that those personalities were described in the biblical texts (Shanks 2002:45; cf. Shanks 1997:36ff).

Davies (1992:1ff) puts the composition of the story into a clear political context. He sees the creation and compilation of the Deuteronomistic History as a long process, with the final form of the narrative being created in Hasmonaean Judea during the second century BCE. Davies (1992:10) depicted the ideologies of authors regarding biblical text as in service of the Temple. Other minimalist scholars traced their ideology back to the political goals of the Judean priests and nobles who had returned from the Babylonian exile in the late sixth and fifth centuries BCE (Davies 1992:306, 415ff). These new leaders, the theory suggested, were loyal agents of the imperial power but they were eager to bolster their position among the population that had remained in the land of Judah during the exile (Davies 2005:117-36). As imposed elite that had ousted the local leadership of Judah, they needed to create a history to legitimise their role (cf. Isbell 2004:211ff). The Jerusalem scribes of the post-exilic period collected the folktales and vague memories and skilfully wove them into the wholly imaginary history that stressed the centrality of Jerusalem, its temple, its cult, and its priests (Collins 2004:183). It was a complete innovation, designed to establish a “national” myth of origin where none existed before (Garbin 2003:17ff). According to this premises, OT narratives are not only historically baseless, but powerful, focused propaganda that sold an essentially made-up narrative of patriarchs, Exodus, conquest, and the glorious age of David and Solomon to a credulous public in the Persian and Hellenistic period (Finkelstein and Silberman 2007:261).

Although the Minimalist view denies the existence of the David narratives, however, the authentic information about David cannot be dismissed. Taking into consideration that the Davidic narrative is referred to over a thousand times both in the Old and New Testament, I would like to argue that David remained an ideal leader in the history of humankind.

4.2.2.1.3. ‘So-called’ Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories

4.2.2.1.3.1. Introduction

In the past several decades’ scholars have debated the nature of Old Testament history writing (Galil 2004:413; Spieckerman 2001:337-358; Anderson 1999:165). The emphasis is based on the disparity of presentation between the books of Joshua, Kings and 1-2 Chronicles (and Ezra-Neh) commonly known as the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories (DC). The term ‘Deuteronomistic History’ is a theoretical construction of the idea that the books of Deuteronomy to Kings were compiled during the exilic period from a number of pre-existing sources to form a unified work (Satterthwaite & McConville 2007: 19; Noth 1991:4). Martin Noth (1991: 49ff) first coined this term. The term refers to historical writings known as the Early Prophets that share an ideology in common with the Book of Deuteronomy (Collins 2004:183).The Deuteronomist emphasised prosperity and blessings for obeying Yahweh’s commandment and destruction and curse for disobedience. The Chronicler’s History is a phrase used to describe the biblical books of 1 and 2 Chronicles, usually combined with Ezra and Nehemiah (Sparks 2008; Klein 2006; Knoppers 2000:181ff; 2004; McKenzie 2004).Both histories were written by two different authors and addressed to specific audiences in different periods.

The two traditions are theologically motivated interpretations of the traditions of Israel (Thronveit 2003:374; Baqon 1965). The author of the Chronicler however was familiar with the events. The Chronicler is more concerned with repentance than retribution. Scholars have long recognised the difference between the presentations of the historical events according to Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (Edelman 2000:67-84; Davies 1992:16ff). The differences are many and obvious. Although Noth’s (1991:4, 49-53) perception regarding the single authorship of the Deuteronomistic History is widely accepted, the idea has been challenged by: redactional approaches (Auld 2000:19ff; Veijola 1977:115-122) and (2) Traditional critical analysts (Campbell 1986:17-21; McCarter 1980:18-23) as well as (3) other approaches. The redaction approach is represented by the Harvard school (Cross 1973:274ff ;) and the Gottingen school (Veijola 1975). The Harvard school identified two editions, namely: (1) a pre-exilic and (2) exilic

redaction. The Gottingen school opted for three redactional editions, namely: (1) a history writer (DtrG); (2) a prophetic redactor (Dtr), regarded as an (the) author(s); and (3) a nometric redactor (DtrN) (Person 2002:2-3ff).

Beyond some Chronological discrepancies, major differences are in the presentation of events, differences that stem from theological differences (Edelman 2000:67-83). Authorship, meaning, development, the significant and theology of both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories receive attention. How each tradition has portrayed David is crucial in this discussion.

4.2.2.1.3.2. Deuteronomistic History (DH)

(a) Introduction

It is of paramount importance to have some background on the Deuteronomistic History in this study. The David portrayed in the Scriptures (both the Old and the New Testament) is made by this tradition. Apart from the Deuteronomy there would be no information about David. It should be known that even the Chronicler tradition used the Deuteronomistic as a source.

(b) Who was the Deuteronomist?

The author(s) of the Deuteronomistic History or tradition is (are) of importance in this document (Breytenbach 2000:50-61). Noth (1943:1-110) maintained that one editor was responsible for the whole of the Deuteronomistic History. He suggested that the final verses of 2 Kings 25:27-30 were added by the Deuteronomist from his own knowledge. This view of unitary authorship is the one aspect of Noth's thesis which has not been accepted (Coggins 1999:24). The Deuteronomist (Dtr) can therefore be associated with the single person (editor) or group of people (editors) with antiquarian intent (Noll 2007:311-45). McKenzie (1962:1-6) regards the author or the editor as four Samuels.

The author(s) compiled and selectively rewrote a vast collection of source material into a historical work characterised by a single Deuteronomy theology and purpose (Bartholomew 2005:396). The history named after, for this single editor/writer, namely

the Deuteronomistic Historian (Dtr). Auld (2002:167-81) refers to the Deuteronomist as “internationally traded currency”. Coggins (1993:80-94) argued that the Deuteronomist(s) have sometimes been praised or blamed for virtually every significant development within ancient Israel’s religious practice.

Traditionally scholars have seen the hand of the Deuteronomists in an impressive amount of biblical literature (McKenzie 2001:393). Scholars or the Deuteronomist’s influence was still confined to a relatively small portion of the biblical corpus (Wilson 1999:68). They were responsible for Deuteronomy and for most of the so called Deuteronomistic History (Josh, Jdg Sam and Kgs). Apart from the Deuteronomistic books (De Pury 2000:388ff). The Deuteronomists were thought to be responsible primarily for the non-narrative prose in Jeremiah, Isaiah 36-39, and for small units in Amos and Hosea (Wilson 1999:68). Richard Nelson (1968:68) surmised that the final form of the Deuteronomistic Historian’s work consisted “roughly of Joshua 1-12, 23; Judges 2-16; 1 Samuel 1 through to 2 Samuel 20; and all of 1 and 2 Kings,” with the other sections of the history added later. The climax of this DH’s inspiration is surely the reform movement of Josiah. After the short-lived reform, the nation quickly spiraled to disaster and destruction at the hands of the Babylonians. The connection of the DH to Josiah also affects the debate concerning the literary history of the work (Leithart 2006; McKenzie 2000:135-145). Scholars argue that at least two editions of DH were created, one during the Josianic reform, 626-609 BC, and the other in the sixth century, after 562 BC (Koster 2000:120-149; Williamson 1982:141-161).

Before moving on to the theological themes of the Deuteronomist’s and Chronicler’s histories, some deficiencies of the DH theory should be mentioned. Howard (1993:78, 179-182) argued that the primary deficiencies are the negative theme of the work and the creation of a Tetrateuch that is neither literarily nor canonically viable. Noth (1966:145ff) argued that the primary purpose of the DH was to explain the overthrow of Judah by Babylon. The DtrN redactor evaluated kingship negatively (Veijola 1977:119-122). Other scholars have suggested other, more positive themes, such as the ongoing promise to David as a word of hope (Cross 1973:277). Scholars still debate the nature of the connection between Deuteronomy and the first four books of the Pentateuch. As Howard

concluded, one needs not posit a sixth century origin for Deuteronomy in order to agree with Noth's basic conclusions concerning the literary production of Joshua and 2 Kings. The (DH) author's relationship with the earlier material (of the tradition) is more difficult to judge (Römer 2000:24-141). It is perhaps possible to speak of him as the 'author' (Howard 1993:182). The discussion of themes will now follow.

(c) Meaning of Deuteronomistic History

Half a century ago 'Deuteronomy' and 'Deuteronomistic History' were terms applied in biblical studies to the book of Deuteronomy or to the proposed pentateuchal D source (Coggins 1999:22). In practice the difference between the two usages was conducive, in most versions of Pentateuch Criticism D was largely confined to the book of Deuteronomy (Knoppers 2001:393). Studies have changed the situation. The additional adjective 'Deuteronomistic' has been coined, and its influence is all-pervasive (Cook 1986:27-48). The Deuteronomistic History (DH) is defined as that historical work encompassing the biblical books of Deuteronomy through 2 Kings (Richter 2002:1). The theory of a Deuteronomistic History, as the appropriate description for the books Joshua and 2 Kings, first propounded by Noth in 1943 (Coggins 1992:24). Noth's theory has won universal acceptance, and this brings the dating down to the middle of the sixth century. Since then, the Deuteronomists survived for some sixty years at least after the discovery of the Law-book under Josiah (Briend 2000:360ff).

(d) Development of Deuteronomistic History

The development of the Deuteronomistic History has attracted the attention of various schools of thoughts. Theories of various levels of Deuteronomistic redaction can be traced in the Deuteronomistic History (Coggins 1999:24). Such thoughts were a direct challenge against Noth's conclusion regarding Deuteronomistic History (Noth 1991:4). Two main types of proposals have been put forward. On the one hand, and largely in the USA, Cross (1975:4ff) and his pupils have suggested that the basic form of Joshua and 2 Kings is pre-exilic. Cross's theory underwent a further redaction during the period of the Babylonian exilic period (Noll 2007:311). On the other hand is the proposal of Smend's followers. Smend's followers have taken the view that the whole work is essentially

exilic, and that particular prophetic and ‘noministic’ redactions can be identified (DtrP and DtrN). Vermeylen (1986:123-127) has claimed to detect three redactional levels which he identifies as Dtr 575, Dtr 560 and Dtr 525, the number referring to the dates of supposed historical activities.

The redactional approach consists of several scholars’ view points. Noth (1991:4, 89-99 and Ahlstrom (1993:389ff) saw a single compiler of the exilic period who used the law of Deuteronomy as guideline to interpret history. Noth (1943:27) was concerned that Deuteronomistic History is the result of a single author. His theory was challenged by scholars who view Deuteronomistic History differently. De Bruyn (2009:44; cf. Person 2002:2) listed two types of redactional approaches: (1) The Harvard school and (2) the Gottingen school. The former contended for both pre-exilic and exilic redactions and the latter on DtrG (a history writer), Dtr (a prophetic redactor), and DtrN (a nometric redactor).

Two periods for the redaction of the DH can be identified as namely a pre-exilic redaction in the time of Josiah and an exilic redaction (De Bruyn 2009:44; cf. 1982:22ff). Certain concepts and observations are refuted in the exilic period (Cross 1973:275-285). Cross (1973:289) indicates that redactional work existed prior to the Babylonian exile. Friedman (1981:6) acknowledged the theory of two redaction as stated by Cross. He is of the view that the promise to David was no longer an issue in the last period. Josiah and his reforms was the essential focus of the Deuteronomic History (De Bruyn 2009:45). According to Friedman (1981:1ff) the redactors inherited a priestly tradition. Prior to the establishment of the monarchy in Israel, the nation was governed by a priesthood centred in the city of Shiloh, in the central part of Israel (Howard 1990:101ff). Many Israelites believed that the priesthood had become corrupt and demanded that the king be appointed to give them judgment and to defend them against aggressors (Bartholomew 2005:396). Different attitudes towards kingship in the DH are thus noted (Veijola 1977:115). As a point of departure, Veijola disputed from the traditional idea of two redactors (Deuteronomistic and the Nomistic) text. The former is regarded as a pre-Dtr source (Jdg 17-21; 1 Sam 7:5-15; 17; 8:1-5; 22b; 9:1-10:16; 10: 17-18a, 19b-27a; 10:27b). De Bruyn (2009:45) maintains that the source which DtrG used has a pro-monarchy attitude. The

second redactor (DtrN) evaluated the kings negatively and critically due to his perspective of the law (McKenzie 2000:286-314). The law served as the weight that measures the kings of Israel (Veiljola 1977:119-122). The work of DtrN consisted of 1 Samuel 7:2-4; 8:22; 10;-19a; 12:1-25. The primary concern of the first redactor was to preserve the pro-Dtr historical materials, while the later redactor was concerned with the law of Deuteronomy (De Bruyn 2009:46).

Soggin (1989:211) viewed 1 Samuel 8-15 as the results of redactional work. Three versions are noted: (1) 1 Sam 8:10:17-27; 12. (2) 1 Sam 9:1-10:16; 13:5-15; and (3) 1 Sam 11; 13:1-4; 27:12, 1 Sam 14. The first version is regarded as a later interpolation; the reduction presupposes the tribal league as an ideal regime. Soggin (1989:211) was convinced that the concept resulted from the exilic experience. The second version is viewed as legendary and favoured the monarchy. The third version originated in the north of Palestine. It is also favourable towards the monarchy (De Bruyn 2009:46). Other studies acknowledge more layers of redaction (Jobling 1986:45-46).

The development of the Deuteronomistic History consists of two fundamental views, namely the pre-exilic school and the exilic school of thoughts (Römer 1997:1-11). These two proposed school of thoughts represent two influences of their time (Davidson 2003:97-118). The one view suggesting the form of Joshua and 2 Kings as pre-exilic and based its thought on the existing view (Na'aman 1992:638-658). The former rejected the concept of kingship and perceived this office as a rebellion to theocracy. The latter view tries to reshape and restore the Davidic kingship (Howard 1990:105ff). In this view, kingship is regarded as an act of Yahweh (Ackerman 1991:1ff). Deuteronomy is considered to be a later, written record of homilies of a Levitical reform movement which preceded the cultic transformation carried out under Josiah, at the time of the 622 reform (Lohfink 1999:38). Wolff (1965:20) spoke of 'this great Deuteronomistic school' in which was born that vast historical work which is concerned with the preservation and the understanding of the prophetic books from before the exile.

(e) Theology of the Deuteronomistic History

The theology of the DH is based on two fundamental factors: firstly, God was recognised at work in history and He is faithful to His Covenant people (Israel) whom He called to carry out His purpose of redemption. Secondly, people's response to God was determined by two contrasting factors: Destruction if they as a result of disobedience and reward if they chose to obey God's law. Assessment of the Deuteronomistic Historian (Dtr) was made by different scholars. Noth (1991: 50) argued that Deuteronomistic Historian (Dtr) discovered the meaning of the history of Israel to be that: God was recognisably at work in this history, God continuously dealt with the acceleration of moral decline with warnings and punishments and, when these proved fruitless, with total annihilation. Noth (1991:49-53) supported this negative assessment of the theology of the DH in several ways. First, the history demonstrates that the people were committed to an 'unbroken loyalty to God', and that the history shows a continual disloyalty on behalf of Israel. Second, the emphasis on worship in the DH is primarily concerned with 'various possible forms of deviation' from the proper worship of God (Heater 1991:115-555; Bar-Efrat 1978:19-31). Furthermore, Deuteronomy promised destruction for disobedience, a reality for the Dtr. Noth further argued that the reader should not interpret the final verses of 2 Kings as predicting a positive future for Jehoiachin and Judah.

Other scholars have questioned this completely negative assessment of the theology of the DH. Frank Moore Cross (1973:274) argued that the pre-exilic Josianic editions of the DH contained two contrasting themes. The first was the sin of Jeroboam and its resulting punishment. The second was the ongoing promise to David and his heirs (Davies 2005:45). Josiah cleansed the Jerusalem temple and destroyed the shrine founded by Jeroboam. Threat existed, as it always had, but the promise to David endured. However, Cross (1973:275) posited that the exilic edition of the DH (550 BC) emphasises the sins of Manasseh as a cause for final judgment for Judah, only delayed by the faithfulness of Josiah. Nelson (2005:319-377) further emphasising that "time after time the nation's repentance leads to forgiveness from the Lord and restoration," exhibited especially in the Book of Judges and Solomon's dedicatory prayer in 1 Kings 8 (Schokel 1999: 255-278). The themes of threat and promise are both present in the DH, with threat

overshadowing promise because of the continuing failure of Israel and Judah to obey God (Romer & De Pury 2000: 24ff). One might suggest that the Jehoiachin narrative that closes the DH gives the document an overall positive character.

Gerhard Von Rad (1962:306-347) wrote extensively about the theology of the DH. He stated that the Deuteronomist acknowledged that Israel had a privilege to be God's chosen people. Her response to God's command was determined by choosing between blessing and curse, unfortunately of all the good gifts of salvation, Israel chose death. Yet, Von Rad tempers this negative assessment of the DH when he states that in the narratives the 'word of Yahweh' functioned in history as law, which operated destructively, and gospel, which operated as salvation. God's word was delivered by Joshua, by judges, by Samuel, by David and Solomon, and by many prophets (Fritz 2003). Nelson (2005:319ff) also emphasised the role of the spoken word, in prophecy and fulfillment pairs and in speeches at important points in the history, such as Joshua 1, Joshua 23, 1 Samuel 12 and 1 Kings 8 (Nelson 1991: 71-72). For Von Rad (1966:50), the final word of the Dtr is that even the events of 587 BC do not represent an end for God's people. Hope always exists in repentance and return to God.

Nelson (2005:319ff) argued that the main theological theme of the DH is the doctrine of divine punishment and reward derived from Deuteronomy. The primary sins were apostasy and disloyalty to Yahweh, although even these could be forgiven if the people were repentant and returned to fidelity. Apostasy and disloyalty are emphasised by two themes in the DH, namely worship of other gods and worship at any site other than the temple in Jerusalem. Of course, Manasseh's sin became intolerable to God and resulted in the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem, especially after the failure of Josiah's reform.

(f) Significance of the Deuteronomistic History

The legal corpus of Deuteronomy conceptualises the king in a way that rejects all prevailing models of monarchic power within both ancient Israel and the broader ancient Near East. Deuteronomy submits autopian manifesto for a constitutional monarchy that sharply delimits the power of the king (Levinson 2001:511). Among the components of the Near Eastern royal ideology, the responsibility of the king for justice was of great

importance. In ancient Israel the monarch was regarded as the supreme legal authority, arbiter of justice, and appellate court (Ps 72). So central was the king to the administration of justice that, in his narrative of the establishment of the monarchy (1 Sam 8). The Deuteronomistic Historian (DH) grants priority to the emergent need for royal judicial integrity. The Deuteronomistic Historian presents the popular demand for a king as filling a judicial, and not a military vacuum (Bartholomew 2005:396).

The Deuteronomistic Historian (DH) glorifies the monarch by regularly including stories of his judicial activity, by ruling with justice. David and Solomon both directly and by delegation heard complex legal cases and entertained judicial appeals (Levinson 2001:519). The Deuteronomistic Historian further portrays the monarch as an arbiter of ambiguous legal cases (cf. Mayers 2001:241-258), in which there are no witnesses and in which there exit no empirical criteria for deciding between the competing of the claims of the two litigants (1 Kgs 3:16-28). In this idealisation of the king in terms of his judicial wisdom, the Deuteronomistic Historian draws extensively from standard Near Eastern royal ideology (Knoppers 1993:83-87). Based on the composition of the Deuteronomistic tradition, two contrasting viewpoints regarding kingship are identified, namely the view which supports the monarchy and the view which totally rejects the monarchy. Originally Israel was a theocracy functioning through a tribal confederacy and bound together by common allegiance to Yahweh. Monarchy was secondary to an older tribal league (Thompson 1974:204).

Noth (1980:89) argued that Dtr discovered the meaning of the history of Israel to be “that God was reconcilably at work in this history, continuously meeting the accelerating moral decline with warnings and punishments and finally, when these proved fruitless, with total annihilation. He explained this negative assessment of the theology of the DH in several ways. Firstly, the history demonstrates that the Israelites were committed to an “unbroken loyalty to God,” and that the history shows a continual disloyalty (Römer 2009). Secondly, the emphasis on worship in the DH is primarily concerned with ‘various possible forms of deviation’ from the proper worship of God. Furthermore, Deuteronomy promised destruction for disobedience.

The Deuteronomistic History measures all the kings by their religious behaviour and religious policy, the model for which is presented in Deuteronomy (Gerstenberger 2002:180). The Deuteronomist postulates the Yahweh alone movement of the God of Israel, and his Torah (Gerstenberger 2002:181). The king is depicted as God's partner and representative depicting him as different from the mass of his subjects. The intention of the Deuteronomistic History was to explain that there are two contrasting views, which the nation could partake of: (1) reward and blessing if they obey, and (2) curse and destruction if they disobey God's command. Peace and prosperity for the people depended on their faithfulness in worshipping a true God. The nation's fate was the result of its apostasy from the true worship of God (Levinson 2001:511-534). The covenant (Deut 7:7:12) illustrates what God for His part would keep, but peace and prosperity for the people depended on their faithfulness. Coming to conclusions concerning the composition of DH will always be tenuous, and the options of both Noth, Cross, and others are equally plausible. In fact, as Richter pointed out, scholarly opinion is divided on the matter now. Equally difficult is determining the exact relationship of the history recorded in Chronicles with DH, and to that topic the study will now turn briefly.

The term Deuteronomistic History was first coined by Noth in 1943 (Collins 2004:183). It refers to those historical writings (often called the Early Prophets) that share an ideology in common with the Book of Deuteronomy, which have been described as theological preference to the Former Prophets (Anderstand 1999:165). The term Deuteronomy refers specifically to the fifth book of the Pentateuch/ Torah, while the term Deuteronomistic refers to the work of the editors influenced by this perspective.

(g) Synthesis

In order to have a better understanding the concept of the Deuteronomistic History, the following sub-themes have been discussed: who was the Deuteronomist, the meaning thereof, the development, theology and significance of the Deuteronomistic are the building blocks in the David narratives.

The *meaning* of the concept 'Deuteronomist' was based on scholars' viewpoints who have debated the nature of Old Testament history writing. The emphasis was based on the

disparity of presentation of Joshua-Kings. This collection was known as the Deuteronomistic. Noth (1943:110) is of the view that one single editor was responsible for the whole of the Deuteronomistic History. The *development* of the Deuteronomistic History has attracted attention to various schools of thoughts (Coggin 1999:24). Two main types of proposals have been suggested: Firstly, the Cross (1975:4ff) *and his pupils proposal* who maintained that the basic form of Joshua- 2 Kings is pre-exilic. Secondly, *Smend's followers* proposed that the whole work is essentially exilic and particular prophetic and noministic redaction can be identified.

Theology of the Deuteronomistic is based on the two fundamental factors: firstly, God was recognized at work in history and He is faithful to His Covenant people Israel. Secondly, people's response to God was determined by two contrasting factors, destruction if they disobey and reward if chose to obey God's law. The primary sins were apostasy and disloyal to Yahweh. The *significance* of the Deuteronomistic History was based on two contrasting view regarding the monarchy, one in support of and the other in total rejection of kingship(Bartholemew 2005:396). The view that support kingship glorified the monarchy by regulating stories of judicial activities where David and Solomon or the Davidic dynasty is the central theme. The David portrayed in this thesis is shaped by the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic Histories.

4.2.2.1.3.3. Chronistic History

(a) Introduction

A list of the differences between DH and the Chronicler's History would be lengthy. For the purposes of this study, a summary of four major differences given by Peter Enns (2005:84-85) will suffice. (1) Chronicles greatly diminishes the sins of David. The author of Chronicles does not mention David's sin with Bathsheba. David and Solomon are 'glorified figures.' As such, they have become 'messianic' figures, models of ideal kingship that embodied the hopes of the returnees. Von Rad (1966:350) echoed this sentiment when he wrote, 'The David of Chronicles is a spotless holy king who delivers solemn oration'. He and his sons do not rule in Israel, but in the 'kingdom of Yahweh' (1 Chron 23:5)—according to 1 Chronicles 29:23 Solomon occupies the throne of Yahweh.

(2) Chronicles emphasises the unity of God’s people (Williamson 1982). All the people supported Solomon’s succession to power. The need for unity in the post-exilic period was paramount to avoid dividing into factions. (3) Chronicles emphasises the temple and Solomon’s role in building it. The pre-exilic kings failed to live up to their responsibilities to maintain proper worship—a failure that the post-exilic community needed to avoid. (4) The Chronicler emphasises “immediate retribution”. Further, this history stresses individual, rather than corporate, responsibility for sin. Von Rad (1966:211) argued that the Chronicler wanted to hammer home to his readers that each generation stands immediately before Yahweh, and stands or falls with its anointed. Enns (2005:85) posited that the post-exilic community needed to recognise that they were responsible for their own sins, not for the sins of their ancestors. The present theological study will return to these and other differences between the DH and the Chronicler’s History, but these will suffice for this introductory presentation.

(b) Who was the Chronicler?

1-2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are collectively known as the Chronicler. In the Hebrew Old Testament, Ezra, Nehemiah all appeared as one unbroken book, closely connected in theme and style to the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles (Lockyer 1986:372). The books of the Chronicle give no definite information as to who the author might have been (Knoppers 2000:181-208). The large number of sources mentioned should not be taken as indicating the book is merely a stitched work. Most scholars agree that these four books were written and compiled by the same person, but not all accept the theory of Ezra’s authorship (Lockyer 1986:222). As far as authorship of all these book are concerned, Ezra is the most probable after arriving in Jerusalem about 457 B.C. and led the reforms among the people (Lockyer 1986:222). Kratz (2005:87) argued that the hypothesis of a unitary Chronistic History comprising of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah arose for the first half of the nineteenth century with Leopold Zunz in his *Religious Lectures on the Jews* of 1832. The person of Ezra deserves attention in this study as his influence shaped the *David character* for this study. Ezra was a scribe and priest who led the returned captives in Jerusalem to a new commitment to God’s Law, the Torah. The nature, style and composition of 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are collectively known as the

Chronistic History. The Chronicler's intention is clear: based on his/her (their) political, socio- economic and religious background, the Chronicler glorifies the Davidic dynasty.

(c) Meaning of the Chronistic History

The Chronicler's History is a phrase used to describe the biblical books of 1 and 2 Chronicles, usually combined with Ezra and Nehemiah. The Chronicler is the presumed author of this work. Scholars debate whether Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah existed separately or were created as a single work. However, since Ezra-Nehemiah is beyond the Chronological framework of the DH, the debate is beyond the scope of this study. Since Noth wrote the definitive work on the DH, his companion volume, *The Chronicler's History*, warrants discussion at this point. Like the Dtr, the Chronicler also saw the history in terms of his times. Contemporary issues of the author(s)/composer(s) drove the creation of the history. Noth argued that the primary interest of the Chronicler's history was "to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty and of the Jerusalem temple as Yahweh's valid cult centre". Von Rad (1962:350) echoed this opinion when he asked, what does the Chronicler's history contain apart from David? According to the Chronicler, the meaning of the writings was to legitimate cultic offices founded by David, and in so doing he showed himself to be a representative of the messianic tradition as such. In Noth's view, the role of temple and cult was secondary to the importance of David. He argued that the conflict between Jewish Jerusalem and the Samaritans during the post-exilic period was the background of this historical narrative.

(d) Development of Chronistic History

The Books of 1 and 2 Chronicles cover several centuries of the history of God's Covenant People (the Israelites) from the founders of the nation until the end of their captivity in Babylon and Persia about 538 B.C. The development of the Chronicler's History started after the Babylonian exile. These historical books of Chronicles are characterised as 'books of hope'. In the broad sense, these books trace the history of the nation of Israel from Adam to the Babylonian captivity and restoration. Much of this material is a repetition of that found in the Books of 1- 2 Samuel and 1- 2 Kings. But the writer of the Chronicles apparently wrote his history to encourage the exiles who had

returned to Jerusalem after more than 50 years of captivity in Babylon. This selective history reminded them of Israel's glorious days from the past and gave them hope for the future as they pondered God's promises to His covenanted people (Lockyer 1986:220; cf. Williamson 1987; 2001). The Book of Ezra describes the resettlement of the Hebrew people in their homeland after their long exile in Babylon. The book is named after its author and central figure, Ezra, the priest who led the exiles in a new commitment to God's Law after their return (Lockyer 1986:370). On the other hand, the book of Nehemiah has a detailed account regarding the rebuilding of the wall around Jerusalem.

(e) Theology of the Chronistic History

The primary interest of the Chronicler's theology was to determine the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty and the Jerusalem temple as Yahweh's valid cult centre (Throntveit 2003:374). The pre-exilic kings failed to live up to their responsibilities to maintain proper worship, a failure that the post-exilic community needed to avoid (Davies 1992:16-48). This history wants to legitimate the cultic offices founded by David, and in so doing he showed himself to be a representative of the messianic tradition (McKenzie 2000:34ff). In Noth's (1943:8-38; Derby 2000:111-116) view, the role of the temple cult was secondary to the importance of David. The history of David's dynasty and its promised continuance is of greater importance in the Chronicler. The Chronicler wrote with a specific purpose in mind: to give comfort and hope to those who returned to Jerusalem after the exile (Merril 1987:295-308).

The Chronistic History (CH) kept its faith and traditions active and required continual endurance and faithfulness. The situation called for determination and a strong sense of hope. Hope that the promises of God to David are not forgotten, and that a king from this royal line would rule again among God's people (Howard 1990:101ff). The Chronicler's History ties the entire sweep of the Old Testament together into the one great affirmation of hope (Lockyer 1986:224). These books should not only be read as actual histories, but for their insights into how God has kept faith with His Covenant People across the centuries. By selecting events that show how God has kept His promises, the author(s) present(s) a doctrine of hope that begins with Adam (1 Chron 1:1) and stretches to the

end of the Babylonian captivity of God's people thousand of years later (2 Chron 36:22-23).

The account of David's reign is presented in a positive light in the Chronistic History with all the details about David's great sin omitted. The Chronicler gives a theological evaluation about the kings of Judah and is mostly positive (Lockyer 1986:221). This indicates that the author(s) was (were) interested in showing that Judah was the nation which remained faithful to the covenant between God and His people. This fact would have been encouraging to the exiles who returned to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple. They felt they were continuing the forms and traditions which set them apart as the true worshippers of God and gave them identity as God's covenant people.

The main focus of attention is the Davidic monarchy, which symbolises the uniqueness and unity of Israel and its observance of the Torah (Finkelstein 2006:196). The Chronicler further projects an idealised image of the kings of Judah, especially of David and Solomon (Throntveit 2003:374-381). It lays special emphasis on the temple and its construction, on the role of the priestly house of Zadok, and on the Levites, whose work was organised during David's time.

(f) Synthesis

Like the Deuteronomistic History, the Chronicler consists of the following attributes has been discussed: who was the Chronicler? The meaning, development, theology, and the significance of the Chronicler are of greater important. The books of 1-2 Chronicles and Ezra –Nehemiah are collectively known as the Chronistic History (CH). In the Hebrew Scriptures, Ezra, Nehemiah appeared as one unbroken book, closely connected in theme and style to the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles (Lockyer 1986:372; Kratz 2005:87). Most scholars agree that these four books were written and compiled by the same person and Ezra is regarded as the author. Therefore the *meaning* of the Chronistic History is a phrase used to describe the biblical books of 1- Chronicles combined with Ezra and Nehemiah. The development of the Chronicler's History started after the exile and they are characterised as 'books of hope'. Much of this material is a repetition of that found in the Deuteronomistic History (DH). The primary interest of the Chronicler's *theology* was

to determine the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty and the Jerusalem temple as Yahweh's valid cult centre (Throntveit 2003:374). The Chronicler gave a theological evaluation about the kings of Judah is mostly positive (Lockyer 1986:221). This indicates that the author was interested in showing that Judah was the nation which remained faithful to the covenant between God and His people.

4.2.2.1.3.4. Synthesis

It has already been noted that several decades scholars have debated the nature of Old Testament history writing (Galil 2004:413; Spieckerman 2001:337-358, Anderson 1999:165). The emphasis is based on the disparity of presentation between the books of Joshua-Kings and 1-2 Chronicle Histories. The term 'Deuteronomistic History' is a theoretical construction of the idea that the books of Deuteronomy to Kings were compiled during the exilic period from a number of pre-existing sources to form a unified work (Satterthwaite & McConville 2007:19; Noth 1991:4). On the other hand the Chronicler's History is a phrase used to describe the biblical books of 1 and 2 Chronicles usually combined with Ezra and Nehemiah (Knoppers 2000:18ff). The two traditions are theologically motivated interpretations of the traditions of Israel (Throntveit 2003:374). Scholars have also recognized the differences between the presentations of the historical events according to the Samuel-Kings and Chronicles (Edelman 2000:67-84; Davies 1992:16ff). The David discussed in this thesis has been portrayed by both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler. Brueggemann (1968:156-181) referred to those traditions as the theologians of David. The account of David's reign is presented in a positive light, in the Chronistic History with all the details about David's sin omitted.

4.3. David – a theological characterisation

David's theological characterisation will be done by focusing on: introductory part, the name David, David's family background, and his leadership character. His leadership character is based on the depictions of the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic viewpoints.

4.3.1 Introduction

A theological characterisation of David in this study is influenced by the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler's traditions (Rumney 2007:1ff; Throntveit 2003:374ff; McKenzie 2000:34). The first few paragraphs of the Deuteronomistic narratives presented in 1 Samuel 16 introduce the biblical David a man of his own character (2 Sam 16). Who was this David who received such attention in biblical narratives? When David is introduced in Samuel 16 his entry to the narrative stage is well prepared. The reader has been told that David is a young man after Yahweh's own heart (1 Sam 13:14), who Yahweh has provided as king (1 Sam 16:1). Yahweh looked into his heart and saw in David someone desirable (1 Sam 16:7), but the reader is never told what qualities qualify David for kingship (Noll 1997:52). The Chronicler presented David in a positive light, with all the details about David's great sin omitted. My depiction of David will explore and identify the qualities qualifying David for the kingship position. In this chapter, I aim to highlight the theological David as presented by both the Deuteronomistic and Chronicler. Very little about the historical David is known. The chapter focuses on David's leadership character from the theological depictions in the DH and the CH. Scholars have long recognised the differing depictions of David in the books of Samuel and Kings and in Chronicles (Throntveit 2003:374). Although Samuel, Kings and the Chronicler were independently utilising material from earlier sources, Samuel and Kings are the Chronicler's major source (cf. Ackroyd 1973; Myers 1966:259-273; Freedman 1961:436-442). Chronicle's is seen as essentially a revised edition of the earlier work. Both the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic histories are what are called actual history. Both are theologically motivated interpretations of the traditions in Israel (Throntveit 2003:374). The point of departure between the Deuteronomist's and the Chronicler's theologies in the presentation of David is that, the former portrays negative and positive characteristics of David and the latter depicts a blameless positive characteristic of David.

David was Israel's second and greatest king. He rose to power from humble circumstances and amid many difficulties: he captured Jerusalem, established it as his capital, united the nation, and built an empire that stretched from Egypt to Mesopotamia

during a 40-year reign (ca 1010-970 BCE). David exposed many talents: he was portrayed as a shepherd, musician, poet, warrior, politician, administrator, but he was more prominent as the *parexcellence* idealised king, as the standard for later kings and as a messianic symbol (Howard 1984: 41). It is this type of David that has attracted my attention.

4.3.2. David - the name

The name David means ‘beloved’ (Lockyer 1986:282). This name is rendered *dawid* in Hebrew and *daueid* in Greek. It occurs more than 1000 times in the Old Testament and 59 times in the New Testament. The name is attested in Old Babylonian (early 2nd millennium B.C.E: *da-wi-da-nu-um*) and in the Moabite language (9th cent. B. E.: *dwd {h}*). The term ‘David’ has been suggested as a title, or perhaps a throne name, and not a personal name. Impetus for this suggestion has come from 2 Samuel 21:19, which credits ‘Elhanan’ with the killing of Goliath, whereas according to 1 Samuel 17 ‘David’ has killed him. The former would have been his personal name (Honyman 1948:23-24). Excavations at Tell el Hariri on the Euphrates River have revealed that the word “*dauidum*” served as a title for a military marshal (Sarel 1997:50).

David, king of Israel and Judah, was a mythic biblical figure to many people (Halpern 2001:479; McCarter 1986:117ff; cf. Brueggemann 1990:98ff). A few families can trace their roots before the Common Era, but the house of David has kept the memory of the ancient king alive as living legacy. David was not just another king; he was a transitional figure whose leadership defined a nation for millennia (Anderson 2004:60ff; cf. Bentzen 1955: 16ff). Alter (1999:1ff) argues that the story of David is probably the greatest single narrative representation in antiquity of human life by slow stages through time, shaped and altered by the pressure of (i) political life, (ii) public institution, (iii) family, (iv) the impulses of body and spirit, (v) and the eventual sad decay of the flesh. David’s name is unique and belongs to him alone. The name bears a person who occupies a position of prominence in the lineage of Jesus Christ.

4.3.3. Family background

David's family can be discussed in two categories, namely his ancestors and his parents. Firstly, I will focus on the ancestors, then on the parents. David's ancestors are theologically traced through the book of Ruth, a Moabite woman who became Boaz's wife through a levirate marriage (Hillel 2006:83). Ruth's narrative is staged at the time of the Judges. The setting belongs to the period of the Judges but its writing belongs to a later date. This is indicated when the author explains former customs (Ruth 4:1-12). A wide range of dates is offered for its actual composition, ranging from pre-exilic times to a late post-exilic date. The classical style and language do point to an early date, attitude to foreign marriages, for under the Deuteronomic law a Moabite could not enter the congregation (Deut 23:3). The late dating is based on the antiquarian interest displayed in the book, and on its supposed connection with the reforms of Ezra-Nehemiah. One school of thought (cf. Boad 1984:375) sees evidence of both early and late work in the book, supposing that the genealogy of David (Ruth 4:18-22) and the explanations of early customs belong to a much later date than the book itself. Many suggestions as to the purpose of the book are the following. It was intended to supply a family tree for the greatest of the kings of Hebrew history, David, because this was omitted from the books of Samuel (Rowley 1947:77ff; cf. Robertson 1949:207ff).

David's family history is unknown until Yahweh commissioned Samuel on a prophetic mission (1 Sam 16:1). David appears in the narratives of Israel for the first time (Brueggemann 1985:19). De Vaux (1961:22ff) explains family life and institutions in ancient Israel. According to the DH and CH David's youth was spent in Bethlehem. The names of Jesse's children from the first born to the last, including his sisters: Eliab (Elihu), Abinadab, Shammah (Shimeah), Nethanel (Nathaniel), Raddai, Ozem, Zeruah, David, and Abigail. David was the youngest son of Jesse of Bethlehem (1 Sam 17:12-14). Jesse was a respected elder of Bethlehem and a wealthy man with significant holdings of land and livestock (Meyer 1997:1-47). David was therefore not a poor, rural shepherd boy. He came from a prominent family (Elliott 2000) and had at least two half sisters, Abigail and Zeruah (1 Chron 2:16).

His mother's name is unknown, but Howard (1984:34ff) suggested it was Nahash. David's mother however, was remembered for her godliness (Pss116:16; 86:16). Each of these genealogies shows David as a descendant from Judah, with an important purpose of showing the continuity of the Judahite line (Alter 1999: xiiff).

4.3.3.4. Synthesis

In the above discussion the background of David's background has been noted. Three outstanding features have been discussed: the two traditions that portrayed David, the name David and lastly his family background. The David portrayed here has been influenced by both the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic Histories (Rumney 2007:1ff). Although Samuel-Kings and the Chronicler were independently utilising material from earlier sources, the later used the former sources (Mayers 1966:259-273; Freedman 1961:436-422). The point of departure between the Deuteronomist and the Chrononcler's theologies on the presentation of David is that the former portrays negative and positive characteristics of David while the later depicted a blameless positive characterisitc of David.

It has been noted that the name David means 'beloved' (Lockyer 1986:282). The name is rendered *dawid* in Hebrew and *daueid* in Greek. It occurs more than a thousand times in the Old Testament (OT) and fifty nine in the New Testament (NT). David's family was discussed in two categories, namely his ancestors and his parents. The emphasis was on David's ancestors' and later on his parents' family. David's ancestors are theologically traced through Ruth, a Moabite woman who became Boaz's wife through the levirate marriage (Hillel 2006:83). David's family history became known after Yahweh commissioned Samuel on a prophetic mission (1 Sam 16:1). Through the DH and the CH, David is known to be from a 'big' family. Most of his family members are mentioned by name except his mother and few sisters (1 Sam 17:12-14). David's father Jesse was a respected 'elder' of Bethlehem and a wealthy man with a significant holdings and livestock (Meyers 1997:1-47). Although his mother is not mentioned by name, her influence in David's life is remarkable.

4.4. David's leadership character

4.4.1. Introduction

David's leadership character is based on both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronic Histories (Knoppers 2000:341; Galil 2004:413ff; Throntveit 2003:374). The story begins with his dramatic rise in fortunes, from humble beginnings as an insignificant shepherd at his father's home to his acclamation as king over his own capital city of Jerusalem (Howard 1987:42; Conroy 1983:64). Through it all, what is seen is YHWH favouring him and events consistently turning out in his favour (Gerhard 1962:306ff). David is presented as 'the quintessential winner' (Polzin 1980:156), whose worthiness of divine patronage is never really explained, but becomes increasingly questionable as the story advances (Noll 1997:45). His rise to power is characterised by dramatic events (cf. Gunn 1978:10ff). According to Miscall (1986:115) 1 Samuel offers essential knowledge of who David is, why he is anointed, and what is meant to be anointed.

4.4.2. David's leadership character as a youth

4.4.2.1. A shepherd lad.

Two outstanding features about David's character can be expressed, namely his outside appearance and his inner character (1 Sam 16:6-7). The former describes David as a handsome lad (1 Sam 16; cf. 1 Sam 9:2; 10:23; 2 Sam 14:25-26), while the latter feature expresses his inner character. David's heart was completely loyal to Yahweh (1 Sam 16:16:7; cf. 1 Sam 13:14). These two features are of important value in this discussion as they are the building blocks distinguishing David's leadership character. As the youngest son of Jesse, David proved to be a capable person by being the keeper of his father's sheep. He was a shepherd⁴⁶. He demonstrated a trustworthy character by providing security to his father's flock. As a trusted shepherd he provided caring and protection for

⁴⁶ Figuratively, the Old Testament pictures God as Israel's Shepherd-Leader (Ps 80:1; Ezek 34:14). Also the king was seen as a shepherd.

his flock (Newsome 1982:295). In this job he showed courage and faithfulness by killing both a lion and a bear, when they attacked the flock (1 Sam 17: 34-37).

The ‘shepherd boy image’ of David derives from a common metaphor for rulers in the ancient Near East (Elliott 2000:10ff; Finkelstein & Silberman 2006:2). Is a shepherd a leader? In ancient Near East, a king was seen as a shepherd. The concept of David as a shepherd indicates him to be a leader. Rather than following in his father’s footsteps David stood out on his own. Apart from being a shepherd, he displayed an outstanding musical talent with the harp, a fact that figured prominently in his life. He cultivated a variety of skills for survival. Those skills are expressed by his encounter with wild beasts (1 Sam 17:34-37). David is described to be a person of considerable intelligence and charm, but he was also ambitious and ruthless (Brueggemann 1972:10ff). Even in this early stage of his character depiction, the narrator provides some glimpses into the opaque person of David (Noll 1997:52).

To summarise some of David’s leadership characteristics the following qualities can be identified: (1) by protecting the flock from wild animals (beasts), David indicated his concerns for safety and security for his flock. At an early age David distinguished himself as an able and successful warrior. If he can be trusted in providing security for the flock, he can be trusted in protecting a nation from enemies. (2) To David music was more than a hobby. He was endowed with qualities that enabled him as a competent harpist, and, in accordance with the custom of the times, he composed several texts (Kapelrud 1966:38). David’s connection to the Psalms and role as musician for worshipping, praising and glorying God has a significant role in music. (3) His skills for survival further illustrated resistance, persistence and willingness to fit into every environment. Wis (2002) argued that music conductor is also regarded as a servant leader.

4.4.2.2. Candidate for kingship

David’s anointing as a king-to-be appears in the DH (1 Samuel 16) introduces David as the anointed and the king-to-be. His appearance has an ordered plot, which is accompanied by memorable characters, clearly stated themes, and a well-delineated setting (Hillel 2006:161; cf. Miscall 1986:115). The narrative begins with a conversation

between God and Samuel, the prophet (1 Sam 16:1ff). The themes of the conversation are based on change of kingship and new kingship dispensation. A leadership crisis during Saul's reign demanded God to intervene (Howard 1989:473-483). Samuel was sent by Yahweh on a difficult and risky mission.

Samuel spoke briefly and expressed his fear, for he knew he was to be sent on a subversive mission (Brueggemann 1985:26). He was ordered to anoint David as the next king of God's people, something unusual in Israel (Machinist 1995:105). The anointing of David as king was an indication that the kingship of God was in crisis (Esler 1983:61-76). The arrival of Samuel in Bethlehem brought fear to the elders of the town. It is not clear why the elders of the city should have been afraid of Samuel (Newsome 1971:56). Upon his arrival Samuel invited the people to assemble. They knew nothing about his mission. Jesse's sons were summoned for an identity parade so that the best candidate could be selected. Samuel kept his eye on Eliab (1 Sam 16:6-7), David's eldest brother whom according to him, was the perfect candidate for the office. In the ancient Near East, the eldest son was likely to be elected to be a leader. Samuel assumed that Eliab might be the right person for the leadership. Jesse's seven sons were not impressive sons, who nonetheless, were not YHWH's choice. The text does not explain the criteria which God used to access David's brothers.

Samuel doesn't seem to ask God the reason for not selecting any of Jesse's other sons. The details of the selection the potential candidate remained to be divine secret. Who can stand before Yahweh, because He is the Holy One (Ackerman 1999:1-15)? The statement "Pay no attention to how tall and handsome he is. I have rejected him, because I do not judge as people judge. They look at the outward appearance, but I look at the heart" (1 Sam 16:7) is meaningful. Chafin (1989:132) is of the view that the verse is the most familiar verse in the Old Testament because it indicates a vast difference between how God and mankind view people. The sons of Jesse were passed over one by one until the question was raised: "have you any more sons?" The implied question (1 Sam 16:11) seems to be: "Is God truly able to live up to His promise?"

Only then was David summoned. He was the youngest of the brothers and considered too unimportant to be brought in from his sheep to be part of the event (cf. Alter 1999:96; Menahem & Sternberg 1968:263ff). Yet he was appointed as a leader. David's importance was recognised by Samuel and considered as king to be. The anointing of David was the beginning of his rise to power (Lemche 1978:2-25).

As the drama unfolds, the following questions require reflection: firstly, why didn't God direct Samuel to appoint the exact candidate? Secondly, the anointment of David as king was not to replace Saul's immediately (Gruber 2000:3ff; cf. Howard 1984: 41; cf. Hayes 1982:55). What was the purpose of anointing David at such an early stage if he would not replace Saul immediately? The anointment of David as king at his early stage was an indication that Israel's kingship was in crisis (cf. Brueggemann 1971:317-132). After his anointment David has done little and said nothing (Miscall 1986:115). He continued to be on the background of the narratives. Newsome (1982:55) sees the secret of David's anointing by Samuel as the first account where David was made known in the DH for the first time. Miscall (1986:30ff) regards 1 Samuel 16:1-13 as *a call narrative of Samuel*. Hayes (1971:55) noted that the crucial nature of David's entrance into history was the manner of his anointment. The account of his anointment was to legitimise the kingship of David (Robinson 1993:95). The kingship of Saul was in the DH and CH thus far discredited (Polzin 1989:155ff). Therefore the narrative (DH and the CH) offer essential theological knowledge on who David was, why he was anointed, and what it meant to be anointed.

4.4.2.3. Talented young man

4.4.2.3.1. Musician

David gains what Saul loses (Whitelam 2002:277; cf. McKane 1963:106). With this statement McKane emphasised that the charismatic endowment reserved for the king of Israel passes from Saul to David. Samuel's word on the

rejection⁴⁷ of Saul is fulfilled (Polzin 1989:155; cf. Lockyer 1986:284). Moreover, the place vacated by the spirit of Yahweh was filled by an evil spirit from Yahweh. The Chronicler alerts careful readers to a very different picture of Saul, a picture that serves his portrayal of David (Throntveit 2003:375; De Varies 1989:424-425). An “evil spirit from the LORD” entered Saul (1 Sam 18:10). Saul’s mental sickness was ascribed to the working of the evil spirit. In ancient Israel, it was commonly believed that all physical and mental illness was caused by evil Sprits (Chafin 1989:136). Saul was probably subjected to moods of depression and insanity (Lockyer 1986:283). Conroy (1983:67) maintains that there are no ethical implications in stating that the “spirit is said to be evil”. The servants of Saul diagnosed the king’s disease and suggested music as the necessary therapy (1 Sam 16:14-23). They advised him to secure a harpist, whose music might soothe his spirit (1 Sam 16:14ff). One of them advised Saul that he should get David to play music for him (Robinson 1993:96). David was recommended for this task (Howard 1989:473-483). The spiritual transfer of power symbolised the inevitable political transfer of power as well. In 1 Samuel 16:19 David is presented as “a man of valour, man of war”. Through the words of the servant, the pro-Davidic author, the DtrG portrays David here as the best choice for a king in all respects (Kim 2008:45; Robinson 1993:97). He was not only good at playing music, but he was also “a man of valour”, “a man of war”, “prudent in speech”, and a “man of good presence” (1 Sam 16:118b). David was introduced into Saul’s court as one who is skilled in many areas, including the ability to soothe Saul whenever the evil spirit afflicted him (cf. Payne 1972:321-325). Therefore, David started his royal career as an aid to Saul (Mettinger 1976:80ff). David was exposed to government affairs, a task that prepared him for his later service as king of Israel. He became armour bearer and musician to Saul, presumably at Gibeah, Saul’s hometown (1 Sam 15:34; 22:6). Apparently, David did not remain with Saul all the time, since he probably returned to Bethlehem to continue caring for his father’s sheep (Lockyer 1986:283). During one of these visits to his home, the Philistines invaded the country and

⁴⁷1 Samuel 15:27-28 read as follows: Then Samuel turned to leave, but Saul caught hold of his cloak, and it tore. Samuel said to him, “The LORD has torn the kingdom of Israel away from you today and gives it to someone who is better than you (GNB).

camped 24 kilometres (15 miles) west of Bethlehem. Saul led the army of Israel to meet the enemy. Three of David's brothers were in Saul's army and Jesse sent David to the battle area to inquire about their welfare (1 Sam 17:17-20). While on this expedition, David encountered the Philistine giant, Goliath (1 Sam 17:41ff). Based on his action and leadership style, the Deuteronomist presented Saul as a failure (Scheffler 2000:263-271). In this discussion, David's musical talent is regarded as a crucial aspect in his life.

4.4.2.3.2. Warrior

The story of David and Goliath is portrayed in detail in the Deuteronomistic History but avoided by the Chronicler. David's character as a warrior is confirmed by his encounter with the giant Goliath (Hillel 2006:180) that has revealed David's leadership skills in a risky situation (1 Sam 17:1-58). David's speech, action and faith in Yahweh proved to portray him as a potential leader. The two main characters in this scene were David and Goliath. David is the main character against Goliath, a Philistine from the city of Gath. Their characters differ in various aspects. David was a lad, Goliath was a grown-up man. David was a young boy, Goliath a giant. David was an Israelite, Goliath a Philistine. David was not a soldier in terms of battle fight. Goliath was an experienced soldier. David was dressed in normal clothes, while Goliath was dressed in war attire. David worshipped Yahweh, the Israelite God while Goliath worshipped Dagon one of the Philistine's gods. According to the text David trusted God, Goliath trusted in his armour and warfare. It is hard to imagine a greater contrast in personalities than that which existed between these two individuals.

The two rivals exchanged words of war, and a combat took place (Hoffner 1968:220-225). Then David struck the giant with his sling and stones and he fell to the ground (1 Sam 17:47). David further cut Goliath's head as a sign of victory. By so doing, the Philistines were defeated (1 Sam 17:51b-54). Hereby David has proven himself to be a leader. In the story of David and Goliath four outstanding features describing David's leadership characters are identified: (1) his zeal to know the affairs of the land, (2) his willingness to participate in problem solving, (3) David overcomes criticism by his brother Eliab and obstacles for not wearing war clothes and (4) his faith in God. One of

the functions of the king in the Ancient Near East was to be a warrior against enemies. The nation's safety was highly valued during this period, by demonstrating his skills as a warrior; David proved that the nation could be safe in his leadership.

Jesse's anxiety to know how things went with his sons in the battle camp is demonstrated by sending his youngest son, David, with provision (1 Sam 17:12-19). The battlefield consisted of two camps of nations at war with each other (Machinist 2000:53). The Philistines were fighting the Israelites. In this scenario, David's leadership character can be traced through his action and speeches. Upon arriving at the battle field, David engaged himself in the affairs of the battle field. David saw how Goliath, "the Philistine of Gath", defies Israel. David was astonished at what he saw and heard. David's action is further traced through literal combat with Goliath (1 Sam 17:48b-51). A staff, a sling, and five smooth stones (v. 40), known as shepherd's weapons, were enough to face the giant. Robinson (1993:101) indicated that the emphasis here is that it was not so much David who was going to fight, but the LORD (37, 45-47). David's leadership character can also be traced through his courageous speeches: (1) With Saul: "...*Your Majesty, no one should be afraid of this Philistine! I will go and fight him.*" (1 Sam 17:32); "...*The LORD has saved me from lions and bears, He will save me from this Philistines*" (1 Sam 17:37). (2) With Goliath: "*You are coming against me with sword, spear, and javelin, but I come against you in the name of the LORD Almighty, the God of the Israelite armies, which you have defiled*" (1 Sam 17:45). David's speeches need to be taken into consideration.

In verses 34-36 as indicated, the speech concerns personal bravery (Brueggemann 1985:32). In verse 37, the speech of David makes a theological acknowledgement (Miscall 1986:120). Three outstanding features demonstrated by David, courage, speeches (1 Sam 17:34-37, 39, 45-47) and faith are regarded as leadership qualities (1 Sam 17:37, 45-47). The word *courage* and or *courageous* is used throughout the Old Testament narratives and directed to few individuals who hold leadership position. Such courage was in two folds, namely physical and moral.

The term courage has a significant meaning in both the DH (Josh 2:11, 5:1, 2 Sam 4:1, 7:27, and CH (1 Ch 17:25, 2 Chron 19:11, 19:11; Ezra 7:28, 10:4). Equally important, the adjective courageous cannot be ignored (Deut 31:6, 7, Josh 1:6, 7, 9, 10: 25) and 1Chron 22:13, 28:20; 2 Chron 26:17, 32:7) stressed the importance of courage and/or courageous. Physical courage was based on moral courage- a reliance on the presence and power of God and a commitment to His commandment (Joshua 23:6, 2 Chron 19:11). By courage, David showed the strength of purpose that enabled him to withstand fear and difficulty. Saul and his men failed to face Goliath because of fear. A speech is more than uttering the words. In this scenario, few individuals gave speeches concerning the battle, like Saul, Eliab, David and Goliath. The content of David's speech indicated his dependence upon God. Both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories stressed that the God of Israel had overcome the Philistine's god. That David put his faith in God. He was sure of the results of the battle before it was started.

4.4.2.3.3. Synthesis

David's leadership character is based on the two histories (DH and CH). The narrative begins with his dramatic rise to fortune from humble beginnings as a shepherd to his acclamation as king over Israel (Howard 1987:42; Conroy 1983:64). Through the narratives, Yahweh is portrayed as favouring him (Gerhard 1962:306ff). His rise to power is characterised by dramatic events. From the beginning David's leadership character is traced through different stages: Firstly, *as a youth* David proved that although he was a young man he was capable of exercising leadership. By shepherding the flock of his father Jesse David proved that he can be trusted in 'shepherding' the nation. David's *anointing to kingship* at his early age was a further proof that the kingship of God was in crisis and a divine intervention was necessary (Esler 1983:61-76). As a *talented young man* David's leadership qualities were revealed through music and military skills. His music skill was used as medicinal remedies to the tormented leader, Saul. As a military hero, David defeated the proud, aggressive and gigantic giant, Goliath and fought victoriously in many battles. He risked his own life by expressing servanthood character. David indicated that trusting God was the right option rather than on the armour and men power. Victory was won through faith in God. A person who trusts the Lord in such

circumstances proves leadership character. In David, leadership qualities were clearly displayed.

4.4.3. David's leadership character as an adult

4.4.3.1. Introduction

David was no longer a seventeen year old shepherd boy; he has become a grown and married man. David was faced with more responsibilities than before. His leadership skills become evident on the basis of his family relations, his relationship with other people and as a king of Israel.

David had eight wives⁴⁸, seven of whom bore him children. The names of David's children are listed in the Scriptures. He had many unknown sons and daughters. His line continues unbroken among the kings of Judah, and the NT traces this line, via two routes, to Jesus (Mt 1; 6-17; Lk 3:23-31). Throughout the narrative, David's wives played vital role in his life, irrespective of positive or negative influence. Therefore, the female characters in David's life cannot be ignored (Berlin 1982:69). Observing the variety of literary characters, Foster (1949:75) distinguished between "flat" and "round" characters. The flat ones, in their purest form, are built around an idea, or a single notion (Amit 2001:72). They have no inner life, while the round characters are complex, self-aware, and capable of development and change. Based on this, Ewen (1980:33-44) is of the view

⁴⁸Seven of whom bore him children. The names of David's children are listed in Scriptures. He had many unknown sons and daughters. His line continues to unbroken among the kings of Judah, and the NT traces this line, via two routes, to Jesus (Mt 1: 6-17; Lk 3:23-31). David's prominence as Israel's greatest king and his importance as a theological symbol are noticed. The names of David's wives are: Michal, daughter of Saul, for whom he paid a hundred foreskins of the Philistines men as a dowry (1 Sam 18: 20ff), A'hinoam of Jezraeel (1 Sam 25:43; 1 Chron.3: 1); Abigail, widow of Nabal (1 Sam 25: 39-42; 1 Chron 3: 1), Maacha, daughter of the Aramaean king of Geshure (2 Sam 3: 3; 1 Chron.3:2); Haggith, mother of Adonijah, one of David's sons(2 Sam 3:4; 1Chron.3:2); Abital, mother to Shephatiah, one of David's sons (2 Sam3:4; 1 Chron.3:3); Eglah , mother to Ithream, one of David's sons (2 Sam 3:5;1 Chron.3:3); Bathseba, Uraih's widow (2 Sa. 11:1ff); and other wives (1 Chron 3:6-9; 1 Chron. 14:3-4) as well as concubines (1 Chron.3:9). The most prominent was Abigail (1 Sam 25) and Bathseba (2 Sam 11-12). Throughout the narrative, David's wives played a vital role in his life irrespective of positive or negative. Therefore, the female characters in David's life cannot be ignored (Berlin 1982:69).

that between the extremes (the flat and rounded characters), there are many intermediate gradations; for example the round type-character that has a dominant quality. The life of David, both in a negative and positive side, is characterised by those two extreme female characters, which cannot be ignored or left unscrutinised. Berlin (1983:23-33) shows how different kinds of women related to the stages of David's life.

Two contrasting views regarding David's relationship with people are noteworthy. Those views are based on the Deuteronomistic and Chronicler Histories. The Deuteronomistic tradition is of the view that David loved his children too much and could not bring himself to discipline them for wrongdoing, even when some of them rebelled against him (2 Sam 15:1-12ff, 16:15-23). In contrast the Chronicles omitted such stories. The omission of David's mistakes by the Chronicler is regarded as the defense of him (cf. Whitelam 1984:61-87).

4.4.3.2. David's leadership challenged.

David was later faced with a life-threatening challenge, more severe than he had with Goliath (Hillel 2006:170). His leadership character was tested on how he dealt with political opposition. David's opposition can be divided into two categories, namely opposition from within his fellow country men and opposition from outside his country. The former refers to Saul and the later to the Philistines. In all his situations, David had to remain calm, focused and put his faith in God. David's opposition is filled with wide contrasts (1 Sam 18-20:42). The contrast is reflected in the lifelong friendship of Saul's son, Jonathan with David; of the love of Saul's daughter Michal for David; and of Saul's first attempt to kill David. A whole range of emotions of people related to David is portrayed in 1 Samuel 18: friendship, love, celebration, envy, deceit, violence, and fear (Boogaart 1985:204-214). The outcome of the battle between David and Goliath planted the seed of fortune in David, Michal and Jonathan. Both people loved David (Howard 1984: 42)⁴⁹. Saul's reaction to David's victory was a typical sign of jealousy which

⁴⁹In 1 Sam 18:6-21:1, the narrator elaborates how the women showed their sense of relief by singing joyful songs after hearing the victory over the Philistines.

occupied his heart and mind. The results were hatred and pursuit from Saul's side. The root cause of all this was Saul's misinterpretation of the women's appraisal song (1 Sam 18:8-9):

“...as they danced they sang: “Saul has slain **his thousands** and David **his tens of thousands**...and from that time on Saul kept a **jealous eye on David.**”

Saul's jealousy was increased by the song. His intention was to trap David. By the cultural aspects of marriage in the ancient world, parents had a direct influence on whom and how their daughters and sons got married (Yamauchi 1978:241-251).

David's fortune waxed as Saul's jealousy increased and his fortunes declined according to 1 Sam 18:9-16. Saul's plot against David appears in two or more folds:

*By Saul's hoping that the Philistines would kill David, and
by Saul's use of his own daughters, Merab and Michal*

In this scenario, Saul used his daughters Merab (1 Sam 18:17) and Michal (1 Sam 18:21) as a tool to have David killed. By offering Merab to David in marriage, Saul wanted her to serve as a brave and loyal daughter. Saul intentions were clear: Saul was thinking that in this way the Philistines would kill David, and he would not have to do it himself (1 Sam 18:17). In reply David turned the offer down. Michal's love towards David created another opportunity for Saul to have David killed. As revenge to his enemies Saul wanted from David as payment for the bride, the foreskins of a hundred dead Philistines. Saul planned that David would be killed by the Philistines (1 Sam 18:24-26). Surprisingly to Saul David brought what was required of him (1 Sam 18: 27-28). David's marriage was politically motivated (Levinson 1998:507-18).

Despite all the negative aspects injected into David's life, he succeeded to defeat the enemies and became famous (1 Sam 18:28-30). The Deuteronomist makes the reader understand that David succeeded because the LORD was with him, and all of Israel 'loved' him (1 Sam 18:28). Saul felt threatened by David's success (1 Sam 18:8-9). The concept 'all Israel is significant in the Chronistic History in the divided kingdom'. To the Chronicler the concept of all Israel includes both the Southern and the Northern Kingdom

(Throntveit 2003:375). In this scenario Saul thought the people would make David king (Sam 18:8b). Another example is found in 1 Samuel 20:31. Saul rebuked his son Jonathan by stating that as long as David lived Jonathan would not be king. Saul became obsessed with killing David and endeavoured by various means to do so. Michal (1 Sam 19:11- 17), Saul's daughter and Jonathan, his son, came to David's aid against their father's plans. Jonathan's love for David and the covenant between them is illustrated. Their relationship would play an important role when David becomes king. Although brother and sister tried their best to secure David's safety, the latter was forced to flee from Jerusalem permanently, due to Saul's pressure to kill him. Saul's action towards David was an indication that he foresees a strong leader in David.

While faced with life threatening circumstances three outstanding features regarding David's leadership character are noted in this discussion. Firstly, there was David's reaction to political opposition, namely internal and external (opposition). Secondly, David's overwhelming support from Saul's children and from the LORD. Thirdly, despite the life threatening situation, David's fame increased. Gordon (1980:37-64) regards the event as David's rise while its Saul's demise.

David's leadership character was tested on how he dealt with political opposition. David's opposition can be divided into two categories, namely opposition from his fellow country men and opposition from outside his country. David's opposition is filled with wide contrasts (1 Sam 18-20:42). The contrast is reflected in the lifelong friendship of Saul's son, Jonathan with David; of the love of Saul's daughter Michal for David; and of Saul's first attempt to kill David. Both Jonathan and Michal demonstrated their complete loyalty to David (Magga-Cohen 2005:251-268).

Despite all the negative aspects injected into David's life, he succeeded in defeating his enemies and he became very famous (1 Sam 18:28-30) even further and because the LORD was with David, all of Israel "loved" him (1 Sam 18:28). Saul felt threatened by David's success. Saul's eagerness to pursue David even in the prophets' territory was an indication that his intention to kill David was clear. He was known to be among the prophets (Sturdy 1970:206-213).

4.4.3.3. David as fugitive hero

1 and 2 Samuel portrayed the time David had to live as an outlaw, compelled to flee from Saul, who sought to kill him. The narratives depict David's magnanimity towards the persecuting Saul and the respect which he cherished for Saul and his royal office (Kapelrud 1966:38). David's intelligence and intuition endowed him with a talent for public demonstration (Hillel 2006:291). Saul had premonitions that David would succeed him as king. As David's popularity grew, Saul's fear increased until he could no longer hide his desire to kill him. David had no option but to flee from a worried and jealous king and to live as a fugitive (Finkelstein and Silberman 2007:63).

As David was independent, he had to show leadership qualities. My intention is to reflect on David's leadership in the wilderness. David prevailed in difficult situations even though he had no legal protection. His physical safety depended entirely upon his wits, not forgetting that the Lord protected him. In order to become a political and military leader David had to win the loyalty of clan chiefs and towns that owned nominal allegiance to Saul. The arid ranges and steppes of Judah formed a frontier or no-man's land where Saul's authority had no influence, and where outlaws gathered (Brueggemann 1990:108ff). In the ancient world the worst penalty the state could impose was life in exile from one's native environment. This was a fate considered at the time worse than death. In the Judean wilderness David launched his movement for the national crown. Every one who was in distress, and everyone who was in dept, and everyone who was discontented, gathered with him; and he become captain over them(1 Sam22: 2). He was a chief of outlaws and a refugee like them. He preserved the *esprit de corps* of this band which numbered between 400 and 600 men. As a fugitive hero David demonstrated his leadership character by leading a group of six hundred men excluding their families (wives and children). A person who is capable of leading a large group of people and meeting their basic needs proved to be an ideal leader. David's leadership qualities were portrayed as he took unpopular decision by acting justly. The loot was equally distributed among all his men, including those who did not go to fight. By so doing, David taught that no job is better than the other. Distributive justice was portrayed. Indeed, David proved to be an ideal leader.

4.4.3.4. David's leadership character as a refugee

David's leadership qualities are expressed while he was on the run from Saul. While fleeing, his movements can be traced in about eight places, namely, at Nebo, Gath, Moab, Judah, Keilah, Ziba, Moan and Engedi. Those places can be grouped in two categories, namely within the territory of Israel and in foreign territory. David's leadership qualities can be traced during these movements. Out of those places, David's movements were characterised by tragedies and fortunes. An unforgettable tragedy happened in Israel's territory at Nebo where Saul slaughtered the house of the prophets (1 Sam 22:3-5; 22:6-19). David's remorseful action towards the death of Ahimelech and his household reveals a sympathetic heart and compassion (Firth 2006, cf. Constable 1967:85). He accepted full responsibility for their killings and vowed to provide security for Abiathar (1 Sam 18:22-23). Compassion is one of the desired characters of a good leader. In foreign territory David's leadership character was portrayed in a number of ways. Among the Philistines David was a brave warrior, and the secret of his bravery was that God protected him (Mare 2006:712-722). Upon settling at Adullam, he was joined by many people, including marginal and disaffected members of society, who became his strongest army (1 Sam 22:1-2). By that time, his parents relied upon him for safety. Knowing that he was still fleeing David crossed into Moab to seek shelter for his parents and placed them into the temporary care of Moabite king (1 Sam 22:3-5). His descent from the Moabite Ruth could have helped him (Howard 1984:42). This character as a warrior was expressed when he defeated the Philistines after attacking Keilah. David showed kindness to the towns he saved when they planned to hand him over to Saul (1 Sam 23:1-13).

4.4.3.5. Mercy for enemies

The Deuteronomist presented two important scenarios describing David's opportunity to do what he liked with Saul. Those incidences are recorded in 1 Samuel 24:2-23; 1 Samuel 24:1-22; cf. 1 Samuel 26:1-25 and 1 Samuel 26:1-25). The incidences described how David spared Saul's life (Green 2003a:1-23). There is no record in the Chronicler regarding Saul pursuing David. In those prime scenarios, David decided to spare Saul's life. In *the first incident* (1 Sam 24:1-15), David used the opportunity to address Saul. In

his address, three important factors are highlighted: (1) David advised Saul about the danger of listening to bad advice (1 Sam 24:9); (2) there was evidence that he had the opportunity to kill Saul (1 Sam 24:10-11); (3) David's assured Saul that he would not harm him (1 Sam 24:12). In response to this remarkable incident, which is described as mercy, Saul was left with no choice but to repent (1 Sam 24:16-23). Was this permanent and genuine repentance or was it a temporary and fake one? A close observation reveals that Saul's repentance was temporary. The *second incident* revealed David's address to Saul's body guards, with special emphasis to Abner (1 Sam 26:13-16). Two outstanding features are noted: (1) David reprimands Abner for failing in his duty to protect the king (1 Sam 26:15-16); (2) David's enquiry regarding the cause of Saul's pursuits (1 Sam 26:17-21). (3) Evidence that he had the opportunity to kill Saul (2 Sam 26:22-24). Saul's response revealed that he was assured that David did not want to kill him. In 2 Samuel 16:1-13, a narrative about Saul's relative cursing David is recorded. Regardless of being cursed, David did not pay revenge. In his study on 2 Samuel 16:5-14, Bruggemann (1974:175-92) is of the opinion that David coped with curse. David's leadership character was revealed by his mercy. Those two scenarios revealed a merciful character in David. Mercy is one of the most outstanding attributes admired for an ideal leader.

4.4.3.6. Openness to advice

The death and burial of Samuel received little attention in the books of Samuel (1 Sam 25:1a). The story about his death covers half of verse one of chapter twenty-five. The Deuteronomistic History did not give an elaboration on the narratives. No mention of Samuel's death in the Chronistic History. David had the opportunity to bury Samuel with other Israelites. After Samuel's burial, David resumed his temporary activity of running away from Saul (1 Sam 25: 1b -43). He went to the wilderness of Paran (25:1b). In the area of Maon, David met Nabal, a man whose character lived up to the meaning of his name, (namely fool) (Howard 1984: 43). Nabal was known as a rich man in the region (Green 2003a:1-23). David's message to Nabal through one of his men proved that he (David) and his band provided security for Nabal's assets (1 Sam 25:14-17). In response Nabal continued to reveal and expose his selfish and foolish character (1 Sam 25:9-11). Had it not be for Abigail's intervention in the situation (1 Sam 25:23-35), David would

have left the stone unturned for Nabal's belongings including him. Abigail spared him from David's retribution (Howard 1984:43). Abigail's intervention proved that she was aware of David's special favour from YHWH (1 Sam 25:28-31). David listened to Abigail's advice and stopped his attack on Nabal (Camp 1981:14-29). The drama about Nabal closes at his death, and Abigail becomes one of David's wives. In this narrative, *openness to advice* as one of David's leadership characters is portrayed.

4.4.3.7. A sympathetic heart

David's leadership character is clearly revealed by his reaction to Saul and Jonathan's tragic death. The story of Saul's tragic death is portrayed in both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler Histories. The Deuteronomist devotes more than twenty-three chapters to Saul and his reign (1 Sam 31; 2 Sam 1:1-23:29). The Chronicler is only interested in the final story of his death at the hands of the Philistines (1 Chron 10:1-13).

The Chronicler began their narratives without the long and complicated story of Saul's decline and David's rise (Thronveit 2003:377). The Chronicler alerts careful readers to a different picture of Saul, a picture that serves his (their) portrayal of David. The Deuteronomistic presented both a humiliated and honoured Saul (Brueggemann 1990:208). The Chronicler had a negative view of Saul (Thronveit 2003:377). To the Chronicler, three important aspects are noted (1) Saul's death (1 Chron 10:1-7), (2) the humiliation of Saul's house (1 Chron 10:8-12); (3) the Chronicler's all-theological evaluation or negative view? (1 Sam 10:13-14). In this scenario (1 Sam 31), David continued to run away from Saul and sought refuge in the Philistine region (1 Sam 28:1-2; 29:1-11). This incident had the effect of removing David from any responsibility for Saul's death as recorded in 1 Samuel 31. Saul's persistence to kill David was an indication that he regarded him as a threat. The manifestation of Saul's 'madness', persecution mania, contradictory behaviour, irrational anger, and violent changes of mood between ecstasy and dark despondency, were consistent with the symptoms of what is today recognised as manic depression.

The scenario served as a clear indication that he was an incompetent leader (Kamm 1999: 53). Saul's end is told in 1 Samuel 29-31. David, who has distanced himself from Saul's

insane jealousy and hired himself out as a Philistine mercenary, is conveniently sidelined, so that he does not have to fight against his own people. Saul, severely wounded by several arrows, commits suicide on the battlefield. His three sons including Jonathan, beloved by David, are killed alongside him. David's respect for the office of king was again demonstrated when he received the report of Saul's and Jonathan's death (1 Sam 31: 1-2 Sam 1:27). A self-serving Amalekite brought the news. The Amalekite was killed for his lack of respect for the royal office (2 Sam 1:1-16). David's lament (2 Sam 1: 17-27) over the death of Saul and Jonathan is a model of grief and was recorded in the poetic "Book of Jashar" (1:18; Joshua 10:12-13; 1 Kgs 8: 12-13 (LXX) (Howard 1984: 43).

4.4.3.8. Synthesis

David was no longer a seventeen year shepherd boy; he has become a married man with increased responsibilities. His leadership skills become evident on the basis of his family relations and with the general public. Two contrasting views regarding David's relationship with people are noteworthy. The Deuteronomistic tradition is of the view that David loved his children too much and could not discipline them for wrongdoing, even when one of them rebelled against him (2 Sam 15:1-2ff, 16; 15-23). In contrary the Chronicles omitted such stories in order to present David as a spotless king. David's *leadership character was challenged* in various ways and different circumstances. His leadership character was tested on how he dealt with political opposition. David's opposition can be divided into two categories, namely opposition from within his fellow country men and opposition from outside his country. Opposition from his country men (Saul in particular) was severe that he was forced to become a fugitive. As a *fugitive hero* David's leadership character proved that for the sake of peace and to prevent civil war, it was proper for him to 'run' away from Saul than to cause bloodshed among the Israelites.

He was also capable of leading a group of six hundred men excluding their families. David's leadership character was also revealed while seeking refuge in other countries such as Nebo, Moab and Philistia

As a refugee, he was confronted with challenging situations but he overcame those challenges. By showing mercy to Saul his greatest enemy David demonstrated he was a *kind and merciful leader* (1 Sam 24:1-25; 1 Sam 26:17-21). Openness and listening to advice are some of the scarce leadership qualities. In David, such qualities were demonstrated. The Deuteronomist presented a narrated event regarding Nabal and Abigail (1 Sam 25:1-43). Lastly, David's leadership is portrayed through his sympathetic heart and exercise justice at the death of Saul and his son Jonathan (2 Sam 1:1-23:29). Both the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler narrated the death of Saul (1 Sam 31; 1 Chron 10:1-13). Further David exercised retributive justice to 'a self confessed king killer', an Amalekite who thought David would be pleased by the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam 1:1-16).

4.4.4. David's leadership character as king

4.4.4.1. Introduction

The reign of David marks politically speaking Israel's golden age. A power vacuum in both Egypt and Mesopotamia made it possible for the tribes that had entered Canaan under Joshua a few centuries earlier to become a mighty nation. The story of David, first as a tribal king in the South and then as king over all Israel, is recorded in books 2 Samuel and I Kings 1-2. David was a realist with the ideal of improving the lot of his countrymen. His actions and speeches demonstrated that he was a chosen king. His sincere convictions led him to important political results without the cynicism of political intrigue (Cahill 2004:20ff). He excelled in exercising patience, attempting at all times to avoid shedding the blood of any Israelite. David knew that it would set back any program for national unification. He dramatised his belief in the sacredness of the royal person to impress King Saul's entourage (Finkelstein 2002a:118). When the Philistines at Gibeon killed Saul, David's moving elegy not only voiced his personal grief, but also served to reconcile Saul's following movement. His message of gratitude to Jabesh-Gilead for the burial of the royal dead was a sign of the inauguration of his own reign as king, which was newly established at Hebron (Jones 2002b:208).

4.4.4.2. The anointing of David as king

4.4.4.2.1. Introduction

The anointing of David king of Judah and later as king of both Israel and Judah happened after the tragic death of Saul and his three sons in battle (1 Sam 31:1-13). The Chronicler's view of Saul's death differs from that of the Deuteronomist. Two modifications clarify the Chronicler's use of the story. In Chronicles 10 'all his men' are replaced by 'all his house' (1 Chron 10:6). As a result Saul's kingdom came to an end. To the Chronicler the end of Saul's line re-emerges in the concluding theological evaluation that *God* slew Saul and turned the kingdom over to David as a direct consequence of Saul's unfaithfulness (1 Chron 10:13-14). Both the north and the south experienced military defeat and exile due to their unfaithfulness (1 Chron 5:25; 1 Chron 9:1; 2 Chron 36; 14). The Chronicler begins his (their) narrative with the story of Saul: a picture of Israel in exile, defeated by enemies because of the unfaithfulness of a king who is everything a king should not be. The message is clear. In Chronicles, exile is always a possibility for those who, like Saul, are unfaithful and for those who like the Israelites follow them (2 Chron 36:13-21).

David was anointed as king on two separate occasions. (1) David was anointed king of Judah at Hebron where he ruled for seven years. (2) David's anointment as king of both Israel and Judah. The detail of his anointment is mentioned by the two traditions (2 Sam 5:1-10; 1 Chron 11:1-9). David's anointment as king of Judah is recorded in the Deuteronomistic tradition (2 Sam 2:1-7) and excluded by the Chronicler. Two separate ceremonies performed by Judah are omitted in the Chronicler. The Deuteronomistic highlighted the division between Israel and Judah, while the Chronicler concentrated on the unity among both Israel and Judah. Scholars have long recognised the differing depictions of David in the books Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (Throntveit 2003:374; Bruggemann 2002; Steussy 1999). The Chronicler used the David story to address the needs of his (their) postexilic community who questioned the value of God's old promises to David in the time of Persian domination. To the Chronicler, the founder of the kingdom has become the founder of the Temple and public worship, the king and hero. When David succeeded to the throne, he founded a family dynasty that lasted over four hundred years. The

anointing of David as king in Israel was a fulfillment of his rise (North 1982:524-544; Lemche 1978:2-15).

4.4.4.2.2. Anointing of David as king of Judah

After the death of Saul David's family and his men returned to Judah and settled at Hebron (2 Sam 2:1-3). David's leadership qualities are demonstrated when he was anointed king of Judah (2 Sam 2:4). By anointing David as their king, the local leaders of Judah had shown confidence in and trusted him. No mention of a power struggle for the leadership position in Judah. David's desire to unit Israel and Judah is portrayed by his condolences to Saul's family and for his appraisal for their efforts to bury Saul. He consistently demonstrated that he was not responsible for Saul's death. The other eleven tribes of Israel followed Saul's commander, Abner, and made Ishbosheth their king (2 Sam 2: 8-11) (Robinson 1993:160). Isho-bosheth ruled Israel for two years (2 Sam 2:8-10). During this period, there was an ongoing war between the two halves, Judah and Israel. Under David's leadership, Judah grew stronger and stronger, while Ishbosheth's incompetence made Israel weaker and weaker. 2 Samuel 2-4 reflects on the natural rivalry that existed between Israel and Judah; the narrator is couched in terms of the rivalries between the houses of Saul and David (e.g. 3:1, 6). The Chronicler passed over the event of 2 Samuel 2-4 without comment (Throntveit 2003:376). The dispute between the families of David and Saul are omitted by the Chronicler. The kingdom had not yet been divided, yet "Israel" is referred to several times in contrast to "Judah" (e.g., 2:0-10; 3:10, 19,37; 4:1), reflecting the very real divisions that existed throughout the nation's history (Howard 1984:43).

In these chapters (2 Sam 2:8-4:12), the rivalry is played out through Abner, and Joab, David's general. Joab killed Abner for this (2 Sam 3:26-30) despite the treaty between David and Abner (2 Sam 2: 24-32) and that Abner had had friendly contacts with David (3:12-21). David mourned for Abner's death (3:31-39), in a manner reminiscent of his mourning Saul's death (Howard 1984: 43). This and more pleased the people (3:36). Ish-bosheth then was murdered, eliminating all effective rivalry to David's claim to the throne (chapter 4). David again mourned and had the murderers executed, again displaying the concern for fairness in combat exhibited (Howard 1984:43). It was a testimony to David's personal magnetism and abilities, as well as

to YHWH's favour upon him, that a unified kingdom was able to exist as it did under him (Kamm 1999:55).

David was anointed to become the king of Judah without conflict. The leaders of Judah had confidence in David. David's leadership qualities are portrayed through (1) David's lament for Saul and his Jonathan (2 Sam 1:17-27); (2) his attempts to unify Israel and Judah; (3) his condolences to Saul's family and for his appraisal for their efforts to bury Saul; (4). David's mourning for Abner's death (2 Sam 3:31-39) reminiscent of his mourning of Saul's death.

4.4.4.2.3 Anointing of David as king over all Israel

The anointing of David as king over Israel and Judah is portrayed both in the Deuteronomistic (2 Sam 5:1-16) and the Chronistic histories (1 Chron 11:1-9; 14:1-7). In 1 Chronicles 11-12, the Chronicler combines a variety of Chronologically and geographically disparate lists to demonstrate the unity of 'all Israel', north and south, and their immediate and unanimous recognition of David's kingship (Thronveit 2003: 374). An outer framework describing David's anointing at Hebron (1 Chron 11:1-3, 12:38-40) includes lists of the warriors who attended the festivities (1 Chron 11:10-47; 12: 23-38), while an inner frame work David's forces while stationed at Zikgal (1 Chron 12:1-7; 12:19-22) includes those who joined him at 'the stronghold' (1 Chron 12:1-7; 12:19-22) (Williamson 1982:25-28). The deteriorating leadership condition of Israel led to a state of desperation, and finally to the assassination of Ishobesht by his own subjects (Brueggemann 1971:317-132). Without an alternative, the elders of the northern tribes came to Hebron and anointed David as king of all Israel. By coming to David in order to anoint him as king of Israel, the elders of the community proved that they trusted him (cf. Brueggemann 1972c). David was anointed for the third time, also at Hebron, this time over all Israel and Judah (2 Sam 5:1-5; 1 Chron 11:1-9). David's leadership qualities are further elaborated by being anointed to be a king over all Israel. The restoration of David to Michal was an indication that he regained what he lost during Saul's reign (Ben-Barak 1979:15-29).

The question is why David, and why not someone else? David's leadership style is what the northern tribes of Israel admired for a king of Judah. Apart from David, they found no one who would be capable to lead the nation.

After the event he was to take Jerusalem, and he reigned there for 33 years, with a total reign of 40 years (Howard 1984: 43). As the anointed king of Israel and Judah, the remaining impediment to his movement to unite the north with the south was the fortified city of the Jebusites, Jerusalem (Yadin 1952). The walled city occupied an impregnable position, and had been occupied since pre-history. As an independent Canaanite city, Jerusalem had its own king, Melchizedek (Gen 14:18-20). The priest-king Melchizedek became the model for sacred kingship, which David introduces into the customs of his realm.

4.4.4.2.4. Synthesis

Politically, the reign of David marks Israel's golden age. A power vacuum in both Egypt and Mesopotamia made it possible for 'Israel' to become a mighty nation. The narratives of David, first as tribal king in the South and then as king over all Israel is recorded in both the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic Histories. His sincere convictions led him to important political results without the cynicism of political intrigue (Cahill 2004:20ff). David excelled in exercising patience, and attempted to avoid shedding of blood of any Israelite. The anointing of David as king of both Judah and Israel was an indication that he had unique leadership qualities that others lacked. The deteriorating of leadership condition of Israel led to a state of desperation. In both instances, he was 'followed' for the position instead of him demanding to be made king (2 Sam 2:1-7; 1 Chron 11:1-9; 14:1-7).

4.4.4.3. Successful leadership

4.4.4.3.1. Introduction

The story of David's rise to power is narrated in the DH (Deut 10:8; Joshua 15:63, Jdg 1:21; 1 Sam 7:1-2, 2 Sam 5:6-10, 2 Sam 11:1; 2 Sam 23:19, 1 Kgs 7:40-47) and the CH (1 Chron 5:13, 1 Chron 11:1-11; 1 Chron 13:1-14; 1-7, 15:25-29; 1 Chron 16:37-43; Ezra 3:11; 1 Chron 18:1-17; 1 Chron 19:1-19, 1 Chron 22: 1-19, 1 Chron 26:4-5). David's leadership character can further be traced through his successful events and deeds. His successes are measured in: *political, socio-economic, good moral values* and *religious* aspects.

4.4.4.3.2. Political success

(a) Introduction

David's rise to power emerged from the early years of his youth when he was anointed to be the next king of Israel (1 Sam 16:13). Years later, he was made king of Judah (2 Sam 2:1-7) and later on, he became the king of the entire nation of Israel (2 Sam 5: 1-5; 1 Chron 11:1-9, 14:1-7). David's rise to power has not been an easy task. He was faced with many challenges starting with his brother's critics, Goliath's mockery although he finally killed him, followed by Saul's jealousy, escaping from dangerous situations, enemy attacks, and natural disasters. David's rise to power is clearly stated by both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic historians.

(b) Israel's world view changed

An overview of political leadership prior to David is crucial in this discussion. Before his rule, Israel had been the object of attacks, as they had been weak. Israel was faced with political challenges from its neighbouring countries like the Philistines. David's political success is portrayed both in the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories. The story of David's rise to power in the DH (Deut 10:8; Joshua 15:63, Jdg 1:21; 1 Sam 7:1-2, 2 Sam 5:6-10, 2 Sam 11:1; 2 Sam 23:19, 1 Kgs 7:40-47) and the CH (1 Chron 5:13, 1 Chron 11:1-11; 1 Chron 13:1-14; 1-7, 15:25-29; 1 Chron 16:37-43; Ezra 3:11; 1 Chron 18:1-17; 1 Chron 19:1-19, 1 Chron 22: 1-19, 1 Chron 26:4-5).

In capturing Canaanite Jerusalem, David was engaged not in a holy war but in acquiring an administrative centre (Miller 1974:115-27). A governing apparatus system would be needed quickly, and was not to be found in the older pattern of the federation. Once the loyalty of the northern tribes was secured, there was a need to have a neutral place for administrative purposes. Hebron, in the heart of the southern tribe of Judah, could no longer serve as his capital (2 Sam 2:1-4). By capturing Jerusalem and living there (Cahill 2004:20-31, 62-63), David assured that no tribe could have undue influence over the king or overly favoured by him. The city stood between and outside the tribal system (Humphrey 1990:61). Jerusalem afforded him numerous advantages (Cahill 2004:20-31). This city was centrally located between Judah and Israel and was not strongly identified with any tribe. Jerusalem had been included in the tribal allotment of Benjamin (Josh 18:28), but appeared as part of the

borders of the tribe of Judah (Joshua 15:8), and it was included in the list of cities Jadeites did not conquer (15:63). Thus it could well play the role of “neutral” capital (Howard 1984:44). Jerusalem consisted of a portion known as the city of David (Tarker & Cahill 1992:52-67).

(c) Military success

In the Ancient Near East, the king served as a military commander-in-chief, with the expectation that he led his city or nation in war (Levinson 2001:517). The Deuteronomistic historian presents the popular demand for a king as filling a judicial, not a military vacuum (Levinson 2001:518). David had his first military success against the Philistines by means of YHWH’s fighting on his behalf (2 Sam 5:17-25; 1 Chron 14:8-17; Howard 1984:44). He continued to demonstrate his military victories, over neighbouring countries such as the Philistines and Moabites (2 Sam 8:1-2; 1 Ki 7:40-47; 1 Chron 18:1-17, 19:1-19), Arameans (2 Sam 8: 3-8; 1 Chron 18:1-17), Edomites (2 Sam 8:13-14), and (2 Sam 8:9-12). Its function is to show that YHWH was impressed with David and that he was an effective warrior and ruler (2 Sam 8:6b, 14b-15). The extent of David’s kingdom was impressive: it reached the Mediterranean in the West; the North of the Sinai desert in the South, much of Transjordan in the East, and it approached the Euphrates in the North (Howard 1984:44).

Although David was commander in chief of his army, he appointed ‘cabinet-level’ chiefs of staff to maintain tight control of his military power base (Coogan 1998:257). Military success brought spoils of war, which filled the royal and priestly coffers (2 Sam 8:7-12 and; 12:30, 1 Sam 15:9 and 27:9) and secured the loyalty of the army and key officials. It also brought war captives into the kingdom. According to the Samuel-Kings (Deuteronomistic) and Chronicles (Chronistic) narratives (Lemos 2006:225-241), foreign servitors came from Ammon, Moab, and Edom, as well as from the various Aramean cities that David encountered in his campaigns to the northeast (2 Sam 8:2-14; 12:31). These captives constituted a workforce with their own chief administrator for building projects initiated by David (2 Sam 5:9, 11; 12:31; 1 Chron 11:2; cf. Coogan 1998:258). The two types of military forces can be related to the king’s efforts to maintain his troops’ allegiance.

The mercenaries, sustained and supported away from home by the crown, served the king directly and were inherently well controlled by the commander (Kapelrud 1966:44). The mercenaries were under the command of Benaiah (2 Sam 8:18). As leader, David shared the responsibilities among his men. By appointing commanders in his army, he wanted to make sure people's needs were met.

The need for an institutionalised political and military administration was a response of Israel's enemies (Constable 1967:85). Measured by his skills concerning military affairs, David proved beyond reasonable doubt that he was an ideal leader. During the reign of David, Israel was depicted as being military, politically and geographically strong.

(d) Synthesis

David succeeded in his position as Israel's leader. In this context his successes have been measured on politically. In capturing Cananite city, Jerusalem, David was engaged not only in a holy war, but in acquiring an administrative centre (Miller 1974:115-127). David made assured that no tribe could have undue influence over the king or overly favoured him. Once more David's was a might warrior. He fulfilled the people's expectation of a military leader. In the Ancient Near East and in Israel, a king would be evaluated on the basis of his military skills. The king served as a military commander-in-chief with the expectation that he led his city or nation in war (Levison 2001:517). In David such skills was common as he fought victoriously against the enemies(2 Sam 5:17-25; 1 Chron 14:8-17) He continued to demonstrate his military victories over neighbouring countries such as the Philistines and Moabites (2 Sam 8:1-2; I Kgs 7:40-47; 1 Chron 18:1-17, 19:1-19) and other nations(2 Sam 8:3-8; 1 Chron 18;1-17).

4.4.3.3. Economic success and administrative skills

Sound economic policies are the crucial phenomenon in every country or nation. David's predecessor, Saul spent much of his time in pursuit of David's leadership character which is revealed through his economic and administrative successes. In 1 Samuel 30:18, David portrayed as rescuing everyone and everything the Amelikites had taken. Victory in warfare, with spoils and attributes, provided an economic base for specialists and workers in the state's overlapping domains of judicial, religious,

commercial, diplomatic and constructional activities. David's military operations brought two important resources: capital, from spoils and tribute; and labour from war captives. The local economy alone could not have supported such projects without severe deprivations to the indigenous farmers, nor would local residents endure the hardship of construction-gang work with enthusiasm. David expanded and systematised his predecessor's rudimentary administrative structures. His administrative team consisted of several officials and their portfolios⁵⁰. In order to feed and pay his officials and to meet the expenses of the court, especially the maintenance of the king's sons who lived in great splendour (2 Sam 15:1; 1 Kgs 1:5), financial resources were necessary (Lods 1932:363). The resources seemed to have been raised by successful wars followed by plunder and tribute imposed upon the conquered⁵¹. David's official Adoram, was head over the conscript labour, and was responsible for the levying of tribute (Lods 1932:363). In connection with David's effectiveness as a ruler, the chapter ends with a list of David's chief administrative officials (2 Sam 8: 16-18). The pair, Ado and Ahimelech served as David's priests (Howard 1984:44). The double set of military officers-one commanding officer of the army and the other in charge of the Cherethites and Pelethites, two foreign mercenary units-reflects the importance of the fundamental source of royal power.

David's administrative leadership is expressed through the appointment of his administrative team. Although the criteria used to select those individuals for the office is not clearly stated, David had confidence in them to serve the community.

4.4.4.3.4. Social success

(a) Introduction

David's social success is measured on how he responded to social situations of his citizens. The well being of the nation depended on the leaders' responsibilities to

⁵⁰ Joab son of Zeruiah was in charge the army of Israel (2 Sam 8:16; 1 Chron 18:15). Both the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler mentioned that, Benaiah son of Jehoiada was in of the Kerethites and Pelethite (2 Sam 8:17; 1 Chron 18:17), sometimes referred as David's bodyguard. Adoniram was in charge of the revenue (2 Sam 20:24); forced labour, Jehoshaphat son of Ahilud was in charge of the record. Seraiah was the secretary (2 Sam 8: 17b) while Zadok and Abiathar were the priests (1 Chron 18:16), was over the conscript labour, and responsible for the levying of tribute (Lods 1932:363).

⁵¹ In ancient world, the nation conquered in battle or war paid tributes to the nation that conquered.

address social needs such as: dwelling places (houses), education, health, safety and security as well as justice and peace). David was a social being. He danced and celebration in various occasions like when moving the Covenant Box from Baalah in Judah, in order to bring it to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6:1-3, 5-21). Although dancing and celebrating was part of social life during David's leadership, he ensured that basic social needs of the people were met.

(b) Justice and kindness

In this section, justice and kindness are emphasised. David is described as a man after God's heart. This is shown in his traits of grace, mercy, patience, kindness, and justice. The Deuteronomist recorded certain traits which David enjoyed. Firstly, an example of these traits was when two hundred (200) of David's six hundred (600) men were too exhausted to fight the Amalekites; they volunteered to stay behind. Upon their return, some of the men refused to share the plunder and possessions with those who stayed behind (1 Sam 30:9-25). David instructed that loot should be distributed equally between all his men. He made this rule and it has been followed in Israel ever since. This action, David demonstrated *distributive justice*.

Second, an Amalekite confessed that he killed Saul who had already fallen on his own spear (1 Sam 31:4-7). David reprimanded him for not being afraid to kill 'the LORD'S anointed king' (2 Sam 1:14). David himself had a high respect for the life of the "anointed king". In several occasions, David had an opportunity to kill Saul (1 Sam 24:4b-7; 1 Sam 26:7-9; 10-13), but he (David) spared Saul's life because he was the anointed king of the LORD (1 Sam 24:6b; 1 Sam 26:9-11). Justice was to be done. The Amalekite had to face the consequences of his own words. He confessed with his mouth that he had killed Saul, whom David respected highly. David ordered the man to be struck down on the spot for killing the Lord's anointed (2 Sam 1:15-16). 1 Samuel 31:4c, states that *Saul took his own sword and threw himself on it*. Recab and Baanah went and murdered Ish-Bosheth (David's enemy) while he was sleeping on his bed in his own home (2 Sam 4:5-7). By killing David's enemies 'the two' thought David would be pleased. When they brought David the news, he had them killed because they killed an innocent (2 Sam 4:1-12). David loved righteousness and hated wickedness. In both these incidences, *retributive justice* prevailed. Another example of retributive justice in David's leadership character was when he allowed the

Gibeonites to hang seven of Saul's descendents in revenge to his (Saul's) killing them(Gibeonites) during his reign (1Sam 21:1; 1 Sam 21:9).

Third, another display of justice and kindness is given when David showed kindness to the Ammonite king, Hanun (2 Sam 10:1-2), as a token of sympathy for the loss of his father, Nahash. Hanun, however, dishonoured David's ambassadors by shaving off their beards and cutting their clothes (2 Sam 10:4). David did not react against such humiliation but advised his men to stay in Jericho (2 Sam 10:5). In this scenario, David showed kindness to the enemy king demonstrating his efforts to make peace with neighbouring countries. The war that erupted thereafter came as a result of the Ammonites over reaction to their provocation (2 Sam 10:6-19).

Four, David also showed justice by cursing Joab (and his descendants) for taking revenge on Abner for killing Joab's brother Asahel. They did this even though David had sent Abner away in peace (2 Sam 3:22-39). David and Jonathan made a covenant between themselves (1 Sam 18:3-4). Jonathan warned David of Saul's plot against his life (1 Sam 19:1-2). When Saul sought David's life, Jonathan interceded on behalf of David, and Saul reinstated David to good favour (1 Sam 19:17). Jonathan's loyalty to David was proven time after time as he warned David of Saul's threats of vengeance (1 Sam 20) and encouraged David in the times of danger (1 Sam 23:16, 18). After hearing about the tragic death of Saul's sons including Jonathan, David composed a lamentation, the "the Song of the Bow" in which he poured out his grief over the death of Jonathan and Saul (2 Sam 1:17-27). As a token of appreciation and remembering his covenant with Jonathan, David showed kindness to Mephibosheth (2 Sam 9:1-13).

Five, David even spared Shimei, who cursed him and pelted him and his men with stones. Again, David was urged by other men twice (once when Shimei cursed David and once when Shimei repented of his sin) to kill Shimei, but he would not (2 Sam 16:5-14; 19:21-23). David's faith in the Lord that either he needed punishment or Shimei would get his reward soon enough.

In the situation with Nabal, David and Abigail, David saw the blessing in being spared from needless bloodshed and avenging himself (Kaiser 1974:298-318). As a

result, the Lord directly struck down Nabal for him (1 Sam25:1-44). David prayed for God to be just: punishing the wicked (Pss 5:10; 7; 9:5-8; 10:15; 12:3-4), and blessing the righteous (Ps 5:11-12; 7). David had many enemies and cried out to the Lord continually for deliverance (Pss 3; 54; 55:1, 17; 59:1-17; 60:5; 69:14-18). This narratives is regarded by Levinson (1978:11-28) as a literature study.

While staying in Ziklag, David had many people who joined with him to turn Saul's kingdom over to himself. Of interest is how David handled the related situations. A little background: David was banished from the presence of King Saul so he was staying in a stronghold in the desert for safety. Here men from Judah and men from Benjamin, who were Saul's kinsmen and had remained faithful to Saul up to the present time, came to David for the purpose of joining him. "David went out to meet them and said to them, 'If you have come to me in peace, to help me, I am ready to have you unite with me. But if you have come to betray me to my enemies when my hands are free from violence, may the God of our father see it and judge you.' Then the Spirit came upon Amasai, chief of the Thirty, and he said: "We are yours, O David! We are with you, O son of Jesse! Success, success to you, and success to those who help you, for your God will help you." So David received them and made them leaders of his raiding bands" (1 Chron 12:17-18).

The above examples show that David was not a man who went on killing people but was a man interested in doing what was right and just and fair and doing what God wanted him to do. "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts: and see if there is any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting" (Ps 139:23-24). This is what I see David doing: seeking the Lord with all of his heart and walking in righteousness in the strength of the Lord (Pss 63:1-11; 71:5-8).

(c) David's wrongdoing and acknowledgement

Although David was a righteous king, he was subject to wrong doing, just like other human beings. The story of David and Bathsheba played a significant role in David's leadership character. There is a great contrast between the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories regarding the David and Bathsheba story. The Chronicler omits the negative details which appear in the Deuteronomistic regarding David's

misdemeanours. The fact that the Chronicle chose to omit this story does not dismiss it. The Deuteronomistic history presented David's decline in details. His leadership character went through a transitional period. The 'Bathsheba affair' was a critical turning point in David's life (2 Sam 11:1-12:25). Prior to this narrative, David's leadership has shown a peak (Pillay 2009:148)⁵². Details of the matter are given in the narrative. The drama unfolds one spring during Israel's war with Ammonites (2 Sam 10:6, 14; 11:1ff). The Deuteronomist (Dtr) is sure to inform the readers that 'wars were usually waged 'in the spring of the year' (2 Sam 11:1; Lockyer 1986:1092). In Ancient Near East, the king was expected to lead the troops to war. During this time it was customary for kings to go to war with the nation (Youngblood 1992:928).

The narrative consisted of four sequential stages which had an impact on David's leadership. They are: *precursors of David's fall*: circumstances that led to David's action (2 Sam 11:1-5); *the aggravation of his wrongdoing*: cover up and Uriah's murder (2 Sam 11:6-21); *the penitence he manifested and the forgiveness he received*: David's remorseful (2 Sam 11:13-15; Ps 51) ; and *the consequences which flowed from his iniquity*: Tragic incidences in David's family (2 Sam 12:15b-18:33). Pillay (2009:146) attested that David's weakness had a negative impact on David's family.

The narrative puts David in a sensitive spotlight. Two schools of thoughts emerged from the story. Those schools based their argument on the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler's histories. One view characterises David as 'a 'blood thirsty over-sexed bandit' (Mckenzie 1979:236). Mckenzie condemns David's misdeeds (adultery and murder). David is therefore portrayed as a bad husband, a bad father, a bad leader. David is regarded as acting irresponsibly for not leading his troops to battle (Youngblood 1992:928). Gordons (1986:252) argues that Bathsheba is presented as passive that others act upon her. In contrast with McKenzie's view, Terrien sees David as a spotless and faultless man. David is a role model (Terrien 1979:286). McCarthy (1973:401-412) argued that 1 Samuel 7, with its record of the Nathan oracle is at the centre and climax of the history of the monarchy. If these scholars are

⁵²Throughout his life David was seen and admired for his bravery (1 Sam 17), his military strength (1 Sam 18), his ability to honour God and his respect for Saul's position as king (1 Sam 23 and 27). He displays shrewdness in convincing the Philistine king that his presence in Philistia will benefit the Philistines, and David has demonstrated an ethical ability by being able to administer justice (2 Sam 8:15).

correct, then the David narratives need to be reinterpreted. Craven (1975:226-237) presented a unique interpretation of David and Bathsheba's saga. These interpretations are not discussed in this discussion.

David's action displeased the LORD. He had to be brought to a better mind. David was confronted and reprimanded by the prophet Nathan in an exquisite parable (2 Sam 12:2-5)⁵³. After hearing the touching parable, the king in the impatience of his anger, exclaimed: *"As the Lord lives, the man that had done this thing shall surely die: and he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity"* (2 Sam 12:5). Nathan responded: *"Thou art the man"* (2 Sam 12:7ff). Nathan continued to reprimand David but David was remorseful. Three outstanding features are noticed in David's repentance: (1) A flash of lighting into the darkness of David's soul. The exclamation statement "You are that man" (2 Sam 12:7a) was a searching judgment of David by himself. The statement revealed to David, by its momentary brilliance, the full aggravation of his iniquity. David was fully convinced of his wrong doing (Vogels 1975:243-254). An ideal leader would come to his senses and acknowledge his mistakes, regardless of its nature. By acknowledging his own mistakes before God and His servant, Nathan, David proved to possess leadership skills. (2) David's penitence: 2 Samuel 12 are David's genuine utterances of a passionate sincerity. In this text, the word "heart" plays a significant role and the bitter anguish of a wounded conscience discovers itself by the most natural and convincing symbols. Every leader who truly repents without hypocrisy would be panned from any other motive but strong conviction of the heinousness of his offence. (3) Assurance of forgiveness: *Nathan replied, "The LORD forgives you; you will not die"* (2 Sam 12:13). Nathan as Yahweh's representative would not have said anything like that, if the penitence of David had been insincere. There was no attempt at self-vindication; there was no plea in palliation; there was nothing but the frank confession *"I have sinned;" My sin is ever before me."* Nor was it the shame of his iniquity before men, or fear of the punishment he had incurred, that distressed him. David's deepest anguish was that he had displeased his God. David endured the hardship that occurred as a result of his actions.

⁵³ The parable was so finished in its beauty, so admirable in its construction, so perfect in its adaptation, to the end which the divine messenger had in view, as to stand out incomparably the finest thing which the Old Testament contains (Taylor 1874:271).

David endured the hardships that occurred as a result of his actions. Admission of guilt, forgiveness and repentance are three outstanding features credited to David as Israel's ideal leader. Most leaders find it difficult to admit their guilt, asking for forgiveness and repentance. A leader who shows repentance after their own faults is an example of an ideal leader. In this narrative David suits such a character.

(d) A man who consults

David's leadership character is portrayed when he consulted the LORD and the people for direction. David consulted the LORD through Abiathar, the priest. He consulted the LORD before he saved Keilah from the Philistines' attacks (1 Sam 23:1-5). Ironically, the town which David saved planned to hand him over to Saul (1 Sam 23:7-8). In this scenario, David consulted the LORD through Abiathar to verify whether Saul actually planned to catch up with him (1 Sam 23:9-12) or not. Upon receiving the confirmation about the danger, David and his six hundred (600) men left Keilah for another place (1 Sam 23:13). In another instance, David asked the consent of two of his soldiers, Ahimeleck the Hittite and Abishai if one was willing to go with him (1 Sam 26:6-7). David did not impose his will upon the people. David had also consulted with individual personalities, like Abigail (1 Sam 25:1-ff) and listened to the Tekoite women's advice (Hoftijzer 1970:419-44). A 'man' who constantly consults with other people before taking decisions demonstrates leadership qualities.

(e) Granting forgiveness

Although David was an outstanding leader, he was challenged by much opposition especially from Saul's clan. Shimei, of the house of Saul heaped curses, on the head of David (2 Sam 16:5-13). During Absalom's revolt, Shimei cursed David by calling him 'murderer' and 'criminal' (2 Sam 16:7) and accused him for overthrowing Saul's kingdom (2 Sam 16:8). The incident instigated anger towards David's troops. One of David's men, Abishai was provoked by Shimei's allegations/insults and sought permission to slay him. David interpreted the curse as sent from God. In this scenario, as David was in the process of going back to his throne, Shimei made a confession of his guilt of cursing the king, and requested forgiveness (2 Sam 19:19). *"Your Majesty, please forget the wrong I did that day you left Jerusalem. Don't hold it against me or think about it any more. I know, sir that I have sinned, and this is why I am the first one from the northern tribes to come and meet Your Majesty*

today.”David’s follower, Abishai viewed Shimei’s confession of iniquity as sickening hypocrisy. David condemned the revenge on Shimei strongly and forgave him.

In this narrative, four outstanding features are noted. First, *David listened to the plea of confession*: Just like he listened to Shimeis’ cursed utterances (2 Sam 16:5-13); he was also willing to listen to his confession. A leader, who listens to the cry of his subjects with an intuitive ear, demonstrates leadership skills. Listening skills is one of the crucial elements in effective leadership. Second, *David was eager to forgive his adversaries*: He understood the concepts of sin, repentance and forgiveness. He was willing to forgive the man who insulted him without a cause. Third, *David launched amnesty*: By proclaiming amnesty everywhere, David was expressing an attitude of forgiveness. He was encouraging unity among his followers (the people of Israel). Fourth, *power sharing*: David included in his cabinet members of Saul’s clan. The appointment of Amasa by David, as commander of his army was typical of the magnanimity and of a “forgive and forget” attitude that is presented by David’s attitude.

(f) David’s restoration

David did not cling to power through his own efforts. Through the narratives, we are able to trace how David came to have power. Nor do we see him engaging in a power struggle. Had David desired to be involved in a kingship battle, certainly he could have done that. There are a few incidences where he could have become involved in such squabbles which are noted: Firstly, David was anointed king (1 Sam 16:13), yet he did not claim to overthrow Saul; he had to wait for about twenty years before he became king. Secondly, after the death of Saul (2 Sam 1:1-27), David did not pronounce himself as king, instead it was Saul’s descendants who were involved in kingship squabbles. Thirdly, when his son Absalom revolted against him (2 Sam 16:15-23), David did not resist and reinforce his forces to attack Absalom. He surrendered the office voluntarily whereupon his son proclaimed himself a new king until his death (2 Sam 15:13-23; 16:15-23; 17:15-29).

In this scenario, the Deuteronomistic historian presents David as he lost power to his son Absalom. Although it appeared that David had been dethroned, he was still a legitimate king before Yahweh and the nation of Israel. David allowed his son to act against him deliberately. Had he desired to fight back, he would certainly have won

the battle. Following Absalom's death (2 Sam 19:2) there was a power vacuum in Jerusalem and some confusion over David's proper role in Jerusalem and his kingship in a renewed Israel.

Malick (1979:20) maintains that there are two elements in these narratives in support of David's restoration to the throne: (1) Hushai's involvement in encouraging David for war (2 Sam 17:7-13); and (2) Important key people in favour of David to resume his duty as king. The situation was prolonged by the preoccupation with Absalom's death rather than with his loyal followers, after a sharp rebuke by Joab (2 Sam 19:1-8a), David arose to take his rightful place in the gate at Manhaniam (2 Sam 19: 8b-18). North and south tensions which had been visible earlier (2 Sam 2:1-5:14) now resurfaced (Howard 1984:45). To fill the power vacuum David courted the elders of his tribe, Judah. He was accepted by them as king upon his return to Cisjordan. He also courted Amasa, Absalom's general, to the exclusion of his own general, Joab (2 Sam 19:9b-16ff). David's restoration to power indicates that his leadership transcended difficult situations and crisis. The Chronicler's view on David's kingship continued to be fulfilled.

(g) Synthesis

David's leadership character has been traced through social aspects. David was a social being. He danced, and celebrated by playing harps, lyres, drums rattles, and cymbals when he brought the Covenant Box up to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6:5-21). Apart from dancing and celebrating, David concentrated on other social affairs of the community such as: justice and peace, accepting his wrong doing, he consulted both God and other people for advice, he granted forgiveness, and provided safety and security for his entire citizen.

4.4.4.3.5. Religious and spiritual aspects

(a) Introduction

One of the crucial functions of the king in the Ancient Near East was to ensure the spiritual welfare of the nation. The king had an obligation to make sure that the nation kept the sacred religious laws. The celebration of God as King is a common motif in Ancient Near Eastern religion. In the religion of Israel as that of the Near Eastern people, it was common to worship God as a heavenly King (Pixley 1981:10). In

Israel, the king was expected to lead the nation to the LORD. David showed his sincere interest in keeping the laws of the Lord. David's religious and spiritual affairs are portrayed through the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories. The term worship is significant in religious and spiritual affairs.

(b) Deuteronomistic view on David's worship

Studies of worship in the Old Testament have frequently fallen into regular patterns of examining holy places and seasons (Dyrness 1979:143-160; Brueggeman 2005). The approach envisions worship through what has become known as the 'cult'. Cult refers to the formal processes of worship that happened in the sanctuary including the sacrificial system and the various festivals scattered across Israel's calendar (Firth 2009:73). These practices constitute the formal heart of worship in Israel (Firth 2009:74). Pierce (2007:3) defined the term *worship* as 'the relational phenomena between the Creator and the created, which finds expression in both specific events and lifestyle commitments' (Pierce 2007:3).

Deuteronomy is a covenant text in which Israel is directed by its covenant king (Williamson 2007:111-115). The emphasis is based on the rejoicing before God. Deuteronomy's primary goal in worship is the creation of community in response to Yahweh. As the covenant king, Yahweh has created a people, and their worship is fundamentally a lifestyle that understands what it means to be His people. Three fundamental motifs are noted: worship is faithful obedience to God, worship is a response to God's goodness in daily life, and worship is concerned for the marginalised within the community (Firth 2009:75).

The Deuteronomist applied the importance of worship as faithful obedience to God by stressing three elements, namely: *worship where Yahweh chooses*. The Israelites would only worship at the place Yahweh chose where the altar law is stressed (Deut 12:1-7). That place changed over time (1 Kgs 9:3). Miller (1998:110) observed that the aim was not to identify the place, but to urge Israel to conform her worship to divine command. The sacrificial system and the annual feasts were the point of reference (Firth 2009:75). Israel as a nation was to show her obedience by ensuring that formal worship happened in that place.

Worshipping Yahweh alone: Israel was warned about the danger of being led astray to worship other gods by false prophets, a member, a family or a town (Deut 12:29-32). A person cannot be Yahweh's part of community and not honour Yahweh above all else. Since only Yahweh can receive devotion, worshippers were to recognise the temptation that would lead them astray (Firth 2009:76). The Israelites were aware of influential teachers and preachers, of family members or communities that appeared to offer something significant and worthwhile. But whenever they diluted Yahweh's absolute demands they also diluted what was distinctive of Israel (Firth 2009:77). Idolatry was to be counteracted by destroying those who sought to lead the nation into apostasy. Unity with Yahweh produces freedom, but apostasy enslaves the people which is why it is rejected (Firth 2009:77; McConville 2002:241). *Israel was practising cultural obedience to Yahweh.* Absolute obedience to Yahweh was to be demonstrated in all circumstances. Obedience was linked to centralised practises and worship in the home. Leviticus 11 suggests the importance of obedience to Yahweh within culture, providing mechanisms for Israel to live out her holiness as Yahweh's treasured possession (Christensen 2001: 287).

Israelites' worship was not only obedience to Yahweh; it was something that flows out of their daily experience of Him. Aspects of social, economic, political, justice and religious matters are classified as act of worship.

(c) Chronicler's view on David's worship

The Chronicler explores how Israel's relationship with God was expressed through the set-up and upkeep of the covenant, the city of Jerusalem, its temple and sacrificial system, the officiating of the priests, their assistants and musicians and the Davidic king. Baker (2009:29) suggests that the Chronicler describes a holistic culture of worship that nourished a nation. Worship is the identity matrix of the people of God. They were both defined by their worship and renewed by it (Baker 2009:29). Jerusalem is God's chosen city: the temple was located in that city and God's special place of presence. In Chronicle's public worship including sacrifice and songs, play a more prominent and critical role than in the Deuteronomistic. God appeared as a mighty powerful transcendent divinity, Creator, and merciful sustainer of the world (Baker 2009:29).

David endured the hardships that occurred as a result of his actions. Admission of guilt, forgiveness and repentance are three outstanding features credited to David as Israel's ideal leader. The intention of the Deuteronomistic History was to explain the nation's fate due to apostasy from the true worship of God. There was a covenant (Deut 7:12) which God, for His part would keep, but peace and prosperity for the people depended on their faithfulness (Browning 1997). The Deuteronomistic history portrays Israel's unfaithfulness as idolatry and failure to keep God's statutes (2 Kgs 17:7-18). To the Chronicler, Israel's unfaithfulness is identified as forsaking Yahweh. The concept "seeking Yahweh" implies a total response to God. In order to "seek Yahweh" one turns to, prays to, inquires of, trusts in, praises and worships Yahweh and no other god.

David's fortunes reached their peak with the significant royal-grant covenant that YHWH made with him (2 Sam 7). He had an opportunity to be informed that he himself would have a descendant on the throne in perpetuity (Howard 1984:44). David's religious sensibilities are shown via his desire to bring the exiled ark back to Jerusalem and to build a suitable house for it (Howard 1984: 44). The account of the ark's return concludes several stories about its fortunes (1 Sam 4:1-7:1), usually collectively referred to as the 'Ark Narrative'. In this account David is depicted as insensitive towards the strict religious conventions regarding the ark (cf. Num 4:15), but nevertheless well intentioned. The ark eventually was brought to the City of David amid much celebration (2 Sam 6:5; 12-19; cf. Howard 1984:44). Michal, David's wife was embarrassed by his vigorous celebrations. She reprimanded David for his actions (dancing), and as a result she ended up barren (2 Sam 6:16, 20-23), effectively eliminating the possibility that a descendant of Saul's would have any hereditary claim to David's throne, a threat to the promise.

The double set of priestly administrators reflects upon other crucial aspects of royal control. Royal rule depended on priestly groups stationed at shrines throughout the kingdom. Their appointment was from the crown and thus ensured loyalty to the throne (Coogan 1998:257). With the royal and ritual offices inextricably linked, priestly officials had to do more than just simply perform ritual acts. Their work also included communication, adjudication and the collection of revenues (in the form of offerings). These functions may have overlapped with traditional procedures under the control of the village and tribal elders. The network of priestly officials was

closely linked to the redistribution of goods and thus deserved senior government supervision.

Effective leadership entails involving men and women who are capable and committed to doing the work rather than filling the space. Service delivery is one of the most crucial aspects of good leadership. David's leadership qualities are portrayed through his office bearers. By keeping the promises made with Jonathan earlier, David demonstrated that he is a God fearing person. Keeping a promise is one aspect of good leadership. The early promises to Jonathan were now fulfilled: David sought to show kindness to a descendant of Saul for the sake of his covenant. With Jonathan (2 Sam 9:1-13; cf 1 Sam 20:14-17, etc. Howard 1984:44). David took care of Mephibosheth, Jonathan's son.

(c) Synthesis

One of the crucial functions of the king in the Ancient Near East was to ensure the spiritual welfare of the nation. The king had an obligation to make sure that the nation kept the sacred religious laws. The celebration of God as king is a common motif in Ancient Near Eastern religion. In the religion of Israel as that of the Near Eastern people, it was common to worship God as a heavenly King (Pixley 1981:10). In Israel, the king was expected to lead the nation to the LORD. David showed his sincere interest in keeping the laws of the Lord. David's religious and spiritual affairs are portrayed through the Deuteronomistic and the Chronic Histories. The term worship is significant in religious and spiritual affairs. Religious and spiritual affairs are the central themes in the Ancient Near East and in Israel. David's leadership character is also portrayed by both the Deuteronomistic and Chronicler histories.

The intention of the Deuteronomistic History was to explain the nation's fate due to apostasy and idolatry from the worship of God. There was a covenant (Deut 7:120) which God, for His part would keep, but peace and prosperity for the people depended on their faithfulness. To the Chronicler Israel's unfaithfulness is identified as forsaking Yahweh. The concept "seeking Yahweh" implies a total response to God. In order to "seek Yahweh" one turns to, prays to inquire of, trusts in, praise and worships Yahweh and not other god.

As a religious leader, David changed his capital from Hebron to Jerusalem for religious purposes. He further moved the Ark Covenant Box of the Lord from Baalahim in Judah to Jerusalem (2 Sam 4:1-7:1; 2 Sam 6:5; 12-19). Further more, he was willing to build a House for the Lord (Howard 1984:44). In his final address to the community and his son Solomon, he gave instructions for the Temple (1 Chron 28:1-21), he also encouraged the Israelites to worship God. Finally, there in front of the whole assembly David praised the Lord (1 Chron 29:10-20).

4.4.4.3.6. Reaction to crisis situations

(a) Introduction

The penal consequences of David's wrong doing took the form of family trials and national troubles in the narratives. The David portrayed here, is the 'Deuteronomistic *David*', not the Chronistic *David*.

(b) Personal and family crisis

Those consequences aroused numerous events in a Chronological order which placed David's leadership under scrutiny: Adultery (2 Sam 11:4), pregnancy (2 Sam 11:5), disguising plans (2 Sam 11: 6-13), murder (2 Sam 11:18-25), rebuke (2 Sam 12:1-7), judgment (2 Sam 11: 8-14) repentance (2 Sam 11:13), sickness of a child (2 Sam 12:14-15), depression (2 Sam 12:16-17), death of a child (2 Sam 12:18), rape (2 Sam 13:14), Hatred (2 Sam 13:15, 21), revenge (2 Sam 13: 27-29), grief (2 Sam 13:31, 36), flee (2 Sam 13: 34, 37-38), return (2 Sam 14:22-24), reconciliation (2 Sam 14:25-33), rebellion and overthrow (2 Sam 15:1-12), flee (2 Sam 15: 13-37), cursed (2 Sam 16:5-14), overthrow (2 Sam 16:15-23), escape (2 Sam 17:15-29), civil war (2 Sam 18:1-33), reprimands (2 Sam 19:1-8), restoration (2 Sam 19:9-18), kindness (2 Sam 19: 18b-23, 24-30, 31-38), another rebellion (2 Sam 20:1-22). David regulated his public administration by the will of God, yet in his family matters, he seems to have disregarded the plain indications of Yahweh's mind contained even in the law of Moses.

(c) National crisis

David's leadership character was also tested during national disasters: *Famine*, *war* and *pestilence*. First, *famine*: After David's restoration to the throne, Palestine was

devastated by a famine which lasted for three years, then pestilence and a severe war. The famine during this time was caused by Saul's mistreatment of the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21:1). As a leader, David was concerned about his subjects. In the midst of this widespread desolation, the people thought of God. David represented their yearning of heart when he went to inquire of the Lord regarding the cause of the terrible calamity. David's initiative to sort the cause of the crisis was an indication that he was a caring leader. (2) *War* (2 Sam 21:16): After the crises of famine, the land of Israel was again exposed to the evils of war. The Philistines reinforced themselves against the Israelites. Among those, there was a giant named Ishi-benob who had an encounter face to face with David and he nearly killed him. Fortunately, Abishai came to David's rescue and killed the giant. David's men vowed that he should no longer go to war again. *"You are the hope of Israel, and we do not want to lose you,"* they said. Third *pestilence*: David's trouble did not end with the defeat of his enemies, for a severe pestilence came upon the land. The pestilence destroyed seventy thousand of the inhabitants and is known as a result of David taking a census in Israel and Judah. Two versions of the narratives are given: the Deuteronomistic version (2 Sam 24:1-24) and the Chronicler's version (1 Chron 21:1-27). According to the Deuteronomistic account, God moved David to give the command, while the Chronicler alleged that Satan stood against Israel, and provoked David to number the people. Counting the people was no strange occurrence in Israel. In this scenario, the intention was disapproved by God who sent the plague that killed thousands of people.

(d) Synthesis

The reaction of David to the plague is of importance in this study. David was deeply touched by the fact that so many people lost their lives as a result of his mistake. It was a deep feeling of compunction in David's heart. He acknowledged his guilt to God, and earnestly appealed for mercy. The three choices⁵⁴ of calamities given by God through Gad the prophet was not an easy task. David's intercession and plea for mercy "David saw the angel who was killing the people, and said to the LORD, *"I am the one who did wrong. What have these poor people done? You should punish me and my family"* (2 Sam 24:17). God through Gad provided a solution for the plague to

⁵⁴ David was given the opportunity to choose one of the disasters, namely: Famine, pestilence, or war.

end. David's reaction to the scenario proved to me that he was indeed an effective leader.

4.4.4.3.7. Power transfer

(a) Introduction

The succession narrative is presented by both the Deuteronomistic (1 Kgs 1:11-53) and the Chronicler (1 Chron 23:1). In the Deuteronomistic account, the succession narrative is categorised by a power struggle, while there is no leadership battle in the Chronicler.

(b) Deuteronomistic portrayal of succession narratives

David was then an old man. He was devoid of the domestic comforts that his courtiers supplied him 1 Kings 1:1-4. The biblical narrator entered the innermost chambers, present at highly intimate situations, and hears private conversation. Bar-Efrat (2004:18) refers to biblical narrators as omniscience narrator(s). The dramatic event that took place at the palace regarding the succession is presented (Whybray 1968). David's human errors had been largely responsible for the personal tragedies which dogged his life. He dithered about the succession, as other potentates have done since (Kamm 1999:61).

The second half of the reign of David was heavily shadowed by tragic rivalries between the various pretenders to the succession of the aged king. One of the greatest weaknesses of oriental dynasties is that they have no fixed and recognised principle for succession (Cate 1995:91). In Israel the eldest son had a presumptive right. But the rank of the mother, the king's partiality, the choice of the people, and the manifested approval of Jahweh, had strong influences on the selection of one of the younger sons (Lods 1932:364). All the sons of the ruler hoped to succeed him (Gunn 1976: 214-229). Hence there arose shady intrigues instigated by the women of the royal harem, each eager to promote the fortunes of her son. Hence, there developed an increasing bitter jealousy between the two young princes, hot with the headstrong passion of youth (Gunn 1976:214-229; cf. Whybray 1968). The dramatic events which followed are related in 2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2, with accuracy, vividness and psychological insight which are the marks of a great writer recording first hand

experience (Lods 1932:364). The succession battle brought disaster within the royal family.

Absalom, banished for this crime, was soon restored to favour, owing to his father's partiality. By clever exploitation of the defects of David's administration, especially with regard to justice, he then succeeded in stirring up a general to revolt against his father, who was obliged to escape in Transjordan, with hardly any followers save his gibborim. Absalom was defeated and slain by Joab.

Then the court was divided into two factions: eldest of the princes, who assumed the role of the heir to the throne with the knowledge, and hence with the tacit approval, of his father (Jackson 1965: 183-95). The 'new' men, Beniah, Zadock, as well as the *gibborin* and the prophet Nathan, were supporters of Solomon who was only the tenth son of David. Solomon's mother, Bathsheba, was the king's favourable wife, a woman of extraordinary beauty whom he had acquired at the cost of adultery and assignation. Galvanised by circumstances into making a decision, he has Solomon officially anointed king by Zadok (Kamm 1999:61). Adonijah thought that he was strong enough to proclaim himself king before his father's death. But Bathsheba, learning his intentions, prevailed on the aged king to give orders for Solomon's immediate consecration and installation on the throne (Lod 1932:365). Adonijah sought asylum at the Alter of Yahweh and received a provisional pardon. David died shortly afterwards. The Chronicler portrayed a smooth transfer of power from David to Solomon (Barton 1988: 301ff). The succession in leadership continues to be one of the greatest crises in Africa, South Africa, local community and the Church.

(c) Chronicler's portrayal of succession narrative

The Chronicler sought to present the reign of David and Solomon as a single, unified event within the divine economy for the life of the nation (cf. Williams 1977:140): both kings were selected by divine choice (1 Chron 17:11; 22:7-10); both kings ascended to the throne with the full support of "all Israel" (1 Chron 11:1-1-3; 29:22b-25a); both leaders are equally devoted to the temple cult (cf. Braun 1973:503-516). Since David prepares for the temple and Solomon carries out the actual construction, it is the temple that gives focus to the unified reign of these two kings (Throntveit 2003:380). The strongest contrast between the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler's portrayal of the succession narratives is the Chronicler's depiction of a vigorous

David totally in charge of the elaborate preparation for Solomon's seamless accession, an accession that was approved by God, and hailed by Israel's leaders, including David's other sons (1 Chron 29:23b-25). Two divine promises are noted: (1) To David concerning the monarchy (1 Chron 17: 3-4) and (2) To Solomon concerning the temple (2 Chron 7:11-22). Thronveit (2003:380) maintains that these promises are of unequalled theological importance. It is therefore of utmost importance to value the theme and motif in the succession history (Blenkissopp 1966:44-57; Flanagan 1972:29-47).

(c) Synthesis

The succession narrative is presented by both the Deuteronomistic (1 Kgs 1: 11-53) and the Chronicler (1 Chron 23:1). In the Deuteronomistic account, the succession narrative is categorised by power struggle, while there is no leadership battle in the Chronicler. According to the Deuteronomistic History (DH), David's human errors had been largely responsible for the personal tragedies which dogged his life. On the other hand, the Chronicler portrayed a smooth transfer of power from David to Solomon (Barton 1988:301ff). The succession in leadership continues to be one of the greatest crises in Africa, South Africa, local community and the Church.

4.4.4.3.8. David's last words

David's last words are recorded both by the Deuteronomistic (1 Kgs 2:1-5; 5-7, 7-9; and the Chronicler's (1 Chron 28:1-19; 20-21; 29:1-9; 10-20-25) accounts. David son of Jesse was the man whom God made great, whom the God of Jacob chose to be king, and who was the composer of beautiful songs for Israel. These are David's last words (2 Sam 23:1). After the solemn assembly of the estates of the realm, at which David publicly inaugurated the reign of Solomon, the strength of the aged monarch seems gradually to have ebbed away until "the days drew near that he must die". During these heart-searching times of silence and retirement, as he lay looking back upon the irrevocable past, and forward into eternity with dread, many thoughts must have been enjoyed by him. He meddled then not much with earthly things, but when he did give any attention to them, the reign of Solomon still came uppermost, and his earnest admonition to his son concerning the building of the Temple, and the character which he was to choose and cultivate, were renewed. Feeling within him the sure premonition of approaching death, he laid upon Solomon, with all the important

charge. First he reminded him of the conditional promise which God had given to him through Nathan in these words: *“If thy children take heed to their heart with all their soul, there shall not fail thee a man on the throne of Israel;”* and upon this he founded the following exhortation: *“Be though therefore, and show thyself a man; and keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways.”*

“The king who rules with justice, who rules in obedience to God, is like the sun shining on a cloudless dawn, the sun that makes the grass sparkle after rain”

David assembled all the stake holders in Israel according to their office rank and tribe. Among them the following were identified: Officials of the tribes, the officials who administered the work of the kingdom, the leaders of the clans, the supervisors of the property and live stock, palace officials, leading soldiers, and important men (1 Chron 28:1). In this scenario, David based his address on the building of the Temple. David’s public speech consisted of four fundamental’s issues: (1) David began by acknowledging his kingship position and his descendants who were to rule Israel for ever (1 Chron 28). (2) David recalled God’s covenant with Him (2 Sam 7:1-16; 1 Chron 17: 1-14). (3) David’s address to the nation. David charged the nation to obey everything that the LORD has commanded (1 Chron 28:8). (4) David’s charge to Solomon. And to Solomon he said: *“My son, I charge you to acknowledge your father’s God and serve Him with an undivided heart and a willing mind. He knows all of our thoughts and desires. If you go to Him, He will accept you, and if you turn away from Him, He will abandon you forever* (1 Chron 28:9-10). The last event was David’s decision to build an Alter to God in Jerusalem. David showed in his own actions that devotion that cost the worshiper nothing is of little value (2 Sam 24:24).

David died when he was 80 years old, having been king for a total of 40 years, including both his reign in Hebron and his kingship over the United Kingdom. In the light of subsequent national disasters, later Chroniclers and commentators portray David as a great king who presided over a golden age (Kamm 1999:61). A hope was built into Israelite belief that a Messiah, of the line of David, would come and reunite the scattered tribes of Israel and restore Jerusalem to its proper status (Kamm 1999:61). For years David lived on prophecy and promise which God gave to him by the mouth of Nathan; and now, as he lay dying, he pillowed his head upon God’s

covenant that the great Ruler would be sure to come. David died not in despair. He had a firm hold of God's covenant.

In 2 Samuel 23:1-7, the Deuteronomistic history presents David's last words. In this narrative, David is talking about the ideal of royal rule, which comes from God. It is not obtained by grasping political power or living by one's own wits and rules. Psalm 72 spells out this ideal kingship in more detail and begins with the words: "Give the king your justice, O, God, and your righteousness to a king's son".

The second and third last words of David are recorded in 2 Samuel 21-24; 2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2 a unit often called the Succession Narratives. There is a belief that the material in 2 Samuel 21-24 were edited by a different hand other than the author of 2 Samuel 9-20 and Kings 1-2. This narratives describes how several of David's sons lost out in their struggle to succeed their father until David, from his deathbed, orders the coronation of Solomon. David uttered his second (vv 2-4) and third (vv. 5-9) valedictory speeches (1 Kgs 2:2-9). The address was directed to his son and successor Solomon. In the second address, verses 2-4, David seems to be speaking for the author of the book of Kings, as part of the Deuteronomistic History.

4.5. Synthesis

David's narratives are made known through two main traditions or histories, namely the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler. Other than the Deuteronomistic and the Chronistic Histories regarding the stories of David and Solomon, there are no other significant historical sources. The literary layers of the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic Histories show that a variety of written accounts circulated throughout ancient Judah and Israel. Some from the Judahite scribes defending David and Solomon, some from proponents of the Shilohite and northern prophets, some from those hostile to David and Solomon. The Chronicler's History omits negative details which appear in the Deuteronomistic. David is presented as a spotless king by the Chronicler. In both the Deuteronomistic and the Chronicler Histories, Yahweh's covenant with David is the central feature and the rest of the great monarchy (Merril 1988:11-12). David's story begins with his dramatic rise in fortune, from humble beginnings as an insignificant shepherd in his father's house to his acclamation as king over his own entire capital city, Jerusalem (Howard 1987:42; Conroy 1983:64).

Through it all, what was seen was YHWH favouring him and events consistently turning out in his favour (cf. Gehard 1962:306ff). David was presented as ‘the quintessential winner (Polzin 1980:156), whose worthiness of divine patronage was never explained. Became increasing questionable as the story advances (Noll 1997: 45). His rise to power was characterised by dramatic events (cf. Gunn 1978). According to Miscall (1986:115), 1 Samuel 16 offers essential knowledge of who David was, why he was anointed, and what it meant to be anointed.

Unification of the tribes into a single kingdom was still a tenuous arrangement and required delicate political handling by David and his court (Matthews 1991:90). To remove the hint of favouritism for his own tribal group of Judah, a new capital was established at a more centralised and politically neutral site of Jerusalem. Jerusalem also served as virgin ground in which Yahweh’s cult could grow and flourish under David’s leadership. When he had the Ark of the covenant brought to his new capital (2 Sam 6:12-19), David was signaling to the priests of the old cultic centres of Shiloh, Shechem, and Hebron that he intended to use his status as king to drive an independent political and religious course. His desire to do this was curtailed at least in part when he was denied the right to construct a temple to house the ark (2 Sam 7:4-16).

God promised David a kingdom that would have no end. The prophecy was fulfilled in the Messiah, who came to establish the Kingdom of God. Although David committed serious sin, he was still known as a man who sought God’s will. Certainly he was not perfect, but he was willing to repent of his wrong doing and follow God’s leadership. His influence for good in the life of his nation was great, since every king after David was compared to the standard which he established. A capable musician, David unquestionably gave great encouragement to this fine art in the life of his people. As a warrior and military man, he was resourceful and courageous. As a king, he was without equal in the life of his nation. As a religious leader, he was exceptional. Many of his writings will continue to be favourite devotional literature for honest souls who seek a closer walk with God.

Jewish historian Josephus praised David by saying, “This man was an excellent character, and was endowed with all the virtues that were desirable in a king”. David is depicted as a round character throughout the unfolding of the narratives in the

Deuteronomistic. The Deuteronomist (Dtr) portrays David as a shepherd boy and ends with a picture of a wise Hebrew monarch who brought the tribes of Israel together as a united nation. By the end of David's long reign, Israel was depicted as a united nation behind a king who represented the will of God through his faithfulness to Him. David's most important contribution was to unite the political and religious life of Israel. David symbolised this by setting up both the political capital and the centre for worship in Israel (Constable 1967:85). Further, Israel was depicted as being military, politically and geographical strong under David's rule.

Indeed, I stand by my conviction that David provided an ideal model for leadership in Africa, South Africa, local communities, family setups, and religious institutions including the Church at large. In summary, David's character as a successful leader was demonstrated in a number of ways. He united the political and religious life of Israel. He symbolised the setting by establishing both the political and a centre for worship in Israel. As a result Israel is depicted as being military, politically and geographically strong. During David's reign, four outstanding features qualify him as an outstanding leader is noted: *he ensured the spiritual wellness of the people*. David demonstrated that he was a God fearing person in various ways. The establishment of Jerusalem as a centre of worship proved that his desire was to lead people to worship God. *He defended his people against enemies*. Prior to the monarchy, the people lived in fear of their enemies. The advent of David amongst their mist brought a paradigm shift in life as they felt safe. As their warrior, David conquered those enemies and Israel was depicted as politically and military strong. *David safeguarded justice and peace*. The concept of 'justice and peace' has remained the centre subject matter in the Ancient Near East, the Old and the New Testament, in religious and secular worlds to this present age. In his leadership, David safeguarded justice and peace in Israel. *David controlled and managed the resources of the country*. One of the reasons why human beings were created was to manage the resources of the world. Such a mandate was to be transferred from generation to generation. Human assets and management is one of the scares skills needed in leadership. David indicated to be an ideal leader by managing both the people and asserts in his reign.