

The traumatic effects of spatial segregation: 2 Kings 25:8-21

By

Sandile Mnisi

Student Number: u14448638

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree MTh
Religion Studies in the faculty of Theology and Religion,
University of Pretoria

14 January 2020

Supervisor: Professor Alphonso Groenewald

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

The Department of Religion studies places great emphasis upon integrity and ethical conduct in the preparation of all written work submitted for academic evaluation.

While academic staff teach you about referencing techniques and how to avoid plagiarism, you too have a responsibility in this regard. If you are at any stage uncertain as to what is required, you should speak to your lecturer before any written work is submitted.

You are guilty of plagiarism if you copy something from another author's work (eg a book, an article or a website) without acknowledging the source and pass it off as your own. In effect you are stealing something that belongs to someone else. This is not only the case when you copy work word-for-word (verbatim), but also when you submit someone else's work in a slightly altered form (paraphrase) or use a line of argument without acknowledging it. You are not allowed to use work previously produced by another student. You are also not allowed to let anybody copy your work with the intention of passing it off as his/her work.

Students who commit plagiarism will not be given any credit for plagiarised work. The matter may also be referred to the Disciplinary Committee (Students) for a ruling. Plagiarism is regarded as a serious contravention of the University's rules and can lead to expulsion from the University.

The declaration which follows must accompany all written work submitted while you are a student of the Department of Religion studies. No written work will be accepted unless the declaration has been completed and attached.

Full name and Surname: Sandile Mnisi

Student Number: u14448638

Declaration

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that this Thesis (eg essay, report, project, assignment, dissertation, thesis, etc) is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, Internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.
3. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

SIGNATURE

SMnisi

Summary

This dissertation attempts to highlight the trauma effects of the Babylon exile of the 587/586 BCE. It begins by defining narratology in chapter two and understanding the importance of narratives as well as the retelling of stories. In chapter three the study looks closely at the book of Kings and the briefly at the Deuteronomistic history, it also gives an account of the narrative that is in 2 Kings 25:8-21. In chapter four the social phenomenon of forced migration and its economic implications thereof is explained. Chapter five constitute of the trauma chapter. In this chapter trauma, war trauma and cultural trauma is defined, the two trauma theories are then applied to exile conditions of the Judeans.

Contents

Summary	4
Chapter One: Overview of the study	8
1.1 Introduction:	8
1.2 South African Experience	9
1.3 Research Problem	10
1.4 Hypothesis.....	13
1.5 Methodology.....	13
1.6 Aims and Objectives.....	14
Specific Aims	14
1.7 Terminology to be used	14
1.8 Expected Chapters	15
CHAPTER Two: Narratological Framework	17
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Biblical literary form	21
2.3 The Plot	23
2.4 The Narrator	25
2.5 The Characters	28
2.6 Conclusion	30
CHAPTER Three: 2 Kings 25:8-21	32
3.1 Introduction:	32
3.2 The book of Kings and the Deuteronomistic history	32
3.2.1 2 Kings 25:8-21 NIV	41
3.4 Historical Background of 2 Kings 25:8-21	42
3.4.1 The Period of Exile: Judah's last days	42
3.5 Literal Criticism	46
CHAPTER four: Involuntary (Forced) Migration	52
4.1 Introduction	52
4.2 Deportation vs. Displacement	52
4.3 Migration Experience	55
4.5 Forced Displacement and Economical implications	58
4.6 Conclusion	65

CHAPTER Five: Trauma.....	67
5.1 Introduction.....	67
5.2 Trauma Defined	67
5.3 War Trauma.....	72
5.4 Cultural Trauma	73
5.5 Reading the exile through Trauma lenses.....	79
5.5 Conclusion.....	86
Chapter 6: Conclusion	87
6.1 Summary and Findings.....	87
Bibliography	91
7. Bibliography	91

Chapter One: Overview of the study

1.1 Introduction:

The study of Exile has become popular in recent decades. In these research scholars attempt to uncover the nature of Israel's experience of Exile. Historical and sociological studies draw the effects forced migration had on the people of Israel. For the Exile was much more than a state of geographical displacement and biblical passages make it clear that it is a metaphor that explains the systems of association. These system associations are a result from "divine wrath" and a separation of the deity. However the word Exile refers to the deportation of captive peoples, because even when the people have returned from Exile to their Land. The trauma of Exile still lives with them since they were slaves of foreign powers this alienation never leaves. For Brueggeman (2003:3) land is a central theme of biblical faith and biblical faith is a pursuit of historical belonging that includes a sense of destiny and once you are taken away from your own land the alienation will never leave.

In order to understand the Exile, one needs to explore the dynamics of the Babylonian Captivity. According to James D. Purvis (1999:151), the Babylonian captivity began when king Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon crushed Zedekiah's rebellion and destroyed Jerusalem in 587 B.CE and carried several thousand inhabitants of Jerusalem off to destinations east of the Euphrates River. Even though it is seen that Nebuchadnezzar's harshness measures as a direct result of poor judgement by King Zedekiah rebellion. In Chronicles 36:14-17 it is evident that writer explains it as Yahweh's punishment for improper worship on the basis that Zedekiah and his priests had introduced Gentile rites into the ceremonies at the Jerusalem Temple. Thus marks the beginning of the journey of the traumatic experience, named the Babylonian captivity.

Purvis (1999:153) reports, that a small number of the people of Judah were deported to the east by Nebuchadnezzar. According to the book of Jeremiah 4600 men were deported and if that figure is correct we may suppose that the total number of deportee's men, women and children may have been about 20,000. Those who were deported, however, were the best people in the land: what was left of the royal family and the court, the professional soldiers, the priests, the most accomplished artisans,

and probably the wealthy and literate members of the general population (Purvis 1999:153).

The familiar words of Psalm 137, “By the waters of Babylon there we sat down and wept when we remembered Zion” were often cited as expressing emotions by the Babylonian Exiles. Purvis (1999:154) illustrates the Psalm as a beautiful poem in which plaintive lyricism is mixed both with frustration and with nostalgia and loyalty. And that expresses the feelings of Exile and the reality of the deportees. Jeremiah 29:5-7 explains more of the Judean life experience in Babylon, he reports that Jews should build houses and live in them, plant gardens and eat their produce. This means that most captives did not live in total captivity however were oppressed to a certain extent. They had deserted agricultural land to live in and build houses however their status did not permit them to be land owners. In scriptures such as Ezekiel 1:1-3, 3:15-23 we see that some Jews settled besides the river of Chebar, an irrigation canal of the Euphrates. This shows that the Babylonians settled the Judean deportees at or near the sites of ruined, and abandoned cities so that they are far from the central Babylon state where its inhabitants are living at.

1.2 South African Experience

Rogers (1980:9) is of the opinion that the idea of establishing Bantustans was subjected to systematic encroachment and it is not the first to be practised in South Africa. All though in South Africa the concept was taken to its logical conclusion of mass deportation with a whole ideology of separation, minded and guided by a heavy political power. In the 1950's the colonial governments in Africa were seeking to expand their relationships with colonies in response to the political challenges created by the Second World War. Thus throughout the 1950's till the 60's many former European colonies in Africa emerged as new and independent. In South Africa it was a bit different, white settlers were independent from Britain since the year 1910 (Laura 2012:2).

The ruling party then, known as the National Party thought to extend existing patterns of colonial segregation through devolution of political structures and the promotion of a putative independence in the African reserve. The National Party thought it would benefit them to tighten and extend existing systems of invasion control designed to prevent the movement of black people to urban areas.

Debates followed the National Party decision, whereby in the 1960's a protest broke out and ended as a blood bath (Laura 2012:3). The event is known as the Sharpeville massacre, where the oppressed people just wanted answers on why are they targeted, this was probably not the only protest; however it had the biggest influence on the decision taken by the government then. The act resulted into the endorsement out and forced removal of thousands of black South Africans from urban areas to the reserves known as Bantustans (Laura 2012:3). This formulation had been discussed and explained in the earlier 1950's, in the Tomlinson report on the economic viability of the reserves. Also he expressed that black residents of the Republic were to be dominated in their homeland of their supposed origin. It is evident that this law or rather Bantustan project involved the method of decentralization of control over the state services and infrastructure projects of the national economies. All of this painful history replays in the minds of those who were and still are afflicted. Making it difficult for the oppressed to move on and forget of what had happened. In result South Africans are not enjoying the pleasures of the "New" South Africa. "By the waters of Babylon, there we sat down and wept, when we remembered Zion".

1.3 Research Problem

In the past few decades, two movements have dramatically reconfigured the background of exilic studies. Old Testament scholar, Lim (2016:1) demonstrates that scholars began to question the historical authenticity of exilic studies. It was always believed throughout the twentieth century that the Exile referred to the Babylonian Exile that began with the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE and ended with Cyrus's decree in 539 BCE. With this scholars focused exclusively on the life in Babylon through the eye of the Chronicler (2 Chronicles 36:21), when the land of Israel was desolate during the period.

Lim (2016:4) introduces a scholar named Torrey, who made a provoking but largely ignored argument by saying that, the Babylonian Exile of the Judean Hebrews was in reality an insignificant affair to play a part in the history of the Old Testament. Levin (2010:1) on the other hand is of another opinion that the Exile was the most important turning point in Israel's history. The Exile counts as punishment for Israel's

falling away from its God, however the Exile is also to be interpreted as the formative phase during which the Judean community needed for a so called new beginning.

In another view Barstad (1996:121) is of the opinion that the Babylonian Exile never happened as described by the biblical texts. This argument led him to the close examination to the biblical record and to the actual historical condition which shifted his focus to those who remained in the land during the Exile. In support to this 2 Kings 25:12, states that the captain of the Babylonian army left some of the poorest people of the land to be vinedressers and farm workers, which means that only the elite were taken into captivity as suspected by Barstad (1996:122). Lately a new movement is to use social scientific and post-colonial studies as a framework to interpret biblical texts that, are interpreted through the eyes of refugees, immigrants, victims of trauma and hegemonic oppression (Lim 2016:5).

These approaches reveal that the Exile had different effects on people, for example: the poor peasant might have not been geographically relocated but rather was colonised by the Babylonian empire. In the meantime the Judean elite class was relocated and lived in the outskirts of the Babylonian capital district and that must have been traumatising to be forcefully taken out of your own place/land. Thus Brueggeman (2002:4) argues that, to be taken out of your place can be traumatising. With the understanding that, place/land is a space that has historical meaning where some things happened that provides the community a certain identity. One then gets the sense that place/land is a space in which important things have been established, vocation has been defined and promises have been made. In the case of the Exile the Israelites left a place that gave them security and identity.

For the reason that of the different migration experiences, Lim (2016:5) states that, biblical scholars have considered the term Exile suiting and accurately describing these events. With the thought that the term Exile is used eight times in 2 Kings 17-18 to describe the Assyrian kings deporting the Israelites from the Northern Kingdom to various regions of the Assyrian Empire and resettling Samaria with people from regions such as Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, and Sephravaim. It is then evident that the Neo-Assyrian political strategy was cross deportation, which was the practise of replacing populations in one area with that of another in order to establish economically productive provinces across the empire.

On the other hand the same word to describe Exile is used in 2 Kings 24-25 twice to describe the Babylonian Exile of Judeans (Levin 2010:82). Different from the Assyrians, the Babylonians did not employ cross deportation. Instead they engaged in mass deportations and it was centralised to the heart of the empire in Babylon. With this the empire kept local populations intact and conquered lands in order to secure tribute for the capital. Therefore if Exile refers to the condition of Judeans living outside of the land of Judah it could have not ended with Cyrus's decree for the Judeans returned in the year 539 BCE.

The Exile of ancient Israel mirrors the diverse experiences of migrants in the contemporary world, and migration are typically categorised as voluntary or involuntary (Lim 2016:5). According to Ahn (2012: 196-204) voluntary migration is often labour migration by which people seek to better economic conditions. In contrast, forced migration or rather imperial force is the result of war or enslavement such as the experiences of Ancient Israel. Forced migration can be classified into different classifications as argued by Ahn (2012:196-204).

First, derivative forced migration is the result from geopolitical rearrangement. For instance the conquest of Judah by Babylon in 597 BCE, as seen in 2 Kings 24:10-17. It is evident that there were no geographical movement during this period. Some Judeans remained in the land but lost their home due to foreign conquest. Secondly purposive forced migration refers to people being forced to relocate physically at the hands of dominant power. Due to profit driven policies, race related issues, and different cultural and religious orientations (Ahn 2011:41). This depicts the event of 587 BCE when Jerusalem was destroyed and Judeans were transported to Babylon as seen in 2 Kings 25:8-21. Lastly responsive forced migration is the type where people flee voluntarily to escape oppression, poverty and other threats to their security. Just as Jeremiah, when he had fled to Egypt with a group of Judeans in 582 BCE as seen in Jeremiah 41:16-47 (Ahn 2011:41)

The Exile and forced migration research reveal that in ancient and modern times people affected might have to deal with challenges and trauma. The questions to be addressed in this dissertation are: Given the broader scope of the context of the Babylonian Exile, what were the dynamic forces? Were the Israelites forcefully

removed from their own land to live in a foreign land? In addition, this dissertation would like to also understand the trauma effect the Exile had on the Judeans.

1.4 Hypothesis

It is apparent that the Exile had become more than forced migration and geographic placements. It includes a variety of alienations: political disenfranchisement, psychological trauma and separation from God within Israel. In all of this it is evident that it is a sociological matter that has factors of political issues.

In consulted literature concerned with the Exile depicted that, the study of the Exile had concerned with the nature of the deportee's lives in Babylon and the character and conditions of life in the land of Judah between 586 and 539 BCE. The psychology of Exile should somewhat be centred especially to the aspects of trauma involved in experiences of forced displacement. This socio-political concern connects to the violence that was afflicted on the Israelites.

1.5 Methodology

The text will be analysed on the synchronic level using perspectives from narrative criticism. This will be combined with insights from historical-critical exegesis (diachronic perspective) as well as sociological criticism. Sociological criticism will be employed in investigating issues surrounding the narrative, through looking at the sociological impact and the history of the text. According to Frick (2003:35) sociological criticism is an extension of historical critical methods, seeking to place texts in their appropriate social context. It uses methods and theories from the social sciences to help bridge the gap between our modern society and the social world of ancient Israel. As persons living in a highly different world, our perspective on society is shaped sociological factors which can be the same or different from the society of ancient Israel. Smith (1989:3) enhances the view, by stating that sociological criticism does not add new data, however it attempts to reinterpret the basis of the social construction of reality. In other words this criticism approaches many of the conclusions of contemporary literary and textual criticism with the question, "do people really act that way?" Pointing out that attention must be given to the social reality of the reader as well as the text itself.

As already suggested that historical criticism is the basis, resting on the basic principle that the process of exegesis involves discovering as much as possible about the author of the text, the circumstances under which the author wrote and the primary audience for whom the text was intended. It will determine the conditions of the Exile. Purvis (1999:155) suggest that according to 2 Kings the Exile to Babylon began in the 597 BCE when king Jehoiachin was taken hostage by Nebuchadnezzar, thus making it the first and largest of three deportations.

1.6 Aims and Objectives

Specific Aims

The specific aims of the research to be undertaken in this dissertation can be outlined as follows:

- To provide a narratological and historical overview of the Babylon Exile by clarifying the event through the text 2 Kings 25:8-21.
- Through the sociological and historical criticism, to analyse the exilic event
- To use a trauma theory as an interdisciplinary approach, in addressing the trauma and the effect of it within the context of the Judeans within the text.

1.7 Terminology to be used

- Exile: 1 a: the state or a period of forced absence from one's country or home. B: the state or a period of voluntary absence from one's country or home. 2 : a person who is in Exile
- Migration: 1: to move from one country, place, or locality to another. Thousands of workers migrate to this area in the summer.
- Geopolitical: relating to politics, especially international relations, as influenced by geographical factors.
- Sociological criticism: refers to a mode of criticism that locates the reasons for malicious conditions in a society considered to be in a flawed social structure.
- Historical criticism: is a branch of criticism that investigates the origins of ancient texts in order to understand "the world behind the text."

- Deuteronomistic History: abbreviated as Dtr refers to the source document underlying the core chapters of the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings
- Narratology; the structure and function of narratives and its themes
- Forced Displacement: the involuntarily movement of a person or people away from their home or home region.
- Trauma: deeply distressing experiences that is embedded on the psyche
- War trauma: trauma caused by war
- Cultural trauma: occurs when members of a collective group feel that they have been subjected to a horrendous event that left an indelible mark upon their group.

1.8 Expected Chapters

Chapter 1 of this study gives the basis of what the study is about. It introduces the object of the study which is the Babylonian exile. The study of Exile has become of quite importance throughout the year, where scholars attempt to understand the dynamic forces behind the exile. The exile is depicted as a violent event that left a traumatic scar on the affected people. This chapter outlines the research problem, methodology, and hypothesis, terminology that will be frequently used throughout the study as well as the aims and objectives.

Chapter 2 explain what narratology is and how it can be used. Narratives are everywhere even the Bible consists out of narratives. This chapter attempts to understand the dynamics of narratives, in order to be able to understand narratives better. It explores the counter parts of narratives such as the plot, characters, and the narrator.

Chapter 3 focuses on the biblical text of 2 Kings 25:8-21. It explores the text firstly through the briefly discussed Deuteronomistic history by trying to identify the author/s of the book. Then gives a historical background of the text to give a broader understanding on why the exile had happened. This chapter basically retells the narrative of how Judah lost its homeland.

Chapter 4 pays attention to the underlying forces of forced displacement. Since there are many reasons why people migrate to different places, this chapter clearly defines

what migration is and how it differs from being displaced. In attempts to make this study more relevant the modern day migration experience is compared to the Ancient migration experience. This chapter also explores the economic implications of forced displacement.

Chapter 5 is about trauma. In this chapter the trauma theory is explained as well as the after effects of people who are afflicted by trauma. Two trauma theories namely war trauma and cultural trauma are also being explored briefly in attempt to make sense of the Judeans experience during the Babylon exile.

Chapter 6 is the findings and conclusions of the study.

CHAPTER Two:

Narratological Framework

2.1 Introduction

Zeelander (2011:22) defines narratology as follows:

“Narratology is a prose representation that is a retelling of an event, which includes at least two events or one state and one event that alter it. Narrativity is distinct from poetry, drama or prophetic oracles.”

Narratology is the theory of narratives artefacts that tells a story; such a theory helps to understand, analyse and evaluate narratives. The term Narratology was introduced in 1969 by Tzevetan Todorov in his *Grammairé du Decaméron* and was later developed into a Narrative Theory/Criticism (Küster 2013:76). The narratology theory also helps to set generalized statements about a particular segment of reality. In other words, it brings narratives alive to the readers (Bal 1999:4). It also attempts to make it pronouncements consists of narrative texts of all kinds made for a variety of purposes and serving many functions.

According to Prince (2008:1) narratology is the science of narrative or rather a theory of narrative. He believes that everything is narrative because ‘Narrativity’ is culture dependent and is context bound (Prince 2008:1). Narratology can similarly be defined as a verbal recounting of one or more events as any kind of event representation. Thus, creating an idea that narratology refers to the idea that people live their lives by creating stories, while on the other hand stories have the potential to engage people to the point of making them feel part of the story; they are forced to ask about their audience and how their construction seeks to answer problems raised by the various subgroups to which they belong (Hermans 2013:57).

In the same breath Fludernik (2009:1) believes that, narrative is everywhere, not just in a novel or in historical writings. It is always to be found whenever someone tells us a story about something such as a news reader, a teacher at school, a newspaper columnist even a writer of historical texts such as the Bible

(Fludernik 2009:1). However, one should always be analytic for not everything is a narrative or a representation of it. For an entity to be a narrative it must be analysable as the demonstration of one or more than one transformative state affairs (Prince 2008:5). In analysing a narrative, language always has an influence. For most narrative theories are inspired by modern linguistics which demonstrates through a synchronic analysis of the language system of how language material develops from the opposition and combination of basic elements (Fludernik 2009:8).

According to Küster (2013:75) narrative structures of any story entails more than just the quality of the text. Telling stories is crucial to the formation of a person's world view. In agreement, Rath (2009:131) believes that narratives include the comparison of stories from different groups, cultures and historical periods and that narrative are created to meet the demands of social roles and historical cultural settings. Narratives can furthermore be a practical method to promote and cultivate the human capacity to tell and understand stories (Rath 2009:131). Stories not only allow us to put our own experiences into words, they also enable us to take part in other worlds (Küster 2013:75). Thus making it problematic to view narrative primarily as a communicative event rather than a textual structure, for it then pulls the discourse (structure and mode of narration) and the story (events, and existents including settings and characters) apart (Phelan & Rabinowitz 2012:37).

In the creation of stories two processes merge; narrative processing and autobiographical reasoning (Hermans 2013:58). Narrative processing is an account of past events ranging from brief narratives to fully developed autobiographies. For that reason, the significance of narratives in human culture can be comprehended through the fact that written culture seeks their origin in myths which they can record. Similar to that of an individual autobiographical narrative, where historians begin to inscribe the achievement of their forefathers and the progress of their nation down to the present in the cultural memory in the form of histories or stories (Fludernik 2009:2). Autobiographical reasoning cannot stand without narrative processing (the memory of persons). However autobiographical reasoning is more than narrative processing, it includes the capacity to extract meaning from life narratives that yields from life stories.

Küster (2013:81) argues that narratology should be conscious of the contextual differences between individual narrative strategies. Therefore, narratology does not only focus on transcultural constants but also seeks to examine the narrative structures and conventions of specific communities, cultures and text quantities. This gives narratology some common ground with other disciplines such as cultural studies, historical criticism and reception criticism.

In agreement, Brom (2013:185) argues that, narratology shares its distinguishing concepts with other disciplines such as narrative psychology, literary criticism, and narrative ethics as well with everyday practise within family life. This prompts questions concerning the contribution of biblical narratives to the material culture of a particular society, such as:

- (a) What traces did these stories leave behind?
- (b) How are readers of the postmodern era still able to identify with biblical texts that date back thousands of years ago?

Narratology sees itself in principle as the theory that analyses the 'what' and 'how' of narration, which it tries to systemize by providing ideas that are decisive for interpretive textual work, and as a result it is helpful in arriving at clearer interpretations of texts (Fludernik 2009:9). It makes clear definitional boundaries and account for narrative diversities. In the area of narrating, for example, Prince (2008:7) described the temporal orders that a narrative can follow, the misdating that it can exhibit and the timeless structures that it can accommodate.

Furthermore Prince (2008:7) characterized narrative speed and its canonical tempos, which comes down to specifying the signs that refers to the narrator and the reader, and explained the respective functions of the two way communication of a narrative, as well as the possible distances separating them (narrator and the reader) from the situations, events, and characters in the world represented.

Since narratology is the science of narrative and some theorists and researchers holds the belief that everything is narrative, others maintain that narratology is a verbal recount of one or more events. While others argue that it

involves consecution, consequence and even closure, that it must be populated with anthropomorphic individuals and it should be anchored in everyday human experience (Prince 2008:2). There are other definitions that are more dialogical such as cognitivist and constructivist accounts of it, historical, sociological, anthropological, feminists, queer and political definitions. Thus making it evident that scholars will always uphold a different definition of Narratology because of the different fields of science the modern world finds itself in.

According to McKenzie (2005:25) history is what had happened in the past, it is a narrative literature that accounts for what had happened in the past. Written history is judged by how accurate and objectively it recounts the events from the past. This kind of work can be compared to journalism; however, journalism apart from narrative accountancy can be biased while the main goal is to retell the historical event. It can easily be assumed that the same applied to historical biblical writers that they accounted the historical event but with a certain bias. This assumption has been and continues to be a problem in modern retelling of history.

Throughout history readers and critics from diverse perspectives have successfully applied various methods to make sense of the Bible. As time changed the Hebrew Bible is generally perceived with considerable justice as sacred history. McKenzie (2005:28) believes that retelling history is primarily not concerned with relating past events as they really happened. The primary objective of retelling history was to render an account of the past that could be explained in the present; or rather future. Therefore to render an account or to retell a narrative entails measuring accountability for and passing judgement on a nation's past actions as a way of explaining consequences for the present or future.

Thus leading Alter (1981:23) to query that, if the text was sacred and was grasped by the audience for whom it was made as a revelation of God's will, how can one hope to explain it through categories developed for the understanding of such secular world? McKnight (1985:1) responds in arguing that the Bible emerges out of the real experiences of real people and that various parts of the Bible could be set in particular historical narratological

contexts. In agreement McKenzie (2005:25) believes that, readers cannot dismiss the bible as work of sheer mythology thus making him to conclude that the problem is not with the Bible but with the way it is misunderstood by its readers.

2.2 Biblical literary form

The genre of a particular Bible narrative is generally identified by means of analysis of its general writing style, tone, form, structure, literary technique, content, design and related linguistic factors. According to Cohn (2010:107), the book of 1 & 2 Kings is not often celebrated for its literary qualities, even though it includes finely constructed stories and story cycles that are utilized to reconstruct the Israelite history. The book of 1 & 2 Kings is not just a narrative about the past; it is also a narrative that seeks to teach its readers a number of things about YHWH and His ways (Provan 2012:15). Wiseman (1993:46) notes that, the whole of Kings has a unique literary form, which starts with the introductory formulae.

The book of 1 & 2 Kings falls under the collective narrative known as the Deuteronomistic history where the relation between YHWH and the people of Israel is depicted. This narrative mostly consists out of tragic stories, where the people of Israel always fall short and end up in difficult situations. Tragedy is a technical name for a style that embodies catastrophe or any other realistic notions of tragic drama (Mills 2006:71).

In many cases of tragic narratives character within the narrative always up in some sort of trauma to deal with. The disasters from these tragedies are usually not predictable, it enforced the human characters to engage with total darkness and distress (Mills 2006:72). The Deuteronomistic history is generally measured from the time Judeans settled in the promise land to the loss of the land. The Judeans shortcomings usually lead to their doom and destruction of their own society (Mills 2006:79).

Their narratives generally, had an introductory formula consisting of details of a struggle for the throne within the context of a longer narrative. Similarly, the name of the king and his relation to his predecessor is found in the literary form

of the book of Kings (Wiseman 1993:46). The king's name is typically mentioned together with his age and date of ascension to the throne. Furthermore, there is a synchronism with the corresponding contemporary ruler in the other kingdom. The king's place and length of reign is also recorded, with the length measured in total years, months and days (Wiseman 1993:47).

In the book of Kings, the king's theological appraisal of each reign is given. The initial verses constantly included a statement judging the reign as right or evil (Wiseman 1993:47). Cohn (2010:117) notes that all the structural patterns in the book of Kings can be classified as forms of repetition: verbal scenic and thematic, and that these repetitions contribute to unify the book by creating analogies between separated and distinct elements.

Biblical narratology has produced new insights that enhance the readers understanding of the poetics, and the historical texts. To read a text as history is to read it as a specific event, as what happened to particular individuals in geographical and temporary limiting contexts (McKnight 1985:10). Therefore, reading a text as a narrative is to read it as universal truth of the society within the narrative.

For a narrative to communicate a religious instructive message without looking like a sermon it must appeal to the readers and draw them to the subject matter. It must clothe an educational tale from which lessons are to be drawn in the garment of a gripping story that stands by itself (Amit 2005:710). The development of narratology is through the observation that narratives are found in a variety of media; oral and written language (Prince 2005: 112). Biblical narratives as we have them today, as a written text, were earlier transmitted orally. Thus, focus should be given to the written text and the form it was formally given. Hence Zeelander (2011:19) compares closure devices at the end sections of narratives, beginning and the end of the story should be identified.

However, it is evident that Biblical narratives have no physical markers for an end point of a narrative, as the Bible was written on separate scrolls with the end of a scroll indicating the end of an entire book. As argued by Zeelander

(2011:19), this lack of physical separators between stories has not prevented readers of Biblical narratives from sensing the parameters of those narratives.

In Biblical narratology, there are three basic questions one needs to ask when dealing with the narrative (Küster 2013:77):

- (a) Who is telling the story?
- (b) How is the story being told?
- (c) What is being told?

First question (Who is telling the story?) concerns the author and voices of characters who might just tell their own stories within the narrative. The third question (How is the story being told?) question if the narrator has a certain bias ideology or if the story that is being is absolute truth. The third question (What is being told?) concerns the plot and characters of a narrative. This allows differentiation between the “how” and the “what” of narrative, demonstrating that narratology creates awareness of what is crucial to the story, from the sequence of events to how the story is being created (Küster 2013:77).

2.3 The Plot

The plot is a central element in Biblical narratives, because it attracts the interests of all the readers. Definitions to what a plot is, according to Phelan & Rabinowitz (2012:57) can vary from minimalist ones that explain that a plot is the chronological sequence of events in narrative, to maximalist ones that characterizes a plot as the larger principle of organization of a narrative. In the case of Biblical narratives, the uncluttered explanation of a plot is applicable, whereby the reader experiences the constant shifting or evolving of the narrative. Through understanding the different emotions, judgements and expectations as it follows the textual dynamics. As put by Bar-Efrat (1989: 93); “If the characters are the soul of the narrative, the plot is the body.”

The plot is made up of short stories that revolve around a conflict and to a change (Amit 2005:710). From Genesis up to the book of Kings readers encounter figures from the past, significant events and the effects and changes

that they brought. Evidently the chosen element of the different plots and the associated conflicts illustrate and highlights the issues that concerned the Judean faith. The plot serves to organize events in such a way as to stir the reader's interest and emotional involvement, while at the same time infusing the events with meaning (Bar-Efrat 1989:94)

Phelan & Rabinowitz' (2005:59) understanding of a plot has to be combined with narratological dynamics. In other words, the underlying forces of a plot refer to the instabilities and complications related to characters, events and their interconnections. Thus, narratorial dynamics refer to both what we (audience & reader) call as tension arising from difference of knowledge, understanding and values among author, narrator, and narrative audience and to the on-going relationships established by the author's use of the resources of narration. Then because of the instabilities that are encoded in texts, narratological differences are a part of the textual dynamics (Phelan & Rabinowitz 2005:59).

The beginning and the end of a plot always evolves along a line of development which creates a certain pattern. The reader often follows a line which gradually ascends to a climax and then descends to a relaxation. Normally the centre of a plot is almost always a conflict or collision between two forces, whether these are two individuals, a person and his or her inner self, a person and an institution or outlook of fate (Bar-Efrat 1989:94).

However, several biblical narratives combine with another creates an extension block. The unity of the greater narrative whole is determined by the ways in which the individual's ones are connected and the nature of their relations. The extensive blocks combine to form books, and the books to constitute comprehensive compositions bringing us vast canvas of history from the creation of the world to the Babylonian Exile (Bar-Efrat 1989:94)

The smallest narrative unites which presents incidents usually multiple purposes in Biblical narratives, also serves as components of the plot of the bigger narrative. The order in which the small narrative units are arranged is that one succeeds another in a chronological sequence (Bar-Efrat 1989:95). However, these events presented in the narratives are not usually tight casual links serving solely as the cause of another incident and not as the result of a

previous one. For example, the narrative of the Garden of Eden, what the snake had said to Eve is not caused by the outcome of any previous incidents.

On the other hand, there are narrative units that are consequences of a previous incident and that usually thicken the plot. For instance, the books of Kings narrate the history of the Israelite monarchy from the last days of David through the division of the United Kingdom into rival kingdoms of Israel and Judah, to the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile to Babylon (Cogan & Tadmor 1988:3). Throughout the entire book, the main characters in the story are YHWH, the God of Israel, various Israelites kings and prophets as well as a number of foreigners. The plot of the book is concerned with Israel's attempt to live under the monarchy as the people of God in the promised land, and it aligns itself with how God deals with the Israelites in their successes and failures (Provan 2012:3). This is a narrative which is full of the experiences of trauma which Israel experienced during all the different historical periods

2.4 The Narrator

The narrator is the individual that is telling the story and explains it from his/her perspective. One of the most important choices an author of a writing makes, is the kind of narrator they employ (Phelan & Rabinowitz 2012:33). The narrator is the voice within the text that we hear when all character's voices are silent. In Biblical texts most of the narratives have an unknown narrator. Küster (2013:78) finds this a very profound and encompassing feature of the text, as it is a very rare feature in narratological texts. In general, Biblical narratives are told by an omniscient narrator whereby the narrator's voice is not one of the characters in the story (Küster 2013:77). The narrator is always external to the plot, meaning that the narrator does not participate in the action of the narrative. In counter argument, Bar-Efrat (1989:13) is of the belief that, the relation between narrator and narrative is not like that between painter and painting, it is distinguished by the fact that narrator is inside the narrative; he or she is an integral part of the work.

A narrator carries out three primary tasks.

- a) They report (along the axis of facts, characters and events)
- b) They Interpret (along the axis of knowledge or perception)
- c) They evaluate (along the axis of ethics)

When a narrator performs only these three tasks and the author uses that restriction to communicate something that the narrator is unaware of, the implied author is using restricted narration. Meaning that the implied author will have a naïve reliable to report the events but not attempt to interpret the knowledge or evaluate the axis of ethics. However, in dramas the author is felt only indirectly, through the characters, whereas in narrative the narrator exists alongside the characters and the narrator's voice is heard as well as theirs (Bar-Efrat 1989:13). It is therefore important as a narrator to narrate using all three primary tasks in the correct manner. As readers we do not have direct access to the characters of narrative and their speech is even embedded in the narrator's speech through phrases such as; "and he said, and she answered" (Bar-Efrat 1989:13). For even when a narrator performs any of the three tasks inadequately then one has unreliable narration. Furthermore, narrators can be inadequate in two main ways; by distorting things or failing to go far enough. Therefore, narrators can be unreliable by misreporting, misinterpreting and misevaluating.

Nevertheless, the best way of approaching narrators and their narrative modes is by examining the viewpoint from which they observe the events and through the relations between them and the narrative world. In biblical narratives the most important is thus: (Ben-Efrat 1989:15):

- a) Narrators should know everything about their characters and are present everywhere as opposed to narrators who only have limited knowledge. For the former see through solid walls into secret corners while the latter observe things from the outside leaving the readers to draw conclusions.
- b) Narrators should intrude into the story, adding comments and explanations and not be silent and self-absorbed. A narrator who does intrude into the story addresses the reader directly and offer interpretations and evaluations of what is happening.

- c) Narrators narrate what is happening from a remote perspective, offering a wider view as opposed to those who are close to the events only depicting minimum point of view.
- d) Whenever narrators are being objective or neutral, the attitude should not be a definite direct marker forcing the readers how to feel about the narrative.

These abovementioned points of a narrative are important for several reasons. First of all, the narrator's point of view is the fourth unity; after time, place and plot, because it blends the multiplicity of viewpoints of the characters within one general view. Secondly, the narrator should be seen like a photographer who decides what will and will not be included in a picture, from what distance, angle and degree of sharpness. Thirdly, the narrative should be formed in such a way that it will be interesting in order to attract the reader to make him or her share in what is happening. Fourthly, the narrative influences the reader, leading to the absorption of its implicit values and attitudes.

The book of Kings, more than any other Biblical book, specifically notes its narrator. While the narrator stays in the background, he tips his hand by making continual references to his sources such as: the works of Solomon and the Kings of Judah (Cohn 2010:108). The narrator calls attention to the novum of his own composition and challenges the reader to verify his information by consulting those sources. The narrator repeats the recurring judgment that events fulfil past prophecies; he offers a comparative evaluation of each king of Israel and Judah without evidence to support his claims (Cohn 2010:108). The narrator's hand appears again in the complex method of organisation which is the most obvious key to the structure of the book. The book of Kings is a narrated story which presenting a number of characters and events following each other in chronological sequence with verbal and thematic links that binds the entity together (Provan 201:2). In agreement, Cogan & Tadmor (1988:3) note that the narrator's historical approach, the choice of events reported, and the manner of presentation are governed by a single idea and thought.

These techniques are of importance in biblical narrative, for it attempts to influence its audience and to impart its outlook on life, people, good and evil, God and divine activity in the world to fulfil decisive role (Bar-Efrat 1989:16).

2.5 The Characters

In 2 Kings 25:8-21 the reader is informed about on the destruction of Israel and the deportation of the Judeans to Babylon during the Babylonian exile. The text deals with several characters, however the narrator plays no role in the plot and is never identified. Through the omniscient narrator we are able to look closely at the perspective and roles of different characters. Furthermore, not only does the narrative perspective shift from one character to another from time to time, but biblical texts also use clues to guide our interpretations, such as evaluative wording - especially with the introduction of characters.

Phelan & Rabinowitz (2012:111) define character as a set of predicates grouped under a proper name that performs one or more plot functions, for example being the sender, receiver, helper, and/or opponent. Characters resemble people that perform various functions in the progression, and they can function to convey the political, philosophical, or ethical issues that are being brought up in a narrative. Many of the views embodied in the narrative are expressed through the characters through their speech and fate (Bar-Efrat 1989:47). Characters can also be the mouthpiece of the narrator and reveal the values and norms within the narrative through, decisions they are called upon when confronted and that results to the undisputable evidence of the narratives ethical dimension and narrator voice. They often stimulate emotional involvement to the readers, for instance; we feel what they feel, rejoice in their gladness, grieve their sorrow, and participate in their fate experiences (Bar-Efrat: 48).

However, when discussing individuals who are considered to have existed in the past, like those in biblical narratives, it should be emphasized that we know them only as they are presented in the narratives. Nonetheless, we can still judge whether a particular character is convincing as a human being, we cannot know whether he or she is an accurate representation of a specific historical person. As an example depicted by Bar-Efrat (1989:48), the manner David is portrayed in the book of Samuel and at the beginning of the book of Kings has a tone of faithfulness which is a huge contradiction depicted in other narratives

where the embarrassing episode of Bathsheba and Uriah had taken place. Through the literature work of the narratives, readers learn how these characters are more or less formed.

In biblical narratives there is no precise or rather detailed description of the physical appearance of its characters. Only a few brief descriptions are mentioned about the characters outward appearance and these few details that are given helps to an extent to visualize them clearly. In biblical narrative information about someone's outward aspects serves solely as a means of advancing the plot or explaining the course (Bar-Efrat 1989:48). For example, in Genesis 27:11, the narrator describes the characters to explain more of the plot; Esau is a hairy man, while Jacob is a smooth man. These facts are important because the reader then see that Jacob impersonates Esau in order to obtain the blessing intended for his older brother Esau.

In chapter 25 of 2 Kings, the narrator introduces the reader to King Zedekiah's reign; however, he does not record the length of his reign in this chapter. The reader gets the idea that something bizarre had happened during the reign of King Zedekiah, as on the tenth day of the tenth month the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, marched against Jerusalem with his entire army. He camped outside Jerusalem and built siege works around the city (2 Kings 25:2). The narrative horrifies the reader, as by the ninth of the fourth month the famine in the city had become so severe that there was no food for the Judeans to eat.

When the city wall was breached by the Babylonians, the Israelite army and King Zedekiah fled through a gate between the two walls near the king's garden at night, through the surrounding Babylonians. They fled toward the Arabah (The Jordan Valley), but the Babylonian army pursued the king and overtook him in the plains of Jericho. His soldiers were scattered and separated from him, and he was captured. He was taken to the king of Babylon at Riblah, where a sentence was pronounced on him. The Babylonians killed the sons of King Zedekiah before his eyes. They then scourged out his eyes, bound him with bronze shackles and took him to Babylon. The chapter does not describe its characters in detail, but it gives us enough details to understand the plot and the narrative course.

2 Kings 25 deals with direct characterization, starting with how King Zedekiah was abused to the way Nebuzaradan had demolished the city and captured its people. Direct characterization often embodies an element of judgment and it may be voiced by the narrator or the character itself. The quality symbolised through direct characterisation always emerges indirectly through either the actions or speech of the character involved or through both of them. However, the narrative is also contradictory by depicting the characterization to be difficult, arising from the fact that when one character appears to characterize another. That creates trouble in identifying that there is no direct characterization. What one person or character says about another often does not refer to the real features.

For example, Nebuzaradan is commanded by Nebuchadnezzar to destroy the city and capture the people, but that does not tell us anything about Nebuchadnezzar's personality and character outlook.

With that said, characterization is made solely to serve the narrator's end in revealing more about the individual who says them than about they supposedly describe.

2.6 Conclusion

In a nutshell, narratology, in this regard, gained importance when Biblical exegesis underwent a paradigm shift away from the direct moral application of the text towards an ethical understanding of the act of reading itself. History writing in the bible is less concerned with what actually happened and is more of a creative activity than readers assume. This does not take away the meaning of the bible or what the bible tried to describe however it is not main objective of the ancient Judean writers.

The new ethics of reading realizes that multiple ethical perspectives are contained in the contradictions and gaps within narrative structures. Reading Biblical stories now becomes what might be called committed reading. Narratives have the function of writing history, in which historians agree on the facts but disagree on their meaning. As a result narratives can now help people to obtain language in which to talk about daily life experiences including how to

look at and how to respond to these experiences by aiming to inform the audience on how to deal with the issues within the story. (Brom 2013:186).

CHAPTER Three:

2 Kings 25:8-21

3.1 Introduction:

The book of 1 and 2 Kings is seen as a continuation of 1 and 2 Samuel. It is a distinctive source that describes Israel history throughout the united and the divided monarchy up to the fall of Judah. It is also evident in 1 and 2 Kings that the narrators explain how and why Israel has lost the land (House 1995:28). However, the book of Kings does not only show historical works, it also emphasizes the sovereignty of God over Israel and other nations. This chapter aims to look at the historical background as well as the literary criticism in order to gain more understanding on the text of 2 Kings 25:8-21

3.2 The book of Kings and the Deuteronomistic history

Beal (2014:22) believes that the two books of Kings represent the final chapters of a larger section of the Old Testament known as the Deuteronomistic History. The idea was developed by Martin Noth¹ in his monograph “History of Israel’s Traditions” in 1943, he argued that a Deuteronomist developed a school of thought that created a unified composition of the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings (Grabbe 2017:17). According to Noth’s hypothesis the Deuteronomist was an individual who wrote his history in order to explain the ruin of Judah and Jerusalem in 587/586 BCE, giving the assumption that the Deuteronomistic history was probably an independent project of an individual whom witnessed historical catastrophe that sparked interest on the meaning of what had transpired in Ancient Israel (Römer 2007:46).

The Septuagint (LXX) canonical placement of 1 and 2 Kings in the Historical books reveals the conviction that the book has a historiographical intent. It reveals what YHWH did in the nation of Israel and also the nation’s own reflection upon its own political history. It draws upon and informs other books within the canon that are connected to it about the plot, language and themes. The Septuagint divided Kings into two parts that constitute of 1 and 2 Kings as we have it today. The title Kings

¹ See Martin Noth 1943 History of Israel’s Traditions

came from Jerome's Latin translation which was made about six centuries after the Septuagint. The Books of 1 and 2 Kings provide a record of Israel's history from the beginning of the movement to place Solomon on David's throne through the end of the reign of Zedekiah, Judah's last king. Zedekiah ruled until the surviving Southern Kingdom was taken captive and Babylonian governors were placed in charge of the affairs of Judah (Beal 2014:23).

1 and 2 Kings were divided because the scroll was too large and had to be divided into two smaller easy manageable units, which resulted to two books that are almost equal in length (Missler 2003:5). The book of Chronicles also records the history of almost the same period as 1 and 2 Kings. However, Missler (2003:6) points out that the purpose and emphasis of these histories differ even though they play off at the same period. The Kings of Judah were more of interest to the author of Chronicles whereas; both Israelites (Israel's) and Judeans (Judah's) monarchs occupied the interest of the author of 1 and 2 Kings. It is also important to note that the books of Chronicles emphasize more on the priestly elements in the nation's history, such as the temple and worship while, the books of Kings give attention to the royal and prophetic elements as well.

The narratives in the books of Kings can be seen as a problematic by the modern-day reader, since it narrates history of different time periods in a limitation of two books. Therefore, it leads to the question that if it narrates a period of five hundred years, how many authors did it take to compile the books of 1 and 2 Kings?

According to House (1995:29) the debate about the authorship of the book of Kings is divided into two schools of thoughts. There are those who argue that both these books were written by a single author who carefully crafted the history using accurate sourcing. On the other hand, there are those who counter argue by stating that 1 and 2 Kings have two or more authors who carefully edited their writing by integrating all the different stages of Israel's history.

Nevertheless, the authorship of the two books of Kings carries some complication, for no author is ever mentioned in the text itself. In other words, there are no main characters in the narrative that stand out as a possible composer of the two books (House 1995:30). However, there are instances in the narrative providing ideas of when the authors might have lived.

First evidence is when Solomon ascended to the throne of his father David, though not easily determined, around 976 B.C.E. Second evidence is the many occurrences of the phrases such as עד היום הזה “Until this day”. When the reader read synchronically may get the idea that the author is describing what they are experiencing at that moment or on that day (1 Kings 8:8, 9:3, 12:19, 2 Kings 2:22, 8:22, 10:27, 14:7). Third evidence can be referred to two written sources that are mentioned in the 1st and 2nd book of Kings (House 1995:31).

Wiseman (1993:44) describes the acts of Solomon as a document that had court forms of his reigns and administrative documents of Jerusalem which includes the lists of court officials, district governors, and text concerning international affairs both negotiations and treaties. Additional written sources was the book of Chronicles of the kings of Israel as a source for every King that has reigned in Israel except for Jehoram and Hoshea. According to Wiseman (1993:45) this document had more information concerning kings that have ruled over Israel and Judah. It described all the unspecified actions of what kings did during their reign.

However, the geographical location of the sixth century BCE Deuteronomists is still under debate. Scholars such as Noth believes that the location could be Mizpah, the administrative capital of Judah under Babylonian occupation. Even though Mizpah is frequently mentioned in the book of Jeremiah 40-41, the Deuteronomistic report in 2 Kings 24-25 does not emphasize much on it (Römer 2007:115),

Even though the idea of the author can be depicted from internal sources, it is important to note that the books were written anonymously and after the destruction of Jerusalem. Likewise, it can also be seen that the author freely uses sources that were probably four hundred years old to describe a history he could have been part of (House 1995:32).

The Exile has always played a crucial role in the interpretation of the Deuteronomistic History. In such a way that after the final scene of 2 Kings 25:27-30, Jehoiachin was released from prison and was given a seat of honour higher than those of the other kings who were with him in Babylon, which meant that the Deuteronomist wrote and gave birth to the Historical context of the Deuteronomistic History. Since historically the Exilic Period played off between 597 BCE and 539

BCE, historically it does not correspond to the Neo-Babylonian period 626 BCE-539 BCE, nor to the fact that the larger part of the deportees stayed in Babylonia and Egypt after 539 BCE with no intention of returning to Judah (Römer 2007:109).

Therefore, the formation of the exilic period creates a false impression that the deportation was a Judean incident whereas multiple of deportations took place under the Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonian dominators, including in Samaria and Judah. Thus, the idea of an Exilic period suggests that the entire population of Judah would have been deported to Babylon which is in line with the idea of the Deuteronomistic scribes in 2 Kings 25:21. The Babylonian Exile is an essential part of the Deuteronomistic history, it became part of the construction of Jewish identity. Even though the events of 597 and 587 formed a major crisis for the Judean community, it led the Deuteronomists who experienced the fall of the Monarchy to modify their views of the origins of Israel and the Judean monarchy as well as re-working their entire literary works from their predecessors (Römer 2007:110).

There is no doubt that the deportations of 597 BCE and 587/586 BCE created a major crisis for the collective Judean identity; especially the elites that were taken away from their source of power. The biblical account reports that the king was deported, the temple destroyed, and the geographical unity of Judah had come to an end due to the deportations. Therefore, it should have not been easy seeing their monarchy and ideologies around it fallen into ruin. The fall of the monarchy forced the elite to recreate a new ideology that would make sense of Judah's downfall.

Since their reality had to make sense the elites had different responses to their fall. As investigated by sociologist A Steil, there are three types of responses to the fall of Judah that are found in the Bible: (Römer 2007:112):

- The prophetic attitude
- The priestly attitude
- The mandarin position

	Prophet	Priest	Mandarin
--	---------	--------	----------

Situation	Marginal	Representative of the former power	Belonging to the High officials
Legitimization	Personal Knowledge	Tradition	Intellectual instruction
Semantic of Crisis	Hope for a better future	Return to Mythical origins	Construction of a history
Reference	Utopia	Myth	History

According to the analysis the prophetic attitude believes that the fall of Judah marks a beginning of a new era. For example, the second part of the book of Isaiah chapter 40-55 saw the exile as a necessary transition to a new creation (Römer 2007:112). Whilst the Priestly attitude holds more of a conservative view that the destruction of the monarchy clearly shows that the people have sinned, therefore, they need to repent and return God and ignore the new reality. The priestly authors set all the important institutions for the rise of Judaism (Römer 2007:112).

The Mandarin position represents the attitude of high officials who have analysed and worked through the new situation to maintain their former privileges. The Deuteronomistic school had the mandarin attitude on making sense of their reality (Römer 2007:112). The Deuteronomists of the Babylonian period were the descendants of the scribes and other officials of the Judean court. They were the ones who were obsessed with the end of the monarchy and the deportation of the elites. Thus, the Deuteronomists had to explain why the Exile took place and the explanation is given through the construction of history, from the life of Moses to the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the elites (Römer 2007:113).

Following the debate, according to House (1995:33), scholars such as Martin Noth believed that a single composition collected source data and arranged the material into a comprehensible whole and then wrote 1 & 2 Kings as a conclusion to the history of Israel. Patterson & Austell (2017:4) supports the idea of a single composition and argue that he can be identified as the Deuteronomist as Martin Noth proposed. It is believed that the Deuteronomist wrote after the capture of Jerusalem,

most likely in 586 B.C.E in an effort to explain the fall of both Israel and Judah. Patterson & Austell (2017:5) brings the idea of Noth to front that the author's emphasis was on themes such as the violation of YHWH's covenant and the evils of idolatry and such ideas can be seen in Deuteronomist works in Deuteronomy 1:1-4:43.

On the same wave length House (1995:33) further explains that the nineteenth century scholars argue that the author of 1 and 2 Kings did not compose all former prophets, instead he focused on displaying the theological perspective of kingdoms under the rule of certain kings. Thus, this ideology leads the reader to the thought that a single author wrote 1 and 2 Kings and that person could have been a prophet who lived during the second half of the Babylon captivity.

Wiseman (1993:57) supports the idea that the book of Kings could have been written by a prophet and the assumption would be that Jeremiah was that person as he had close association with the court and scribal circles in Jerusalem. Making it possible that he could've used his associations and influence to access the earlier state archives of both Kingdoms prior to the fall of the city in 587/586 BCE.

While some scholars hold the belief that an individual wrote both these books, there are scholars who contend the idea that an individual went through all the necessary historical, theological and literary sources to form the compositions of both the books. Scholars such as Rudolf Smend holds a strong theory that is like the original hypothesis of the Deuteronomistic history. Smend argued that the original work of the Deuteronomistic historian was created around 580 BCE and then was later revised by a redactor whose main concern was with the law around 560 BCE (Grabbe 2017:18). The Smend school proposed that the basic history was compiled by a historian (DtrH) during the early exile and then was later reworked by a prophetic redactor (DtrP) who included comments and multiple prophetic narratives in the book of Kings (Brien 1989:7).

According to House (1995:36) scholars who are against the single author theory concluded that the Deuteronomistic histories as well as 1 and 2 Kings have passed through more than one editor's hands. It is argued that these authors had complete separate histories that had distinct theological and conclusion viewpoints. Therefore,

led a later editor to add his own historical details and gathered all the alterations to produce 1 and 2 Kings as it stands now.

Before Noth's hypothesis scholars believed that there was an early version of the book of Kings that only included pre-exilic materials. One of the opinions is that the evidence עד היום הזה "Until this day" lacks cognizance of the temple and that it would be destroyed. It also denounces the possible happening of the exile in the Deuteronomistic history. Thus, leading to a conclusion that the Priestly and Non-Priestly hypothetical sources played a role in the continuation of the Deuteronomistic history from the Pentateuch (House 1995:37).

Later scholars², after the Deuteronomistic explanation by Noth, chose to opt for a multiple authorship of Kings. This group of scholar believes that a pre-exilic edition of the Deuteronomistic History arranged during the reign of Hezekiah and was then revised with some changes and addition of the end of Judah (Janzen 2012:16). Thus, implying that the first author could have gathered the pre-exilic information and the later author edited and added the happenings of the fall of Judah. For example, the organizational outline of 2 Kings 16 forms a history down to the time of Josiah and 2 Kings 23 emphasizes the fulfilment of the promise made to David's dynasty and the judgement on the Northern Kingdom following the sin of Jeroboam. Now the rework of it commends Josiah as the ideal king, possibly a new David. According to these scholars this could only be the work of two or more authors who had access and influence to edit and presented it as the whole book. Thus, this bringing to the thought that there could have been three or more composers (Wiseman 1993:57).

According to Wiseman (1993:60) the arguments of scholars who believes in the multiple composers lies within texts such as 2 Kings 17:7-25, which is believed to be the beginning of the exile of Judah and can be dated to post 586 or 561 B.C.E. Nevertheless, there are other texts that are totally unaware of the exile or the destruction of the temple, such as 1 Kings 8:21-64 which was a requirement to the people to always ray towards the temple. Even though the political move of capturing people and sending them into exile was a common experience in the Ancient Near East, a trend followed by the foreign nationals, Judeans could have not over looked

² Such as Helga Weippert and Enzo Cortese

that. It should have been a societal matter that they could have taken note of, especially with the fall of Syria in 853 B.C.E and the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.E. The unedited Deuteronomistic History was enthusiastic and confident that the Davidic dynasty would be eternal, as seen in 1 Kings 11:34, his enthusiasm reached a peak in the reign of Josiah.

Then a later editor deduced the enthusiasm to a more pessimistic setting, by explaining what had transpired between YHWH and His people, meaning that they were disobedient and a prophecy was laid that they will be taken into captivity. In the Ancient Near East a common phrase לנצח “forever, everlasting” was used in many decrees and royal grants which did not outlast all the days of the king who made them. However, this does not mean that the tradition of an everlasting Davidic line was just an ideology or a theological concept. During the reign of the last four kings of Judah, the reader can easily see the change in structure and thoughts of their reign and style of writing (Wiseman 1993:60).

As a result there are several views without agreement on the authorship on the book of Kings. Wiseman (1993:62) closes his argument by firmly believing that literary analysis of a single authorship theory clearly can be seen as insufficient, especially with the different stages in the evolution of the book itself. In contrast Patterson and Austell (2017) is of the opinion that to categorise Jeremiah as an author of Kings is ineffectual, for the author himself failed to identify himself. Therefore it would not be justice to read Jeremiah into the book of Kings, even though he was a prophet that could have access to edit and write.

They further argue that the majority of the book bears the impression of being the product of one author who possibly could have been an eye witness of the Judean national demise and in so doing this author weaved together integrated sources to portray Israel's failure to keep the covenant. In agreement House (1995:38) agrees that it is very sensible to be careful when it comes to the authorship of an anonymous document, thus leading him to believe that the single composer approach to the issue is the best solution. For the reason that it explains the unity of Joshua-Kings in general as it is evident that each book is somewhat linked to its predecessor. For example, Moses' death links Joshua to Deuteronomy, Joshua's death links to

Judges then Samuel proceeds to be the last judge. Samuel in his second book the reader finds a flow into 1st and 2nd Kings.

Thus, multiple authors could have not achieved this type of unity. Deuteronomistic History is a literary style and theological notion that holds vast multiplicities that cannot tell us anything, but just speculations about the original authorship. The complex narrative style and thoughts presented within the Deuteronomistic History points to a work that was composed by a single composer during the exilic period, who relied on older source that has been included in his work (Janzen 2012:25).

.

3.2.1 2 Kings 25:8-21 NIV

8 On the seventh day of the fifth month, in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, Nebuzaradan commander of the imperial guard, an official of the king of Babylon, came to Jerusalem.

9 He set fire to the temple of the Lord, the royal palace and all the houses of Jerusalem. Every important building he burned down.

10 The whole Babylonian army under the commander of the imperial guard broke down the walls around Jerusalem.

11 Nebuzaradan the commander of the guard carried into exile the people who remained in the city, along with the rest of the populace and those who had deserted to the king of Babylon.

12 But the commander left behind some of the poorest people of the land to work the vineyards and fields.

13 The Babylonians broke up the bronze pillars, the movable stands and the bronze Sea that were at the temple of the Lord and they carried the bronze to Babylon.

14 They also took away the pots, shovels, wick trimmers, dishes and all the bronze articles used in the temple service.

15 The commander of the imperial guard took away the censers and sprinkling bowls—all that were made of pure gold or silver.

16 The bronze from the two pillars, the Sea and the movable stands, which Solomon had made for the temple of the Lord, was more than could be weighed.

17 Each pillar was eighteen cubits high. The bronze capital on top of one pillar was three cubits high and was decorated with a network and pomegranates of bronze all around. The other pillar, with its network, was similar.

18 The commander of the guard took as prisoners Seraiah the chief priest, Zephaniah the priest next in rank and the three doorkeepers.

19 Of those still in the city, he took the officer in charge of the fighting men, and five royal advisers. He also took the secretary who was chief officer in charge of conscripting the people of the land and sixty of the conscripts who were found in the city.

20 Nebuzaradan the commander took them all and brought them to the king of Babylon at Riblah.

21 There at Riblah, in the land of Hamath, the king had them executed.
So Judah went into captivity, away from her land.

3.4 Historical Background of 2 Kings 25:8-21

3.4.1 The Period of Exile: Judah's last days

Albert (2001:3) believes that, the exilic period represents a huge unfilled space in the historical narrative of the Hebrew Bible. This unfilled space is a bit foggy and not very understandable for it is only explained briefly by isolated beams of light. In the New Testament, the Babylonian exile is still seen as an important or rather significant event in the history of God and his people, ending in Jesus Christ (Matt 1:11-12,17), and is the typical judgement of God upon Israel (Acts 7:43), which threatens Jerusalem once more (Luke 21:23-24).

For scholars such as Albert (2001:4), there was a reason why detail of the exile could possibly be left out. Firstly, it could be to the reason of external political factors, the disbanding of the state, the loss of the archives, and the lack of scribes to continue the historical record. Secondly, it could be societal explanations such as the chaos of the war and the hardship of the exile, which exhausted the resources of the survivors for they had no time or energy left to worry about trivial matters such as documentation for the future. Thirdly, psychological causes could have been the reason, the depression of the survivors and discouraged attitudes made them realise that there is no point in recording the afflictions they had been forced to undergo. All of these considerations may have played a role in the starting interruption of Israel's historical tradition in the exilic period.

Since the exilic era constitutes a gaping hole in the historical narrative of the bible, historical reconstruction of this era faces some difficulties. The only recourse according to Albert (2001:45) is to try to cast some light on the darkness from the history of the surrounding empires whose dominion Israel and Judah came in this period.

According to Bright (1972:343) the destruction of Jerusalem marks the great breaking point of Israel history. Despite all of Josiah's efforts to re-establish Yahwistic practices in Jerusalem, the judgement against Judah was sealed (2 Kings 23:26-27); the monarch was destined to fall (Joo 2006:112). During the final years/decades of Josiah's reign dramatic change in the political scenery of the East

had happened. Assyria's superiority declined with the death of Assurbanapal³. In 614 B.C.E, the Medes⁴ joined forces with the Babylonians and the fate of Assyria became certain, after an extended siege in 612 B.C.E, Nineveh the capital city of Assyria fell into Medo-Babylonian power.

Flanders, Crapps, & Smith (1996:384) states that, the fall of Nineveh had inflamed growing anxiety of Egypt causing Pharaoh Necho to end up in battle with Josiah. In the ensuing battle of 609 B.C.E Josiah was tragically killed at Megiddo and his army fled. This marked as the end of Judah brief excursion in independence, for a brief period after the battle at Megiddo, Judah fell under Egyptian control. However in the same year 609 B.C.E the people chose Josiah's son Jehoahaz to be new king and not being able to conquer he was disposed to Egypt as prisoner. He was then replaced by his brother Jehoiakim, who was more inclined to submit to Egypt and Necho asserted his full authority over Judah.

As told by Flanders, Crapps, & Smith (1996:384) Egyptian control was temporary for the balance of the world power shifted to Babylon. In 605 B.C.E. Necho was defeated at Carchemish by the Babylonian Emperor Nebuchadnezzar (605-598). Soon after that Babylon took over Judah. Since Jehoiakim owed his kingship to Necho's patronage, he encountered no problem with switching allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar and Babylon. He had saw nothing wrong with the decision for it was the same policy just a new overlord. Judah then became a vassal of Babylon and factors leading to its ultimate destruction began to fall into place.

While Jehoiakim paid homage to Babylon he looked for an opportunity to improve Judah's fortunes. He rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar only because Egypt had revolted against Babylon. Nevertheless the rivalry between Egypt and Babylon did not last long; Nebuchadnezzar marched with his army to crush Judah's revolt. By the time he got there Jehoiakim had died and was replaced by his son Jehoiachin who was in power only for three months but Judah was already invaded and attacked. That is when the second deportation had taken place.

According to Ahn (2014:182) Judah ended after Jehoiachin surrendered Davidic monarchy in 597 B.C.E. for the southern kingdom of Judah was reduced to a vassal

³ King of the Neo-Assyrian Empire 668-627 B.C.E

⁴ Ancient Iranian people

status which lead his thinking that the 587 B.C.E deportation not so much a conquering but the suppressing of an insurgence by destroying Judah's religious beliefs as punishment and displacing and resettling another group of its ruling class to serve as additional unneeded labourers in Babylon. While the peasants were left behind to continue farming and land cultivation, the elite who were taken away into exile produced an ideology on the "myth of the empty land" grounding it on the idea that YHWH had left Judah to accompany them into Exile. Through that ideology the captured Judeans considered themselves to be the true "Judeans" compared to those left behind (Römer 2007:109).

Ahn (2014:183) is also of the idea that there could have been a system in place behind the multiple forced migrations of Judeans to Babylon. This move could have been exactly calculated for regional economic development of the Babylonians. Unlike the single deportation of the Assyrians, who used deportation as punishment, the Babylonians implemented a forced deportation system that would repeat itself and then expand their economy centre. The Babylonians brought labour forces, skilled and unskilled to expand and build their own region. Therefore imposing forced migration on conquered people for work on their extensive canals. This systematic calculated move would prevent an immediate overpopulation of people in their own land that would lead to social economic downfall. (Ahn 2014: 184)

Albert (2001:1) believes that, of all the eras of Israel's history, the exilic period represents the most interesting caesura and the most radical change. In a sense that the religion of Israel underwent its most sever crisis, however on the other hand it laid a foundation for its renewal. Albert (2001:2) sees the exile as one of the great miracles of human history, that the loss of Israel's national and territorial integrity, did not spell the end of Israel's history. According to Flanders, Crapps, & Smith (1996:385) the deportation of 597 began an economic and political trauma from which Jerusalem and Judah never recovered from. The holy City and majority of its people were spared.

Nebuchadnezzar captured a few people from Jerusalem; amongst the deportees were the king, his royal family and a major segment of Jerusalem's intellectuals. The propjet Ezekiel and others of religious and political prominence were amongst the

captives. Although in exile, Jehoiachin was still considered as king of Judah by both people at home and the Babylonians. The practical affairs of state were conducted by his uncle Zedekiah (597-587).

It is not long after the state capture Zedekiah began to think of an idea of revolting against the Babylonians. Conferences were held with ambassadors from neighbouring states of Edom, Moab, Tyre and Sidon. For some reason Zedekiah's plans for revolt came to hold and he sent representatives to Babylon to make peace with Nebuchadnezzar. However the tide of loyalty did not last long, as the representatives began to pressurise Zedekiah to bid for Egyptian support and rebel against the Babylonians once again. Without clear conviction himself and unable to control his nobles, Zedekiah finally gave in to the voices of revolution in 589 B.C.E (Albert 2001:55).

Nebuchadnezzar reacted with anger and marched into Judah and laid siege to Jerusalem. The army under Zedekiah's command tried protecting the city but failed, the siege was lifted briefly when Egypt attacked Nebuchadnezzar, but the Babylonians defeated Judah's ally easily and resumed the siege (Missler 2003:294). After an eighteen month siege, the city finally fell in 587 B.C.E. Zedekiah fled the city, but was captured and brought before Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah. Nebuchadnezzar had planned the next move sadistically, but also it was politically driven (Alter 1999:2358).

After the execution of his sons he was led away in chains to Babylon. The captain of Nebuchadnezzar army was sent out to Jerusalem to destroy the walls and burn the city. This act led to many Judeans massacred, some of the inhabitants were carried into captivity, while the poorest inhabitants were left to plough the land for the Babylonian. According to Farisani (2008:78) Nebuchadnezzar captured all the city of Judah and for two years starved the people into defeat, when all food supplies were finished the Babylonians managed to break the walls of Jerusalem and enter the city. This deportation left Jerusalem political and economic life at standstill.

Purvis (1999:151) points out that, Nebuchadnezzar appointed Gedaliah as governor, who established his administrative centre Mizpah. The bible does not recall the extent of Gedaliah's authority, however studies show that there was some hope for peace and economic recovery under his leadership. However, this hope fell short by

the assassination of Gedaliah and the flight of his supporters to Egypt. The destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of its leaders to Babylon, dispersion to Egypt, further weakened the nation.

3.5 Literal Criticism

The bible does not contain a continuous account of the exilic period, only the margins are recorded: How the exile came about, 2 Kings 24-25, and how it ended as shown in Ezra (Albert 2001:3). Brueggeman (2000:591) describes the policy of the Babylonians as clear-cut and has no more than one interpretation. Hobbs (1984:361) notes that the narrative of 2 Kings 25 summarizes the effects of the Babylonian reaction to the Judean revolt on Judah.

The verse opens on a chronological note in which the narrator calls for the attention significance of the event. Through observation of 1 and 2 Kings, Missler (2003:6) states, though exact dates are a problem, several chronologies have been worked out to harmonize the narratives. In most cases these systems vary from each other by only one or two years, hence majority other scholars are not in consensus when comes to dating of various events. For example, Bright (1972:309) and Flanders, Crapps and Smith (1996:383) dates the Babylonian Exile to have happened around 587 B.C.E, while Missler (2003:6) believes the event to have happened in 586 B.C.E

Long (2002:533) describes the significance to the siege of Samaria by the Syrians, for it was by the ninth day of the fourth month that the siege became severe to a point that there was no bread for the עַם הָאָרֶץ the people of the land. It is no secret that the עַם הָאָרֶץ the people of the land were landed gentry who were supporters of the Davidic monarchy. Fritz (2003:421) is of the opinion that the dating in verse eight suggests that, the destruction of the temple and the palace is the result of a separate punitive expedition by the Babylonians led by Nebuzaradan, the high ranked military official of the empire.

The high ranked military official of the Empire, according to Alter (1999:2359), has the same title attached to Potiphar in Genesis 39:1. The Hebrew שַׂר הַתְּבָאָה יִם literally means commander of the slaughter. This title might have originally designated a head steward or chef, but in this passage it clearly came to mean someone exercising high authority in the political and military empire (Alter 1999:2359).

The first task of this official was to destroy all the important symbolic centres in the city. Following the destruction of the city walls and the collapse of resistance in the city, this was accomplished by the Babylonian army, other officials moved to take stock of the situation by looting and setting up an administration under the Babylonian empire. This was done by destroying important centres of influence and by rendering any possible source of resistance in the city ineffective (Hobbs 1984:364).

It is interesting to note that throughout the destruction of the city, both YHWH and Nebuchadnezzar, who used to be an agent for YHWH, were absent. Brueggeman (2000:591) points out that Nebuzaradan acts on the behalf of Nebuchadnezzar. Since in the text, Nebuchadnezzar is only present through reference.

According to Wiseman (1993:313), more attention is paid to the temple than to the city itself with the destruction of Jerusalem. This was symbolic of God's presence and glory that had now departed. The book of Kings has its own unique literary form where, the narrator provides the reader with the exact dates of when the siege had taken place (Wiseman 1993:313). The narrator and the Biblical characters know exactly what had transpired, as the Exile appears to be an event about which a person can exactly remember where he/she was and what was he/she doing when it happened. The time is calculated according to the years of Nebuchadnezzar, which here is his nineteenth year (Brueggeman 2000:592). ובחדש הצמישי חדש

חמישיבשבעה לחדש, The fifth month on the seventh day of the month, is the date given, and is also approximately one month after the fall of the city, and according to Hobbs (1984:364) it would be in July of the year 586 B.C.E.

The destruction of the city is quantified in the text when the narrator explains that every great house **קול באת גאדול** in the city was destroyed, including the temple, the palace and the houses of the important elders of Jerusalem. Cogan & Tadmor (1988:319) emphasize that, the Hebrew word **גאדול** is always used adjectively when expressing importance.

According to Brueggeman (2000:592), the narrative uses fierce and brutal verbs to describe what had happened during the destruction of the city. The ruthless military officer had burned above mentioned significant structures. Burning is regarded as the stereotypical symbol of total mastery and complete lack of pity. One of the characteristics of Jeremiah's account of the event is that the military officer had broken down the walls of Jerusalem; the narrator in this narrative similarly describes how the walls were broken when during the devastation of the city.

Classism was still put into practise among the Israelites during the Exile. The classes of Exile given include deserters and the rest of the multitude (Wiseman 1993:314). According to Hobbs (1984:364), the deserters refer to those that belonged to the group that advocated for surrender to the Babylonians. Brueggeman (2000:592) believes the deserter's demonstrate that there had been a deep and abiding policy dispute in Jerusalem: whether to resist or submit to the Babylon Empire. Those who wanted to submit to Babylonian rule were regarded by the resisters as traitors or deserters (Brueggeman 2000:593). These general terms may be problematic in interpreting the precise numbers of the exiled. Furthermore, the unskilled were left behind and worked as vinedressers in the north of Jerusalem to supply wine for the Babylonian forces and court (Wiseman 1993:315).

It is evident that the narrative aims to describe the deportation as comprehensive as possible, referring to both its severity and to the claim that the impetus for emerging Judaism was exclusively amongst those in Babylon (Brueggeman 2000:593).

Jerusalem was not empty as there continued to be a rural population. The impression is that the Babylonians left unskilled workers behind to labour in Judah for the benefit of the Babylonian empire and so that cultivation continues in the land of Judah (Hobbs 1984:364). These workers were the uneducated and those without influence who would have no voice in the future of faith or politics.

According to Fritz (2003:421) the crafts men who had remained in the city were led into captivity together with the deserters after the Exile of 598: leaving the lower class of simple farmers in Jerusalem. The lists of people of Jerusalem led away by Nebuzaradan were separated into small subgroups. Though few in numbers, they were the one who shaped Israel's future, both giving to her faith, its new direction and providing the impulse for the ultimate restoration of the Judean community. They include priests and temple staff as much as court officials. Thus, after the deportation of 587 BCE the country was not entirely depopulated, the poor of the lower class remained, a group that had always formed the largest part of the population (Fritz 2003:422)

Imperial intrusion characteristically concerns itself with money, seeing as Empires are always anxious about finances and particularly finances that make possible a braggart public life. Brueggeman (2000:594) notes that Babylon seized what Assyria had left behind in Jerusalem and it was a significant monetary loss to Jerusalem. More so a huge political embarrassment because the loss indicates that YHWH who is the Lord of the temple failed to protect His own house from Babylon. The narrator provides something of a detailed inventory of what was seized by the Babylonian Empire.

Throughout verses 13 to 17 the narrator describes the inventory of the utensils that were taken from the temple, for it was common procedure in conquests to cart off the temple treasures of the conquered (Alter 1999:2360). The detail indicates the monetary value of the bronze, silver and gold plus the fine artistry represented in the temple artefacts. Hobbs (1984:364) is of the opinion that the list should be compared to the one depicted in 1 Kings 17:15-50 where the original manufactures of the items are recorded. The temple was dismally destroyed, all of the bronze objects were taken away to be melted down together with the bronze covers of the two pillars of the temple.

Fritz (2003:421) mentions that the other equipment, including silver and gold, were taken at a later stage, because of the explanation of the pillars in verses 16-17 depicts that its later and a different model of description from 1 Kings 7:15-22. For in 1 Kings 7, the bronze pillars are the large pillars "Jachin and Boaz" which stood at the entrance to the sanctuary. The detail of the inventory loss is designed by the

narrator to allow the readers to experience the sense loss, degradation and hopelessness of the exiles and those who were left behind. More importantly, the narrator wants to emphasise that the glory of YHWH has indeed departed as the prophets had anticipated (Brueggeman 2000:595).

The humiliation produced by the sacking of the temple is matched by the violent termination of the urban power structure. The narrative not only speaks of the temple furnishing, the readers are offered a detailed account of the end of the government apparatus and of the privileged urban elite in Jerusalem. The list of officials is careful and specific: chief priest, second priest, and three keepers of the doorway, a commanding officer, and members of the royal council, director of the military draft and sixty people of the land. Thus, the entire power structure had been exiled, including:

- a) The temple hierarchy,
- b) Government officials,
- c) The people of which are part of the elite class.

The third activity Nebuzaradan had performed was the elimination of certain key figures that did not fit into the overall strategy of the Babylonians (Hobbs 1984:365). The number of people led into captivity is not specified. The parallel passage in Jeremiah 52:28-30 speaks of 4600 adult men in three separate actions, the grand total could have been over three or four times that many. However in contrast to the Assyrians, who would deport an entire nation, the Babylonians led away only a fraction of the population without resettling others in their place. Because of this difference between the Assyrians and Babylonian practices of Exile, Judah is spared the fate of the northern kingdom of Israel. The men who served in the army of Judah were taken to Nebuchadnezzar's headquarters in Syria and were executed, not exiled (Hobbs 1984:364).

Their elimination effectively robs Judah of any firm leadership and protection. The words "thus was Judah exiled from her own land" ויגל יהודה מעל אדמתו in verse 21b signifies the end of the book, however it has a thematic parallel sense with 2 Kings 17:23. The warning that Judah would suffer the same fate as Israel is

becoming a reality, one need to note that by “Judah” the narrator means the elite ruling class. The Babylonians plan was to decentralise the power of Judah so that the takeover could be as easy as possible (Hobbs 1984:365).

The narrative draws the conclusion to every reader that an exile took place. The story has been told so slowly and, in such detail, to arrive at the verdict where the story is finally about the killing and exile of Jerusalem.

CHAPTER four:

Involuntary (Forced) Migration

4.1 Introduction

According to Wilson (2012:128) there has been a lot of progress made over the years in studying the lives of Judeans during the exilic period. Archaeologists found several relevant sources to help decipher the lives of Judeans during exile. These texts contains foreign names but are not identified ethnically. These archaeologists mentioned by Wilson (2012:128) believes that a breakthrough can be found when using traces of biblical practices found in these texts such as “Sabbath Day”, or Tetragrammaton. Through traces of religious beliefs and tetragrammatons archaeologists found names of Judeans within Babylonian texts sources.

There were three text sources that were used to identify Judeans: firstly the “so called Werdner tablets” that were from the reign of king Nebuchadnezzar the second referring to the exiled king Jehoiachim. Second text was the “Murašû” archive that contained names of Judeans who had different business dealings in the area around Nippur. The document mentioned about 2500 names of which seventy were identified as Judeans. Even though the list does not refer to a lot of Judeans, it simply indicates that Judeans were there and were located together in demarcated areas where they maintained their livelihood. The third source of information used by archaeologists is the two cuneiform archives from the Persian period that contained information on where the Judeans were settled (Wilson 2012:129).

4.2 Deportation vs. Displacement

It is deemed problematic by Ahn (2012:176) to use the term “deportation” when describing the events of the 6th century. According to sociological, political and jurisprudence settings “deporting” or “deportation” is attributed to immigration problems such as removal of foreign nationals and undocumented people. Therefore the term “deportation” is tied to returning or detaining illegal immigrants between the borders. It is a wrong term to use for the 6th century events, for it lacks social sensitivity.

The forced migrations of the Judeans in 597, 587, 582 BCE does not constitute of different generations, all three of these separate waves constitute the first 1.5 generation⁵ (Ahn 2011:68). It can easily be mistaken for different generation whereas it just different time or intervals during a 15 year period.

Ahn (2012:176) argues that when describing the tragic events of the 6th century the term displacement or displace should be employed. The third generation exilic scholarship uses terms such as “forced migration”, “displacement and resettlement” when restructuring the exilic period. Forced migration is a sociological phenomenon that accounts theories on migration and analysis on the displaced people. It aims to identify the forces that cause involuntarily movements or displacements of people (Ahn 2012:178). Forced migration is a large host of structural issues such as urban redevelopment identity. Displacement and resettlement highlights on intrinsic or internal migration issues affecting those who are displaced. There are challenges to be noted caused by involuntarily displacement which are:

- Political tensions between the displaced migrants and the inhabitants
- Cultural and traditional values clashing in light of the new ones
- Socio economic class struggles
- Language issues in preserving it and using when speaking to close people while having to use the predominant language or languages
- Food diet restrictions and dietary
- Marriage, having to decide at what point would intermarriage become a reality
- Raising children in a dual culture
- Religious practices for the sake of identity
- The concept and definition of home.

These challenges have the capability of creating deep sociological problems in society and within the cultures of the displaced people. The Judeans ended up adopting some Babylonian practices and intermarried while they were in exile. Such acts created a new identity for these Judeans in exile, while those left behind in the land still preserved the old identity.

⁵ The 1.5 Generation may be classified as the pre-teens and adolescents that got displaced with their parents during the exile to Babylon (Ahn 2012:109)

According to Dawson & Farber (2012:2) forced displacement drags many jargons with it such as expulsion, transfer, deportation, migration, dislocation, illegal, involuntarily, forced and unlawful. Besides the many jargons that are associated with forced displacement the results remain the same; thousands of people are forcefully removed from their homelands, placed in areas they are not familiar with. Such an act leads to destruction of people and their cultures. The general idea about forced displacement is that it takes place under violent war conditions. However, Dawson and Farber (2012:3) argue that people can be forcefully removed from their land even during a time of peace. This often happens when a government body finds that it is in the best interest of the public to remove a group of people from their own land.

There are a number of terms that describes forced displacement of people such as deportation, expulsion, forced migration and forcible transfer (Dawson & Farber 2012:43). Terms such as expulsion refer to requiring individuals to move across international borders forcefully. The terms such as internal displacement or forced migration refer to the involuntarily transfer of people within their country of origin. The term displacement means to move something or someone around or away then forcible is added to the term displacement to explain that the force manner that is used to move people involuntarily.

The main purpose of forced displacement is to move the demographic composition of a certain area by enforcing its people to relocate involuntarily to a given location or banish people from their own land. This kind of act endangers the livelihood of individuals and of the community (Dawson & Farber 2012:44). Throughout history there has been a vivid pattern of forced displacement, for example when Iraq wanted to move the demographic composition of the Kuwait people by banishing them out of their land so that the Iraqs can settle there.

This is not an unfamiliar tactic to South Africa. During the Apartheid regime the National Party government came up with what seemed to be a strategic plan of “displaced urbanization”. The term on its own contradicted what the National Party government had in plan. The government then forcefully removed all South Africans of colour from what seemed to be white metropolitan areas and placed them into rural country side slums that were usually far from the white metropolitan areas (Murray 1995:231).

4.3 Migration Experience

In order to be able to compare the ancient exile and modern day migration, Wilson (2012:132) believes that it is always best to compare the two before concluding that they are alike. The migration experience whether forced or voluntarily is generally an individual phenomena. Even though it is evident that in the case of forced displacement involves groups, the adaption to the circumstances has to be dealt with individually. People deal with circumstances differently; it would take one person no time to adapt and the next person a couple of years, decades or never in a life span.

According to Wilson (2012:133) displaced people tend to reshape their sense of identity and culture around their new circumstances. This is often mistaken by sociologists that the individuals or group are stripped of their culture and identity. Wilson (2012:133) argues that the individuals or groups might have been stripped of their homes and land but they bring with them their history, identity & culture to the land of their displacement. War time situations have shown that people react individually first and then lament as a group later. This reaction then pushes them to reshape their identities as individuals and then later as a group/community (Wilson 2012:133).

Displaced people know that they are migrants in the land of their displacement. They carry that mentality throughout even when they later get absorbed into their new social setting. The memories of their homelands remain a huge part of their identities and each has a personal story of who they are and where they from that lead to the bigger identity of the group/community (Wilson 2012:133). However, the down part of it all is that individuals can change their story over time depending on the treatment found in the in the land of their displacement.

Families are important in all cases of migration (Wilson 2012:134). In the case of voluntarily migration families usually relocate to places of their own choice. In most cases these families relocate to places whereby they have relatives or they are fond of with no problem of integration. However, with involuntarily displaced people the family becomes an important source of social, cultural and personal support, for they would be displaced in a foreign land with no roots of their identity.

Even though families are important during displacements they can become a source of tension overtime (Wilson 2012:134). For example, the experience of the first generation exiled Judeans might differ to the children they were displaced with (the 1.5 generation) and the second generation children that were born in the foreign land. The 1.5 generation may remember their homes through the eyes of their parents but equally so be comfortable with a new language and reshaped identity. The second generation would also know the story of how their forefather got displaced but it wouldn't necessarily make sense to them.

Wilson (2012:135) notes that there are certain implications when with the ancient exile. He argues that whenever we refer to the ancient exile we need to be cautious to not refer the exile as a unified experience. In other words one needs to learn that individuals had different experiences from each other. Members of the community might have had shared experiences but that does not necessarily mean each individual relates to those experiences (Wilson 2012:135) This might have caused tension within the community, for they are all displaced but they have different feelings and experiences towards the exile. Others might have wanted to retaliate whilst other decided to make peace with the happenings.

One should always bear in mind that forced displaced people do not arrive at the foreign land without any sense of identity. They arrive there with their history, culture and personal identity. This challenges the readers to be careful of interpretations that imply, that self-identities that emerged from the exile were new. Instead readers should expect two kinds of identities: those that were formed during exile and those who were formed before exile (Wilson 2012:135).

Displaced people always carry personal stories with them (Wilson 2012:135). The Judeans carried personal stories that explain who they are. These stories may have changes especially when passed down orally from one generation to another. Therefore Wilson (2012:135) suggests that one should be careful of the thought that new stories were created during the exile. Instead the thought should be expectation of continuity in these stories, even if there are slight changes; the new self-identities were integrated into the narratives.

The first, second and third generation displaced people held different views when it came to the exile. Wilson (2012:136) uses the example of the prophecies of First

Isaiah where the book seems to have accepted the fate of Jerusalem and also the end of the Davidic monarchy. On the contrary, the second book of Isaiah remembers Jerusalem and looks forward to its restoration. This can be pointed out as the work of the second generation who still held the views and beliefs of the first generation of displaced people, but also were comfortable with having a Persian King.

The book of Ezekiel, on the other hand, has more of a unified view. It is evident that it is the work of the first generation displaced people that were displaced around 598/7 BCE. The prophet Ezekiel as well as the community held a very strong Judean self-identity. The book of Ezekiel carries a lot of knowledge on the Babylonian culture, but there was no sign that the prophet or the displaced community got absorbed by it. They strongly believed in the restoration of the temple and the Davidic monarchy (Wilson 2012:135).

The book of Jeremiah is quite different from the other book that speaks of the exilic period. According to Wilson (2012:136) this book has evidence of redactional work by several generations of displaced exiles. The Golah-redaction can be understood through three layers which are the A, B, C materials. The A poetry consistently paints the perspective of the prophet in the pre-exilic period, his perspective remains focused on the land. In this perspective the prophet believed that the exiles were not the true Judeans for they were not in the land anymore (Wilson 2012:137). The B source material is different in its perspective, it intentionally identify individuals in the period between 598//7 and 587/6 BCE, who either supported the prophet Jeremiah or did not support Jeremiah. This thought could have been influenced by the first generation exile from the second displacement in identifying members of Israel on the basis of their actions in days before the fall of the city (Wilson 2012:137). The C source material represents an exilic group that accepts a traditional Deuteronomistic view of the fall of Jerusalem, which firmly locates the true Judeans amongst the exiles in Babylon (Wilson 2012:137).

The different types of exilic literary material only represent the different views of the exilic period. Therefore migration studies do not aim to solve whether literal pieces were written in Judah or in Babylonia. It aims to gather the characteristics and experiences of migrant communities whether they voluntarily relocated or displaced (Wilson 2012:137).

4.5 Forced Displacement and Economical implications

In the ancient world deportation and exiles were martial tactics used by many nation states; they were perfected as imperial mechanism of control. Forced migration and deportation were used in the ancient world to punish and receive loyalty from other nations or areas of unrest within an empire. Ancient Israel fell victim to a series of recorded and unrecorded deportations during their period of existence. The two most protruding events where Israel resulted in deportation that affected the state was during the fall of Samaria in the Northern kingdom during 722/721 BCE and the destruction of Jerusalem in the Southern kingdom during 587/586 BCE. Even though the fall of Samaria existed from a two stage Assyrian conquest 735 and 722 BCE biblical interpreters tend to discuss the diaspora with the fall of the Southern kingdom that led to exile (Middlemas 2016:3).

According to Ahn (2010:40) it is always the poor, the lower class and the voiceless people in society who are displaced and resettled. The reason for their resettling is mostly because of economic gain. In some cases people migrate involuntarily and are seen as forced migrants. In view of the fact that forced migration is a broad term Ahn (2011:40) is of the opinion that the term can be brought into lesser scale by categorising it into three types of forced migration:

1. *Derivative Forced Migration*

Derivative forced migration, or better known as static migration, happens as a result of geopolitical and cartographical rearrangement. When a new country or territory is discovered people migrate to the new area (Ahn 2011:41). This type of migration takes place when there are changes within the land, for instance, when the then Rhodesia Colony gained its independence and changed its name to Zimbabwe, white people who were living in Zimbabwe migrated to South Africa seeking better opportunities for at that time in South Africa as the Apartheid National Party was still in power and thus gave preference to these migrants.

2. *Responsive Forced Migration*

Responsive forced migration is when people are forced by their home land situations to look for greener pastures, therefore, it is more of a voluntary move from

one place to another due to political oppression, tyranny, war and natural causes such as famine (Ahn 2011:41). For instance, in most emigrant-producing countries, jobs are scarce or salaries are too low, obliging people to seek opportunities elsewhere. Ruth and Naomi's narrative suite perfectly here, for they had returned (migrated) back to Bethlehem, the land of bread, from Moab due to famine that had hit the land.

3. Involuntarily (Forced) Migration

While involuntarily (forced) migration on the other hand describes the people who are forced to resettle without any choice to another land. These people are often victims of hostile political, profit driven, culture orientated, race related, and religiously motivated forces. It all boils down to the security of the dominating structure with power (Ahn 2011:41).

According to Betts (2009:1) the topic of forced migration has been a global issue since the 20th century. There are people in the world who has subjected to this type of inhumane migration to flee their home as a result of political persecutions, conflict or man-made disasters. In most cases it can be noted that people choose not to flee voluntarily but they are deported due to violent issues that has stems of oppressions in their own home lands. As a result some people are displaced across borders as stateless displaced people, and a great number of have been displaced from their home lands but have remained within their country regions as internally displaced people.

No matter the regards of how or where these people have been displaced they all have one thing in common that is they faced significant constraints in their abilities to remain within their home lands, which causes a huge amount of trauma. Migrant refugee movements such as these are inherently political creating fear within the displaced communities. Therefore whether they are displaced across the borders or within the state it causes unpleasant emotions.

After displacement the people have to resettle, redevelop, populate structures and pull up policies in a new foreign place that can be very limiting to their freedom. As a result the phase of resettling can likely cause challenges such as change of identities and complex cultures which can be damaging to the group of people in the new resettling society. Thus they have to constantly rework and build their new

environment while trying to heal from what Ahn (2011:42) recalls as the “push and pull” factors that were the reasons why the migration had taken place in the first place.

In this regard push factors can refer to the initial reasons of migration usually has a negative connotation to it, whereas pull factors are always economically driven or motivated reasons for migration. However that can open up a room for exploitation, especially for women and children. Therefore the central operative system for push or pull factors lies around the ideology of economics, it be voluntarily or not. Economics is capable of leading destruction and causing severe trauma for a group.

Economic gain is one of the key reasons that drive the development induced displacement project (Ahn 2010:42). A nation or government body would raft policies and agreed laws then displace thousands of people from their homeland or residential areas and resettle them in remote areas that are either closer to the business hubs or confined areas with new living arrangements (Ahn 2010:43) Such an action can be seen as a violation of basic human rights that is driven by economic greed.

During the exile of 587 BCE the forces behind involuntarily (forced) migration of the Judeans were pushed through conflict, violence and human inflicted disaster. The Babylonian empire forced the people of the land to leave their homes and residents against their will in violation of their basic human rights. They were forced to migrate to Babylon without having to cross a state border for Judah became part of the Babylonian empire when they invaded Judah (Ahn 2010:43)

Becking (2012:59) is of the opinion that the climate conditions in Babylonia were horrid and a severe drought had hit the land. Therefore the Babylonians needed workers to work in their fields and projects to keep their economy going throughout the drought period. The fact that the Babylonians captured the Judeans and displaced them from their own land can easily be labelled as migration forced by political powers and economic drive.

Ahn (2010:46) argues that internally displaced persons are different from refugees. A refugee can be defined as someone or people who flee against their will because of fear. This fear is driven by their social, cultural and economic conditions that threaten

their security and livelihood. This definition of refugee is suiting to the migration that took place in 582 BCE when Judeans fled and sought asylum in Egypt due to the Babylonian invasion. In most cases refugees crosses borders seeking better livelihood while internally displaced persons do not cross the border, they remain within the country just displaced in a different setting or area. Despite the various reasons the whole exilic period may be termed the forced migration period.

Economists believe that a well calculated and planned immigration policy promotes economic development (Ahn 2010:47). Like any other political body the Babylonians must have had a system that developed their economy that would benefit even the damaged areas within their empire. According to Ahn (210:48) in ancient contexts forced migration functioned as an economic boost especially for the conquering nation in this case the Babylonians. They gained a lot of labourers from the conquered Judah who were placed in the damaged areas that were identified by the Babylonian governing body. They were placed in these areas to rebuild and re-establish the irrigation canals and the entire economic system. In boosting the economy, migrants were given hard labour jobs that were not desirable with little or no remuneration.

Since the displaced were the ones taking care of the irrigation canals, the Babylonian government had to find reason to displace more people. Ahn (2012:181) argues that if the first wave of the forced migrants in 597 BCE to Babylonia were causing racial tension with other ethnic groups, turning enclaves into ghetto slums with no economic input, wide spread of illnesses there would have been no need for additional displacements. However because the Judeans feared for their lives those who governed Judah knew the purpose of the displacement, should it happen that they fail the empire they were to face dire consequences that would have been imposed on them and their children.

Ahn (2011:62) draws a comparison between the Babylonian empire and the World bank involuntarily resettlements projects. She states that the primary cause of modern day mass involuntarily displacement is caused by hydro dam projects. Families and individuals become forced labourers of these projects as it is already established that it is always the poor and the underclass that are affected by such treatment. Since well these projects vary from scale sizes it can require 10 000 to

several hundred thousands of workers. There are a few examples that can be drawn such as the Aswan dam project in Egypt where 100 000 people were displaced. The Shulkon damn on the Min river in China displaced 62 500 people. These contemporary figures provide comparative work. Through observation the Assyrians displaced over 200 000 people, whereby 2 Kings also reports on a number of people that were displaced by the Babylonian empire.

According to Ahn (2011:62) the World Bank is the leading organization that funds modern day forced displacement and resettlement projects. It has a clear plan for implementing and executing projects, taking into account:

1. The legal aspects of resettlement and legislative policies
 2. An economic analysis estimating the full cost of resettlement
 3. Determining whether special needs of tribal populations affected by displacement are necessary
 4. Wider issue and concerns that result from resettlement for the host populations'
 5. Support and encouragement of the suitability of the available organizational infrastructure with proper internal leadership for the resettled people
- (Ahn 2011:63)

All these points could have been established by the Babylonian empire, except for point number for there are no evidence of legal aspects that the Babylonians could have used. The main objective of the World Bank is to help the resettled people to gain their previous livelihood standards, by ensuring that the settlers are afforded opportunities to become self-established and economically self-sustaining in a short period. Nebuchadnezzar's program draws on similar points which were endorsed by the prophet Jeremiah (Ahn 2011:63).

The World Bank ensures that the resettled people can live their lives again by establishing infrastructures, schools, health care and housing. It also ensures that the needs of those who are resettled are met accordingly. The same comparison can be seen when the Judeans were displaced in Babylonia. The prophet Jeremiah (29:6) encouraged the Judeans to get married, build houses, start with families and this encouragement went down until the third generation of the resettled (Ahn 2011:63).

Agriculturally based projects by the World Bank targets areas for relocation with a precise timetable on how the whole project is supposed to roll out. In mass displacements of people an opportunity to generate sustenance is given to those who are displaced for cash compensation is not enough nor sustainable (Ahn 2011:64). The World Bank has established a thorough check list that would ensure that everything goes according to plan. It is not hard to think that the Babylonian empire did not have the exact checklist to ensure that everything goes according to their plan. The checklist consist out of: (Ahn 2011:64)

I. Basic Information for Planning

A. Information on the Departure

i. Census of population that is to be displaced

1. Demographics: sex, age, health etc.

2. Description of production system and of the main social and ethnic groups (artisans, merchants, farmers, tribal groups) and the form of social organizations that operate (kin groups, family, religion)

ii. Inventory of property to be lost

1. Estimate of likely population growth until actual resettlement

2. Issuing identity cards for settlers

B. Information and design for arrival area

i. Identification of new settlers and maps of new sites

ii. Survey of host population around new settlement areas and their resources

II. Policy and Legal Framework

A. Definition of resettlement policy

i. Housing and compensation, overall development objective

ii. Legal rights of displaced population; institutional assistance for land replacement and land alienation procedures at new sites

III Organizational Capacity for resettlement

A. Designation of department or agency responsible for the resettlement

B. Leadership and internal staffing among the resettlers

IV. Resettlement Plan for New Sites

A. Develop objectives for displaced groups

- i. Agricultural intensification
- ii. Irrigation
- iii. Land reclamation and preparation
- iv. Livestock improvement plans
- v. Urban development
- vi. Habitat provision
- vii. Support social organization

V. Transfer arrangements

A. During the transfer period

- i. Information that is disseminated among the displaced and hosts
- ii. Provision of food, fodder for animals, fuel wood, medical during trip
- iii. Mobilization schedule

VI. Timetable and Budget

A. A critical timetable with activity chart by month and years

- i. -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (0= transfer year)
- ii Long term economic profitability

This checklist contains parallel vocabulary of the forced migration period and the modern day displacement:

1. Build houses is equivalent to housing and compensation
2. Plant vine yards is the same as agricultural intensification,
3. By the irrigation canals of Babylon goes hand in hand with irrigation itself,
4. Seek the welfare of the community can be compared with modern day urban development
5. The exilic elders or community leaders is the modern day social support organization
6. Captors and tormentors are the host population in the new settlement.

Ahn (2011:65) believes that many irrigation, hydropower and water supply projects can only be implemented only if a certain number of displaced people are living in the area. This supports the notion that each displacement during the forced migration period 597, 587, and 582 BCE was most likely result from a specific number of workers that was needed to complete the hard labour task. The additional displacements that was carried out by the Babylonians shows that the first wave of

forced migration was remarkably productive, hence they had to keep on conquering Judah.

According to the World Bank the time frame to make the full transition for profitability of the projects is ten years (Ahn 2011:66). It took the Babylonian Empire ten years to execute two migrations, the first being in 597 BCE and the second 587 BCE. Ahn (2011:66) is of the opinion that the Babylonians planned to see if the first wave of Judeans would be productive, when Zedekiah rebelled it prompted for another forced migration. However, even if Zedekiah did not rebel against the Babylonians another wave of forced migration was bound to happen. Zedekiah just did not want his people to be displaced without a fight. On the other hand if Zedekiah had not rebelled against the Babylonians the destruction would have not been as tragic as it was in 587 BCE, it would have been more like the displacement of 597 BCE (Ahn 2011:66)

According to Ahn (2012:182) the Babylonian empire had carefully calculated and planned the multiple forced migrations of Judeans from a socio economic view. They calculated the exact numbers of people needed for each specific irrigation canal project. Jeremiah 52:28-30 supports the idea and gives the precise records and figures of the people King Nebuchadnezzar took to Babylon as prisoners. As years went by the demand for Judeans workers decreased possibilities could be that the Babylonian infrastructure had reached its maximum capacity.

4.6 Conclusion

Judeans had thought that the displacement would be temporary rather than permanent. When they came to realization that they will not be returning to their homeland soon the Judeans continued to live and thrive in Babylon (Middlemas 2016:4). Through years of working many immigrants change their focus and place it towards their families and communities by reforming and rebuilding old infrastructures. These neighbourhoods eventually reform and develop into what Ahn (2010:48) calls “ethnic enclaves”. These ethnic enclaves are not to be confused with modern day “slums/ghettos”. It is a place that creates benefits for the immigrants and the larger community. The key difference between ethnic enclaves and the ghetto

lies within the level of economic output. Ethnic enclaves should constantly gain capital through investments into that region or area and also the constant resupply of a specific product or service that sustains economic growth (Ahn 2010:49). In these ethnic enclaves it is where the Judeans continued to live and try by all means to heal from the tragic events that lead them there.

However, when the Persians conquered the Babylonians, the Judean territory came under Persian rule. The Judeans were free to return to their ancestral land, but many remained due to climate change that opened the way for agricultural success. Therefore the migration under the Babylonians started off as an exile but ended into a diaspora (Becking 2012:59).

CHAPTER Five:

Trauma

5.1 Introduction

Tragic events can happen at any time. A person could be happy the one minute and then the next a natural disaster strikes and threatens the livelihood of the person. Claassen and Garber (2008:187) believe that existence in our world is constantly shaped by traumatic events. According to a definition borrowed by Claassen and Garber (2008:187) trauma is an overwhelming experience caused by a catastrophic event. One would learn through a sociological lens that what had happened to the Judeans was horrific. The exile created trauma within the community of the Judeans.

This chapter focus on what trauma is and also its effects on the survivors. The Bible is full of narratives that contain warfare violence. 2 Kings 25:8-21 is one of those narratives that contain warfare violence. Traumatic events that are shocking and dangerous have an effect on individuals. During warfare individuals, especially victims get exposed to so many things that could a permanent trauma mark not only physically but on the psyche as well. Trauma caused by warfare damages not only the individuals; it also has the potential to damage communities and collective groups. This chapter aims to understand war trauma and the effects thereof on individuals, communities and collective groups. It will also then read the narrative of 2 Kings 25:8-21 through the lenses of trauma theory.

5.2 Trauma Defined

Trauma can be explained as a deep disturbing experience that can last years on the psyche. Kirmayer, Lemelson & Barad (2007:1) believes that trauma is a keyword used by clinicians and scholars to describe the after-math of a violent experience. Therefore trauma is a physical or emotional experience that requires psychological process to be dealt with.

According to Kirmayer, Lemelson & Barad (2007:4) trauma is a culturally constructed way to mark out certain events and experiences, for cultural prototypes of trauma has changed over the time along with ways how people think of illness, suffering,

victim-hood, blame and accountability. The term trauma is borrowed from the medicine domain. It stems from the Greek word *Τραυμα* which referred to a wound, by the mid 1600's the term was featured in medical literature referring to physical wounds. From its original form trauma involves damage to bodily tissues and when physical body capacity fails to repair the wound it may lead to severe damage or death. This effect can lead to a state of cardiovascular collapse also known as shock.

Therefore just as trauma can cause damage to the physical body, trauma can also cause damage to the nervous system that can lead to a loss of behavioural, psychological and intellectual functioning (Kirmayer, Lemelson & Barad 2007:5). It is believed throughout history that the key trigger to trauma is violence. A violent event can cause injury to body and its physiological systems while activating bodily systems to repair and recover. In recent studies, trauma studies has moved from the surgical injuries to more of psychological and physiological processes (Kirmayer, Lemelson, Barad 2007:7)

In another perspective, Rambo (2010:4) compares trauma with the relation between life and death. Rambo (2010:4) believes that, trauma can be described as an encounter with death, she further explains that this encounter is not a literal death but a way of describing traumatic events that shattered an individual's core beliefs and world view. If the person had the view that the world is good and safe, after experiencing the traumatic event that drastically changes into a more negative view believing that the world is cruel and unsafe. In the aftermath of a traumatic event the term survival is described as the suspension of life, for the psyche moves into survival mode therefore hindering the person to move on and start to enjoy life again. Life after a traumatic event changes and takes a different meaning, in the eyes of a victim life will always be mixed with death.

Janzen (2012:27) believes that individuals that have experienced events that involved serious injuries or near death experiences and responded with fear and helplessness can be said to be suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Symptoms of PTSD can include recurring dreams of the event, the feeling as if the event is still happening in the form of hallucinations and flashbacks. On the other hand there are some constrictive symptoms often experienced by individuals.

These symptoms include the feeling of numbness, total avoidance of feelings associated with the trauma. The individuals often make efforts to avoid thoughts, feelings, activities, places and people associated with the trauma (Janzen 2012:27).

Esterhuizen (2016:49) notes that individuals that have been affected by trauma often feel the following emotional and psychological symptoms:

- Shock, denial, disbelief
- Anger, mood swings
- Guilt, shame, self-blame
- Feeling sad and hopeless
- Confusion
- Anxiety and fear
- Withdrawal from others
- Feeling disconnected

There are individuals that show hyper arousal symptoms, in other words their symptoms include exaggerated startle response, hyper vigilance, difficulty sleeping and outburst of anger (Janzen 2012:27). Most of these symptoms noted by Janzen (2012:27) are beyond the conscious control of the trauma victim. Stressors that are known to produce traumatic disorders are natural disasters, participation in warfare, and the experience of mass violence against civilians, rape, torture, and child abuse.

In agreement, Frechette (2015:5) furthers the argument by categorising the symptoms that victims go through after exposure to traumatic event into four categories:

1. Recurrent intrusions: distressing dreams, flashbacks and involuntarily memories, the content of which reflects traumatic events; distressing psychological and physiological reactions in response to certain external cues that resembles the traumatic events.
2. Persistent avoidant behaviour: efforts to avoid thoughts, feelings or memories as well as external reminders of the traumatic events.
3. Persistent negative alterations in cognitions and mood: inability to remember important aspects of the traumatic events; exaggerated negative beliefs about self, others and the world; distorted cognitions that leads to erroneous

attribution of blame, often self-blame, for the traumatic events, negative emotions such as fear, horror, anger, guilt and shame; inability to experience positive emotions such as happiness and satisfaction; feelings of isolation from others; and diminished interest in participating in significant activities.

4. Marked alterations in arousal: irritable behaviour and angry verbal or physical outburst; reckless or self-destructive behaviour; hyper-vigilance; problems of concentration and sleep disturbance.

According to Frechette (2015:5) often when victims faces a threat, their natural response to themselves is to go into what he calls “fight or flight” mode. In cases where neither is possible, the victim involuntarily disassociates and withdraws from the disturbing traumatic event and the intense feeling around it. This type of a withdrawal qualifies as a survival mechanism, where the victim protects itself from mental breakdown. At the same time, the victim might be unconsciously or consciously avoiding the feelings, memories and reminders associated with the traumatic event.

Even though all these feelings and memories remain out of the victim’s conscious mind, the trauma can intrude itself into the victim’s conscious by making them aware of the happenings involuntarily through fragmented ways.

In cases of traumatic events victims often interpret what the event mean for them; this process happens either consciously or unconsciously; leading them to changes in their beliefs about themselves, others, the world and religion (Frechette 2015:6). Victims tend to blame themselves for the traumatic event as a form of a survival mechanism. Frechette (2015:6) argues that in blaming the self it helps the person to confront the threat of overwhelming chaos. Unconsciously a victim’s presumptions about the world may change negatively to account for how and why the traumatic event had happened. This may leave the victim’s core beliefs of about self as worthless, others untrustworthy, the world as dangerous, religion especially God as cruel. These distorted beliefs become permanent in the victims psyche and carries power to cause them harm.

It was Sigmund Freud who identified in subjects who had fought in World War 1 a psychoanalysis called “war neuroses” (Janzen 2012:28). It is noted that war

neuroses involves disturbance in the dreams of the victims. These dreams cause the victim to be hooked to the trauma by disturbing the normal healing nature of dreams. This often leads to a neurotic effect called disassociation, whereby the victim becomes detached from the main stream of consciousness and reality. It blocks new memories from being created; instead it causes them to exist in the subconscious memory, therefore affecting the personality. This causes victims to not be able to move or change their outside world psychologically; it leaves them stuck within the memory of trauma (Janzen 2012:29).

Memory is essential to individuals for it is where their own narrative is embedded. However victims have been exposed to trauma they cannot associate the traumatic event with their own life narrative (Janzen 2012:29). They simply do not remember the trauma; instead the trauma reproduces itself through symptoms such as hallucinations and dreams. These type of reincarnations that come in the form of dreams and hallucinations are not memories. The victims did not add the event to their memories and they do not have voluntarily access to the memory, it just produce itself and disrupt the victims life, hence the correct term to use when describing such is traumatic memory (Janzen 2012:29)

Psychologists such as Sigmund Freud and Janet Pierre argue that victims of trauma get attached to their trauma, therefor causing them to not understand their current life and terror experiences (Janzen 2012:29). These are after effects of disassociation, it creates a break in the life narrative of the victim's memory and that can affect them permanently. The trauma will then continue to disrupt the victim's life.

5.3 War Trauma

According to Hunt (2010:6) a consensus cannot be reached when defining war trauma, especially when discussing the psychological effects of traumatic situations such as war. When a situation such as war or forced migration has hit people a traumatic memory is formed. This memory is at once cognitive, emotional and leads to behavioural. The traumatic stress does not exist or come in the form of normal stress. Instead it relates to the persons unconscious response to the traumatic event.

When the person survives the event the memory becomes fixed within the mind, so that if the same traumatic situation happens again the future they can automatically switch their conscious to survival mode (Hunt 2010:7). Hunt (2010:8) points out that for some people memories of the traumatic even can cause continuous overwhelming emotions. These people do not respond well to what had transpired. They find it difficult to cope with ordinary living due to their memory being emotionally unbearable. This causes them to withdraw emotionally to help them cope. There are people who respond differently to traumatic events, whereby they manage to suppress their memories through unconscious or conscious mechanisms. These people avoid thinking about what had transpired to them.

Another group of people actively think about what had transpired and then manage to work through it, process their responses, change their narratives and grab lessons from the experience. This group lived through the traumatic event and are arguably not traumatized. They have no difficulties dealing with emotional memories or problems caused by the traumatic event. They would look back to the memories and respond with emotions but it would not hinder them in anyway (Hunt 2006:8).

War situations, forced migration can change one's sense of self-identity (Hunt 2010:10). Hunt (2010:10) believes that our identities stem from the beliefs we hold, the world and the future. A traumatic event such as war, forced displacement can change a person's worldview from a positive to a negative perspective. Witnessing destruction or being subjected to torture can impact the self-identity. In traumatic events the victims are the ones that are hit the hardest for they have no control over the hostile situation.

Even though war trauma is not recognized by psychiatric entities, it does not necessarily mean people do not suffer from it (Hunt 2010:59). War from a victim's perspective is traumatising, for they get to witness people getting killed and get affected by man-made disasters such as destruction of buildings and important artefacts, and maltreatment such as rape and starvation. Victims of such a traumatic event are labelled to have PTSD. The pattern of symptoms of vary, victims that are traumatised by war portray wide range of symptoms. These symptoms may have a great or no impact at all. When the victim becomes a refugee then there will be a significant environment psychosocial impact. Displaced people are often damaged by their arrival and reception in the new land than they are by the events they witness or rather experienced in their homeland (Hunt 2010:59). Therefore war trauma leads victims to experience trauma as a collective, which is cultural trauma.

5.4 Cultural Trauma

Rambo (2010:4) believes that trauma is often expressed in ways which are beyond comprehension of the human capacity. Traumatic events that had happened in the past has a tendency of resurfacing and hinder the individual and communal livelihood impacting their present live and possibly the future. Traumatic events such as war, genocide, mass natural disasters, foreign occupations of territories have the ability to shape and reshape communities and nations in the aftermath.

According to McNally (2003:1) victims have a way of remembering their trauma for their experiences are engraved deeply in their minds. Trauma can happen to anyone who had experienced horrific combats such as violence, natural disasters, conflict or oppression and that event leads to the person feeling like a victim for they are not to be blamed for their misfortunes. However, some people dislike the term victim, for it is believed that it puts them in a lower position. Therefore they prefer being identified as survivors. This term is coined to those who had survived the turbulence of their traumatic event.

For trauma dwells deep in the memory, McNally (2003:78) believes that whenever a survivor or victim of trauma remembers their horrific ordeal that causes a high stress level. Three variables may play a figure in how to define their trauma:

1. An objectively defined event

2. The person's subjective meaning of its interpretation
3. The person's emotional reaction towards it.

Therefore when victims or survivors of horrific events remember what they have been through, for them it feels like they are reliving their trauma (McNally 2003:105). In a sense that the traumatic event from the past was happening all over again and this kind of feeling is often associated with Post traumatic stress disorder of the person.

This can be also connected to a group of people. In the opinion of Alexander (2004:1) cultural trauma often happens when members of a society feel like they have been subjected to a horrific event that left a mark which cannot be removed in their societal group's consciousness. Marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in basic irrevocable ways. Cultural trauma is capable of constructing a social groups way of thinking by not only identify their suffering but to take on board their suffering. The society would then identify the cause of trauma and thereby assume moral responsibility to gather all those suffering in solidarity to share their trauma with each other.

Societies can experience massive disruptions that are not necessarily traumatic. For example government institutions can fail to perform as expected. Economic systems may be disrupted to the extent that its functions fail to provide basic needs. While these issues are real, they do not always necessarily cause trauma for the members of the society much less for the community at large. For cultural trauma to emerge at the level of the collective society, the crisis must cause discomfort that enters into the core of the collective society's sense of identity (Alexander 2004:10). The social pain then lies on who they are, where they come from and where they wish to go in the future.

Cultural Trauma depends heavily on the context in which the horrific event played out in (Alexandra 2004:37). For when a social system is threatened it has an effect on the group which can be described as cultural trauma. Social systems in this regard refer to the organisations of social relations in society and its main units and institutions such as religion, economic related institutions, and family bonds.

Therefore when disrupted these systems can cause trauma for the society, because identity and belonging is laid in those institutions.

For example that on 16 June 1976, students from secondary schools across Soweto marched through the township towards the Orlando stadium. It was believed that the march was supposed to be peaceful to demonstrate their resistance against the government of that time plans to change the medium of instruction in their schools from English to Afrikaans. During the protest in the early hours of the morning, the national party police began to gather at the street corners scattered all over the routes students used, where they started to challenge isolated groups of students. The time students heard about incidents that had took place in the morning, they gathered and were confronted by thirty to fifty national party police men.

They were singing, whistling at the police and brandishing placards. In an instant the atmosphere had changed, white police men charged the students with tear gas, and maliciously started shooting at the students. Forty one years later in 2016 students from different Higher learning institutions gathered together all in the name of the controversial hash tag Afrikaans must fall. The current students are saying that Afrikaans must fall as an academic language in higher institutions because it creates unfairness that white Afrikaner people are taught in their mother tongue, while black people have to struggle in English as their first additional language. The protest started off peacefully at the student centre, but ended up in a brutal war with rubber bullets and some students being arrested. It is evident that for these students Afrikaans is a barrier and always ends up in traumatic turmoil'. Therefore cultural event refers to a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, it causes a tear in the social fabric affecting a group of people that has achieved some sense of unity (Eyerman 2001:2).

In instances of forced migration issues such as belonging is important. Davis (2006:197) believes that to belong is about the emotional attachment, and can be best described as "feeling at home". Therefore the feeling of attachment or belonging can be threatened once a discourse such as migration, oppression, economic seclusion is encountered. According to Davis (2006:199) the notion of belonging can be understood under three categories which are:

1. Social locations

In society people belong to a particular gender, race, class or nation. These are the different factors that locate people and placing them in society. Even though some categories are higher while some are lower, they construct the society as markers of different locations in society. These categories also identify people and once these markers are threatened they influence the identity not just of the individual but the society at large.

2. Identifications and attachments

Davis (2006:202) believes that, identities are narratives in a sense that people tell stories to themselves and to others about who they are. Each narrative relates to the self and others in explanation of what being a member of a certain group means. These narratives can be individualistic or collective and are produced from one generation to another carrying narratives that shape the society. However once threatened the identity stands a great chance to get lost and further diluted with other narratives that are not from the group itself.

3. Ethical and political values

Are about the ways these identities are valued and judged. Davis (2006:203) believes that this is related to specific attitudes and ideologies that form the identity.

When a society always struggles with an event that involves identifying the nature and the nature of the victims or survivors it shows that the society is clearly in process of dealing with this trauma. However, in this process the society has to grasp some elements from their past or in their current state to reform their identity in the midst of their trauma. In doing so they would be helping themselves to form coping mechanisms till a time it won't be needed anymore and a new identity with past elements will be formed.

Trauma that has been inflicted on a group of people has an effect that goes beyond the lives of those who have survived it and are also transmitted to their children (Janzen 2012:31). Janzen (2012:31) makes an example of the children of the Holocaust, arguing that they suffered through trans-generational trauma. Trans-generational trauma is the transmission of historical oppression and its negative

consequences across generations. The traumatic event gets transmitted to next generation when the trauma continues to stress the initial victim because it is outside of their realm of the individual's experience. This leads to the incapability to process the meaning of the trauma event in the victims' mind set (Janzen 2012:32).

It is hard to develop as an individual in an environment that has suffered from mass trauma. According to Janzen (2012:32) every individual's worldview is inherited from family and the wider community, and when both has been exposed to trauma the upcoming (second) generation will find themselves repeating and reacting their parents trauma. They become affected to such an extent that the lack of memory and the repetition of trauma in their parent's lives that it starts to reflect in their own lives while not being able to see the gap between them and their parent's. Their parents have not integrated the trauma into their self-narratives, the second generation then feels the trauma without having to have had experienced it directly. The victims offspring live through their parent's dark shadows of stories of the past and details of their trauma that is hard to grasp and relate to (Janzen 2012:33).

In cases of mass trauma communities also get affected by trauma hence cultural trauma. These communities that have experienced trauma provides context for individuals and can moderate the pain (Janzen 2012:33). However when majority of the individuals within the community has experienced mass suffering the community will be negatively affected. Traumatic events that are experienced by communities fracture the social group and dominate the way the community see itself.

Communities can try to take control of the traumatic event by fitting them into their social existence and worldviews. This will lead them to understand their trauma and create recognizable narratives to their ordeal, through a language that has meaning and significance within their worldview context (Janzen2012:34).

Trauma victims or rather survivors often try to create narratives of trauma that expresses their frustration through the limitations of language. The trauma then gets embedded into the narratives that are created by the survivors. Survivors tend to use the same language when expressing their trauma through narratives. Their language is often filled with the image of how dark and unpredictable the world is, and lacks authority. Through their narratives trauma then portrays itself as something that cannot be explained through the scope of language (Janzen 2012:34). Frechette

(2015:5) furthers the argument by noting that, when individuals or collectives respond to traumatic event by interpreting them the result often may cause them further harm. The beliefs that stems from these interpretations can cause further trauma to the following generations.

According to Alexander (2004:12) the representation of trauma depends on constructing a framework of cultural classification, in other words the retelling of the story. For readers to be convinced of what the victim went through was traumatizing, the victim needs to engage in meaningful storytelling skills that has all the elements. Alexander (2004:12) notes four critical representations that are necessary in retelling a trauma narrative:

- A. The Nature of the pain: It is to ask what actually happened to the victimized group
 - How did the Judeans get conquered. Where was their military power at the time?

 - Did hundreds of Judeans die during the exile, or was it ten and possibly hundreds of thousands?

 - Was the exile specifically designed for the Judeans? Or was it a well calculated move for economic gain?

- B. Nature of the victim: Is to ask more of the victimize group that was affected by the traumatizing pain
 - Did a singular and delimited group receive the brunt of the pain or were several groups involved?

 - Were the Judeans the primary victims?

 - How was the upper class affected more than the lower class that were left behind?

- C. Relation of the trauma victim to the wider audience: Although the victim's pain has been identified, the significant question that remains is of the relation of

the victim to the wider audience. In most cases at the beginning of the trauma process, most audience see little relation between them and the victimized group. Only when the victims are represent in ways that are shared by the larger collective identity will the audience share and understand the victim's trauma.

D. Attribution of responsibility: In retelling a trauma narrative it is important to establish the identity of the perpetrator. The reader has to find out who had hurt and caused trauma to the victim.

- Did the Babylonians create the exile? Or was it another empire that had started and the Babylonians took off where they had left?

Through these representations of trauma through narratives it is easier to detect what the collect or individuals had went through. It also makes it easier for the modern day survivor to find a character within narratives to identify with.

5.5 Reading the exile through Trauma lenses

The book of 2 Kings 25:8-21 is a narrative that describes the process of the traumatic event more than it being a particular result, it then rely on other traumatic narratives that happened around the same time that are found in the books of Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel etc. to explain further to what caused the traumatic event, and what happened to the people affected by the event.

According to Frechette (2013:28) there are strategies for reducing trauma symptoms that are rooted from the aftermath of the traumatic event. Even though individuals, in most cases, live on survival mode, their trauma symptoms do not subside instead they become fixed. These strategies of recovery include efforts that deal with helping survivors to express their feelings and memories of their traumatic experiences to trusted and empathetic listeners. Safe boundaries should be set when inviting survivors to tell their stories of trauma. At a later stage their stories can be used as stories of hope for the next survivors to cope with their own circumstances.

Ancient biblical Old Testament contains harmful and traumatic narratives. Trauma studies reveal the insights on how can such narratives benefit the rise of trauma and biblical studies. Biblical trauma narratives are useful in such a way that, not only

does it retell the story of what had happened, it displays the importance of seeing individual and collective elements of memory that convey what the events and persons involved meant for them as survivors. These narratives have two aims: It firstly aims to dismiss the perception that the biblical portrayal of God or people must stand on its own with no other interpretation. Secondly it aims to dismiss the idea that the biblical narratives of God or man has limited or no therapeutic benefits (Frechette 2015:35)

Traumatic experiences that are reflected in the biblical narratives can be utilized for healing modern day trauma survivors. Biblical trauma narratives reflect on human suffering and raises awareness about what trauma entails. Modern day trauma survivors of war, torture, displacement, man-made or natural disasters can find consolidation from their traumatized forefathers in faith.

Old Testament texts carry various narratives that reflect experiences that resonate with descriptions of traumatic events. The trauma character in these biblical texts is quite obvious especially when a text portrays the rape of an individual, slaughter of individuals and communities or warfare (Frechette 2015:7). Frechette (2015:7) makes a reference to the book of Lamentations that carries vivid images of individual and communal trauma. Often biblical interpreters find trauma embedded in texts by comparing literary features with basic trauma theories. For example, the study of the Deuteronomistic history, it is believed that the memories of traumatic happenings surrounding the Babylonian exile were a divine punishment from God. Other studies see traumatic experiences within the Psalter as expressions that show a sense of being overwhelmed by life and its difficulties. As much as these biblical texts and images may relate to actual events, they offer a glimpse into traumatic realities that are still looming in the present.

There are communal disasters depicted in Biblical texts from the eighth century BCE onward, which grabbed the attention of scholars to employ the trauma interpretation of the bible (Frechette 2015:7). The most noteworthy events include the Assyrian destruction of Israel in the Northern Kingdom during the year 734-722 BCE, which resulted into a total collapse and deportation. During the sixth century the Babylonians took over Jerusalem in the Southern Kingdom, which also led to its destruction and the deportation of the Judeans to Babylon (Frechette 2015:7)

According to Frechette (2015:8) the Assyrian military used psychological combat through numerous strategies to gain control of the inferior nations. These psychological combats include threats of military attack which resulted in resistance. In 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 37-39 are narratives of the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib. These sieges were prolonged and caused starvation that led to consumption of human waste and cannibalism, including the eating of one's children as seen in 2 Kings 18:27 and Lamentations 4:10.

In the Ancient Near East the armies used similar strategies to conquer inferior nations. During their attacks they would rape and rip open the wombs of pregnant women. These armies would also destroy houses, sacred buildings and agricultural resources, of which all these destroyed places are important and practical for needs of shelter, food and serve as an important symbolic function for communal identity (Frechette 2015:8). The destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by the Babylonian armies contributed to communal trauma.

Deportations always threaten the community with loss of critical social bonds and collective identity. In the case of the Judeans it ended the state monarchy, it broke down the symbolic world, and it led to mass death and deportation and broke the connection between the community and the land (Frechette 2015:8)

In spite of the gaps in the sources, the history of Israel can be reconstructed. The primary reason is simply the course of history and Judah was a minor state that was crushed between the great powers of Babylon and Egypt in their contest for the remains of the Assyrian Empire. The second reason is that the historical tradition of the bible leaves a large part of the exilic period blank. External sources from Babylon and Egypt cannot fill this gap because what was left of Israel in this period was too marginal in the eyes of the great powers to merit more than casual mention in passing (Albertz 2001:72)

According to Lipschitz (2005:57) the Babylonian attack on the kingdom of Judah at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.E brought about the desolation and destruction of Jerusalem and its community. The house of David came to an end of reign, the temple was left in ruins, and the western border of Judah was destroyed as part of the Babylonian military operation. Furthermore the urban and

administrative centres, the military forts as well as many of the rural settlements in the region were crushed and deserted.

Leading to many Judeans being exiled to Babylon, while many others escaped or were forced to leave their land and homes, some perished from harsh penalties of the long war and by the presence of the Babylonian forces in Judah. From these painful catastrophes a new period emerged for Judah, its borders shrunk and its population depleted. The social, theological and historical centre of its gravity shifted to the community of deportees in Babylon.

Babylon used deportation as means of controlling and suppressing nationalistic tendencies in the colonies. Instead of replacing community leaders with colonists, the Babylonians followed a less decisive policy with Judah. The leadership of Judah was never replaced with colonists. Nebuchadnezzar would choose a leader that would serve under him but rule over the people of Judah. Therefore Nebuchadnezzar would not introduce foreign populations into Judah (Farisani 2008:75). However neighbouring tribes such as the Edomites would invade on the territory of Judah and with no military back up those who remained behind in the land were helpless in this regard.

According to Farisani (2008:76) the idea of taking influential people of a captured nation was to minimise chances of revolution and leaving the poorest in the land would ensure no revolt shall take place. Therefore there would be no leaders to lead any revolt. The strategy of the Babylonian empire was to dismantle the community by capturing the elite and those in leadership positions so that there would be no leadership at all. As a result it would cause that the social life quality in Judah derail and poverty rates increase while in a broader picture the masses are controlled.

Apart from minimising the chances of revolt, it is also important to note that the Babylonian worked strategically and left the poor in the land so that the land would not be in total lost. There must be people who would work on the land; also it would have had serious economic consequences for the Babylonian economy as this would be expensive economically to maintain a lot of poor people who probably had no skill to boost the economy.

The community of the deportees in Babylon social livelihood is often cited from the acquainted words of Psalm 137, **עַל נְהָרוֹת בָּבֶל--שָׁם יֹשְׁבֵנוּ, גַם-בְּכִינוּ: בְּזִכְרֵנוּ,**

אֶת-צִיּוֹן “By the waters of Babylon, there were we sat down and wept when we remembered Zion”. The feeling the readers finds, after reading this is a daunting one. The psalm itself is seen and read as a poem in which lyricism is mixed with frustration. Shanks (1989) notes that, the poem certainly expresses part of the experience of Exile for many of the deportees. However it fails to convey all we ought to know when it comes to Judean life in Babylon. Jeremiah (cf 29:5-7) after 597 B.C.E, on the other hand, looks past the emotional frustration as portrayed by the Psalmist and gives more of an economic dimension of life by the waters of Babylon.

Judeans did not live in total captivity; they were settled on the deserted agricultural land where they were “free” to roam within the designated borders. In this limited freedom they were free to build houses and live in them, plant gardens and eat their produce however their status did not permit them to be landowners; they were likely land tenants on Babylonian ground under its rule and authority (Shenks 1989). Archaeology also shows that some Judeans were settled besides the river of “Chebar” an irrigation canal of the Euphrates that flowed through Nippur.

One of the Judean settlements was known as Tel-Aviv (Ezekiel 3:15) besides the Chebar. This can be seen as evidence that the Babylonians settled the Judeans deportees at or near sites of ruined, abandoned cities probably as part of a program to develop unused land that the Babylon Empire would take and claim as their own. To support this suggestion further, Shenks (1989) reports that were some Judeans that were settled at Tel-Melah and Tel-Harsha, Addan, Immer and Casiphia (Ezra 2:59, Nehemiah 7:61, Ezra 8:17) cities that were, again, ruined and lost however their locations were not known. Several Judeans were conscripted into military and other imperial services, as was the custom of the Babylonians in their dealings with deportees.

Clarifying this event as a crisis many Old Testament scholars such as Smith (1989:59) are in belief that those who were captured and brought in Babylon as

captives can be referred to as prisoners of war, and refugees. These terms are always associated with socio-anthropological assumptions that can from time and again be re-examined. It is suggested that the exiles were not prisoners but were rather seen as displaced population that had the freedom to roam around in the designated space marked by the Babylonians and in exchange they had to render compulsory labour services to the empire. The exile community became land tenants of royal oppressive land.

However the conditions of the exile community can somewhat be deemed to slavery and that can be depicted from a cuneiform inscription of Nebuchadnezzar that reads (Smith 2002:66):

“the lands of Hattim, from the upper sea to the lower sea, the land of Sumer and Akkad, the land between the two rivers... the rulers of the lands of Hattim across the Euphrates where the sun sets, whose ruler-ship, at the bidding of Marduk my lord, I overcame, and the mighty cedars of the mountain of Lebanon were brought to the city of Babylon, the whole of the races, people from far places, whom Marduk my lord delivered to me- I forced them to work on the building of Etemenanki- I imposed on them the brick basket.”

The Biblical account of the life of the exile community does not account on the human conditions of the exiled, however through such documents one can note on the livelihood of those who were exiled. For example, the terms used in this inscription “I forced them to work” clearly refers to forced labour, and “I imposed on them the brick basket” further employs strong terms of forced submission.

Other Neo-Babylonian text affirms Nebuchadnezzar’s claim to authority over people conquered people. Smith (2002:67) mentions the early translation done by Langdon building inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar and one of the texts explains this:

“I called into me the far dwelling peoples over whom Marduk my lord had appointed me and whose care was given unto me by Šamaš the hero, from all lands and of every inhabited place from the upper sea to the lower sea from distant lands the people of faraway habitations kings of distant mountains and remote regions who dwell at the upper and the nether seas with whose strength Marduk the lord has filled

my hands that they should bear his yoke and also the subjects of Šamaš and Marduk I summoned to build E-tem-in-anki.”

Thus proving that in the Neo-Babylonian inscriptions forced labour is associated with rule over people that are captured. This proves that such evidence should not be overlooked when considering the impact and conditions of the Babylonian exile, especially of the displaced community.

According to Smith (2002:71) there are harsh vocabularies that the biblical accounts bring forth which has an impact on the experience of exile that could demonstrate the fact that slavery could have been the method of rule over the people in Israel. Chains and bonds are spoken of with at least three different major terms in biblical accounts:

1. Nahum 1:13: אָנֹכִי וּמוֹסְרֹתַי וּמֵעֶלְיָךְ מִטְהוּ מְעַלְיָךְ אֶשְׁבֵּר אֶשְׁבֵּר אֶשְׁבֵּר אֶשְׁבֵּר אֶשְׁבֵּר (Now I will break their yoke from your neck and tear shackles away.) Significantly of the Babylonian exile in Isaiah 52:2 הַתְּנַעֲרִי מֵעָפָר - קוּמִי שְׁבִי יְרוּשָׁלַם הַתְּפַתְחִי מוֹסְרֵי צְוֹאֲרֶךְ (Shake yourself from the dust rise up, O captive Jerusalem, loose the bonds from your neck).
2. Nahum 3:10: בְּשָׁבִי - גַּם ... וְכָל-גְּדוֹלֵיהָ רָתְקוּ בַזְּקִים (She was taken captive and went into exile... and her great men were put in chains) Significantly of the Babylonian exile in Isaiah 45:14 בְּזָקִים יַעֲבְרוּ וְאֵלַי יִשְׁתַּתְּוּ אֵלַיךְ (they shall come over in chains and bow down to you)
3. Jeremiah 32:2: וְאִזְ חֵיל מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל צָרִים עָלַי יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּרְמְיֵהוּ הַנְּבִיא הִיא (The army of the king of Babylon was then besieging Jerusalem and Jeremiah the prophet was confined in the court yard prison...)

5.5 Conclusion

Through these harsh vocabularies in the Biblical account as well as in Babylonian inscriptions show that there was activity of slavery in exile that had traumatised the community severely. Such images should not only be seen metaphorically for they are terms used by biblical writers to describe their conditions in Exile. The displacement that had happened emphasised on forced migration issues impacting the lives of the displaced. Ahn (2012:178) is of the opinion that such sort of displacement can bring on possibilities of issues of local versus central political tensions, cultural and traditional values clashing in the light of the new emerging ones thus leading to broader sociological problems faced by the deportees.

According to Rambo (2014:16) trauma challenges theology in terms of radical suffering, it exposes the impossibility of Christian claims that of God's presence and human goodness. Thus trauma forces theologians to seek new language to express God's relation to the world. In conclusion it is evident that trauma studies have taught us the impact of trauma and that it can affect an individual or a collective group. The Ancient text of the Old Testament has given us an insight on how the Judeans tried to cope and deal with their experiences of trauma (Groenewald 2018:9). Through their laments readers are now able to understand the experiences with the help of trauma studies.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Summary and Findings

The summary of the conclusion leads us to conclude that the exile of 587/586 BCE was less of Yahweh's divine punishment to his people, instead more political geographical displacements. We learn throughout the research that the word 'exile' continuously refers to the deportation of the captured individuals. These captured individuals were displaced in a foreign land away from what they call home.

Through the analysis of narratology in chapter two, we have come to a realization that narratology is of importance when dealing with historical narratives. The theory of narratology has shown us that narratives are found everywhere and in order for the reader to grasp the content that is within a narrative one has to understand the dynamics that are within a story. This theory analyses the 'what' and the 'how' of narration. It accounts what had transpired in the past through historical narratives. The Bible qualifies to be called a historical book due to its narratives and poetics. This dismisses the idea that the Bible and its narratives are a total myth. Throughout history we are told that biblical narratives were transmitted orally, narratology pushes the readers to focus on the given written texts. In doing so the readers are then able to understand who is telling the story, how is it being told and what is being told.

In chapter three the book of Kings and the Deuteronomistic history was explored. Since chapter two has given us insight on how to read a historical narrative. The research firstly established a brief discussion on the Deuteronomistic history in order to understand the history of 2 Kings 25:8-21, as well as to ask how many authors it took to compile the books of 1 and 2 Kings. This research found the book of Kings as problematic for it narrates history of different time periods in a limitation of two books. The debate on authorship led the researcher to a speculation that the work of the Deuteronomistic history was composed by a single composer, who relied on older sources that has been included in his work, during exile.

In this chapter the historical background of the text is narrated. It is understood that the exile could have taken place due to political factors. During the exile the state

was disbanded, archives got lost and damaged; scribes and other elite groups were captured and displaced. The deportation destroyed the livelihood of Judah. While others were taken away into exile, others were left in Judah to work on the land under the rule of the Babylonians. The literal criticism shows us that the deportation concerned itself with economic gain and ended in the violent termination of the Judean structures. The Babylonians plans were to decentralize Judah powers. This proves that the traumatic event was more of a political gain than God's wrath.

Verse 21b of 2 Kings 25 tells us that Judah was taken away from their land. This suggests that the captured people forcefully taken away from their own land. Chapter four defined what deportation is, however the term 'deportation' is deemed problematic and not fitting for describing what happened to the Judeans. They got displaced and not deported. The research in this chapter depicts that governments and superior nations always have a motif when displacing people. In most cases their motif lies behind political and economic gains. This proves that each displacement is planned in order for it to take place correctly without fail. The same notion can therefore, be applied to the displacement of 586/587 BCE. The Babylon Empire had everything planned out when capturing the individuals. With no escape the Judeans had to adapt to the circumstances they were in as they continued living, inter marrying and building themselves again.

Chapter five dealt with trauma, it attempted to answer the question whether the Judeans had experienced trauma during the exile. This chapter defined trauma as a deep disturbing experience that lasts on the psyche of an individual or collective. This research also established the signs and symptoms of individuals who are affected by trauma. Some of the signs are deep within the psyche, others can be seen physically. 2 Kings 25:8-21 carries language used in combat, for example, in verses 9-10 the armies of the Babylonian Empire broke down the walls, burn the temple and the house of the king and his elite group. Such language suggests that the situation that was that of war. This research explored the theory of war trauma where traces of it can be found in the narrative. War does not only affect individuals it has a potential of causing harm to the collective group. Therefore the theory of cultural trauma was also applied as the after effect of war. The two trauma theories are linked to the narrative through evidence of scripts that depicts the trauma that the

Judeans had endured. Evidence then shows that the Judeans had suffered from trauma but eventually learnt how to live with it.

Traumatized individuals may never be free from their traumatic experiences. However, Frechette (2013:27) argues that, the construction of narratives is important for individuals and collective recovery. Narrative construction works as a process that interprets the traumatic events and the victims and perpetrators involved. Trauma narratives aim to address the vital beliefs and identity of the individuals and community, even though memories of the traumatic events may be distorted to an extent. In order for trauma narratives to provide insight and significance, the narrative must contain facts about the past that are linked together. Through these linked facts the reader is then able to explain the significance of the facts by discussing the relationship of the past events. It also helps to explain the significance of certain facts by indicating the importance of their contexts, with that context the reader will be able to construct the prominence between the narrative and other narratives linked to it.

Throughout the entire research little is being said of Yahweh being the dynamic force or cause of the traumatic event experienced by the Judeans. Although this is not an absolute take on it, the researcher feels that the political powers that were at play, were the ones that caused the traumatic event. From the rebellion of Jehoiakim and the revolt of Nebuchadnezzar, many lives were destroyed by the acts of these two kings. This led to the exile of the Israelites. They were forcefully removed from their land and into a foreign land.

Bibliography

7. Bibliography

Ahn, J. J. 2011. *Exile as Forced Migration: A sociological, Literary and Theological approach on the Displacement and Resettlement of the Southern Kingdom of Judah*. Germany: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG Göttingen. (ISBN 978-3-11-024095-5)

Ahn, J. J. 2012. Forced Migrations Guiding the Exile: Demarcating 597, 587, and 582 BCE. In: J.J Ahn and J. A. Middlemas (e.ds.), *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the study of Exile*, pp. 196-204. LHBOTS 525: 173-89. London: T&T Clark.

Albertz R. 2001. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Alexander, J, C., 2004, Towards a theory of Cultural Trauma, In J.C. Alexander, R. Eyerman, B. Giesen, N. J. Smelser and P. Sztompka (e.ds), *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, London: University of California Press

Alter, R. 1999. *The Hebrew Bible: A translation with commentary*. USA: WW Norton & Company Inc.

Alter, R., 1981, *The Art Of Biblical Narrative*, New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers

Barstad H. M. 1996. *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the Exilic Period*. pp. 121-122 Oslo: Scandinavian University Press..

Becking, B., 2012, Global Warning and the Babylonian Exile, In: J.J Ahn and J. A. Middlemas (e.ds.), *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the study of Exile*, pp. 49-62. LHBOTS 525: 173-89. London: T&T Clark

Bright, J., 1972. *A History of Israel*. Berkeley: S.C.M Press

Brueggemann, W., 1986. *Hopeful Imagination: Prophetic Voices in Exile*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press

Brueggemann, W. 2000. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary: 1&2 Kings*. USA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing Inc.

Dawson, G., & Farber, G., 2012, *Forcible displacement throughout the ages: Towards an International convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of Forcible Displacement*, Leiden Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers

Esterhuizen, E., 2016, "A study of the tension between despair and hope in Isaiah 7 and 8 from a perspective of trauma and post traumatic growth", PhD Thesis, Dept. of Old Testament Studies, University of South Africa

Evans, L. 2012. *South Africa's Bantustans and the dynamics of „decolonisation“: reflections on writing histories of the homelands*. South African Historical Journal, vol.64, no.1, pp. 117-137.

Evans, L. 2012. *South Africa's Bantustans and the dynamics of decolonisation: reflections on writing histories of the homelands*. South African Historical Journal, vol.64, no.1, pp. 117-137.

Eyerman, R. 2001. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and The Formation of African American Identity*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farisani E. 2008. The Israelites in Palestine During the Babylonian. P69-88: In *International Review of Biblical Studies*. Volume 55. The Netherlands: Brill

Flanders, Crapps, Smith. 1996. *People of the covenant: An introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. U.K: Oxford University Press

Flanders, H, J., Crapps, R, W., & Smith D, A., 1996, *People of the Covenant: An Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, New York: Oxford University Press

Fludernik, M., 2009, *An Introduction to Narratology*, Abingdon: Routledge

Frechette, C, G., 2015, *The Old Testament as controlled substance: How Insights from Trauma Studies reveal healing capacities in potentially harmful texts*, *A Journal of Bible and Theology* 2015, vol.69 (1), 20-34

Frick, F. S., 2003. *A Journey Through the Hebrew Scriptures*. USA: Wadsworth Thomson learning centre.

- Fritz, V. 2003. *1&2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by A. Hagedorn; Continental Commentaries: Old Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Grabbe, L. L., 2017, *1 & 2 Kings: History and Story in Ancient Israel*, London: T&T Clark
- Groenewald, A., 2018, “*Trauma is suffering that remains*”. *The contribution of Trauma studies to Prophetic studies*. *Acta Theologica* 2018, suppl 26:88-102
- Herman, D., Phelan, J., Rabinowitz P.J., Richardson, B., & Warhol, R., 2012, *Narrative Theory: Care Concepts and Critical Debates*, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press,
- Hobbs, T.R. 1985. *2 Kings. World Biblical Commentary*. volume 13. Waco, Texas: Word Books,
- Hunt, C, N., 2010, *Memory, War and Trauma*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Janzen, D., 2012, *The Violent Gift: Trauma’s Subversions of Deuteronomistic History Narrative*, London: T&T Clark
- Janzen, D., 2013, *The Necessary King: A Post-Colonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic Portrait of the Monarchy*, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press
- Joo, S. 2006. *Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Books of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter GmbH & CoKG
- Jullia, L., Claassen, M., & Garber, G., 2008, *First words... Faith Facing Trauma*, *Review and Expositor* 105, Spring, 187-190
- Kirmayer, L, J., Lemelson, R., & Barad, M., 2007, Introduction: Inscribing Trauma in Culture, Brain and Body, In: L.J Kirmayer, R. Lemelson & M. Barad (e.ds) *Understanding Trauma: Integrating Biological, Clinical and Cultural Perspective*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Lipshitz O. 2005. *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah Under Babylonian Rule*. USA: Winona Lake

- Longman, T., 1987, *Literary Approaches To Biblical Interpretation*, Volume 3, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House,
- McKnight, E. V., 1985, *The Bible and the Reader: An introduction to Literary Criticism*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia
- Murray, C., 1995, Displaced urbanization: South African rural slums, In: W. Bernart and S. Dubow (e.ds), *Segregation and Apartheid in the 20th century South Africa*, pp. 231-250. London: Routledge Publishers
- Noth, M., 1981, *The Deuteronomistic History*, England: Sheffield Academic Press
- O'Brien, M., 1989, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*, Switzerland: Biblical Institute of the University of Fribourg
- Petersen, D. L., 2015. Prophetic Rhetoric and Exile. In: Boda, M. J., Ames F. R. Ahn, J. J. and Leuchter, M. (e.ds.). *The Prophets Speak on Forced Migration*, pp. 9-19. USA: SBL Press.
- Provan, I. W., 1997, *1 & 2 Kings: Old Testament Guides*, England: Sheffield Academic Press
- Purves, J. D. 1999. Exile and Return: From Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Judean State. In: Hershel Shanks (e.ds.), *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*, pp151-176. Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society.
- Rambo, S., 2010, *Spirit and Trauma: A Theology of Remaining*, Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press
- Rodd C. S.1997. On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical studies. In: Chalcraft D. J. (e.d). *Social Scientific: Old Testament Criticism*, England: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Rogers, B. 1980. *Divide and Rule: South Africans Bantustans*, London: International Defence & Aid
- Rogers, B. 1980. *Divide and Rule: South Africans Bantustans*, London: International Defence & Aid.

- Römer, T. C., 2007, *The So Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*, London: T&T Clark
- Schmid, W., 2010, *Narratology: An Introduction*, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York
- Senker C. 2008. *Migration and Refugees*. London: Evans Brother Limited
- Shanks H. 1989. *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*. London: SPCK publishers
- Smith, D. L. 1989. *The Religion of the Landless: The Social Context of the Babylonian Exile*. USA: Meyer Stone Books
- Smith-Christopher, D, L., 2002, *A Biblical Theology of Exile*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis
- Wilson, R., 2012, *Forced Migration and the Formation of the Prophetic Literature*, In: J.J Ahn and J. A. Middlemas (e.ds.), *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the study of Exile*, pp. 125-138. LHBOTS 525: 173-89. London: T&T Clark
- Wiseman D, J. 1993. *1&2 Kings: An Introduction and Commentary*. USA: Intervarsity Press
- Zvi, E. B, & Levin, C. (e.d). 2010. *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts*. Germany: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG Göttingen. (ISBN 978-3-11-022177-0)