



This material has been provided by Asbury Theological Seminary in good faith of following ethical procedures in its production and end use.

The Copyright law of the united States (title 17, United States code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyright material. Under certain condition specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to finish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be *“used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.”* If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

By using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.

Contact

B.L. Fisher Library
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

B.L. Fisher Library’s Digital Content
place.asburyseminary.edu



Asbury Theological Seminary
205 North Lexington Avenue
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

800.2ASBURY
asburyseminary.edu

THE CHARIOTIC LEADERSHIP OF MOSES: APPLYING
SOCIAL SCIENCE TECHNIQUES TO BIBLICAL RESEARCH

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Theology

Approved:

George A. Turner
First Reader

W. Brent R. R. R.
Second Reader

by

Norman Howard Murdoch

March 1971

THE CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP OF MOSES: APPLYING
SOCIAL SCIENCE THEORIES TO BIBLICAL RESEARCH

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Theology

by
Norman Howard Murdoch
August 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Common Usage of the term "Charisma"	2
Dictionary Definition of Charisma	3
Social Science Definitions of Charisma	4
Charisma Defined for Use in this Thesis	4
I. GREAT MAN THEORY: SOCIAL SCIENCE INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITIES OF CHARISMA	6
Historiography and Great Men	6
Psychoanalysis: The Pathology of Greatness	11
Behaviorists Vs. Geneticists	19
Social Interaction Theory of Social Psychology	22
Sociologists and Charisma	26
Movements Among the Lower Classes	30
II. MOSES AND HIS PEOPLE: A BIBLICAL INVESTIGATION OF A CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT	33
Introduction: The Method of Investigation	33
Slavery in Human Terms	36
Biblical Slavery Defined	36
Slave Conditions	38
The Movement: Stage I. The Hebrews in Egyptian Slavery	42
Egyptian and North American Slave Systems Compared	49
Moses: The Charismatic is Injected	52

Chapter	Page
Stage II. The Plagues: Authority is Transferred . .	55
The People are Involved in the Movement	56
Stage III. Formal Organization of the Movement . . .	61
Codification of the Laws	63
Stage IV. The Reactivist Stage: Renewed Charisma .	65
Stage V. Later Developments in the Movement:	
Formal Development with Injections of Charisma . . .	66
The Charismatic Stage Renewed	67
Transfer of Charisma	71
CONCLUSION	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77
APPENDIX	91

INTRODUCTION

This study deals with two phenomena about which present social science theorists have a great deal to say, but which do not lend themselves to direct empirical research. These are first, the study of the great man or charismatic leader theories, and second, theories concerned with the nature of mass movements. Of particularly interest here is Moses, a charismatic leader of unusual proportions, especially when studied against the background of the natural resistant tendencies of an enslaved people being led from slavery to freedom.

People in mass groupings seem to exude a mentality which causes them to respond to different leaders in ways which are difficult to calculate. A well-studied example is that of the authoritarian personality with documented evidence that large masses of people can be manipulated to perform gross crimes under an authoritarian leader.¹ Studies of responses are done in small, easily structured and manipulated groups, but become almost impossible to study on a national level.

Studies of great men will be probed in order to better understand the unusual capacity of Moses in leading a people with a slave mentality through the processes of liberation and formal organization for national existence. The purpose is to

¹T. W. Adorno, Elsa Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1950).

point out that the Hebrew exodus from Egypt may be the only historical example of a people being internally motivated to escape slavery. Only a "charismatic leader," Moses, could have accomplished this. Again, the charismatic qualities elude empirical measures, but are nevertheless important to social scientists in reporting that which they cannot fully comprehend. Some small group studies have indicated that there are indications as to a charismatic leader's qualities of character in interaction with others. These will be discussed in the first part of this thesis in which the expertise of social scientists will be outlined concerning the concept of charisma.

These findings from social science will be applied to the dynamic relationship between the people of Israel and their charismatic leader Moses. Naturally there are difficulties in seeking to understand psychological responses so far removed from the actual historical setting. Nevertheless the documentation from Scripture should allow some generalized statements on the uniqueness of this man and his leadership of an enslaved people. The Scriptures will be treated as historically valid materials and will be used as such in this work.

Common Usage of the Term Charisma.

Charisma has seeped into common usage to the extent that it appears almost weekly in popular news magazines with little empirical understanding of its meaning. It is applied to men of stature and popularity such as former French President Charles DeGaulle and the late General Douglas MacArthur. It is particularly applicable when some question exists as to

reasons for a man's enormous popularity. Normal analysis produces inadequate answers. In a Time article, "Bringing God Back to Life," charisma was defined as "an ability to inspire energy and enthusiasm among the apathetic and the alienated."² This provides a good enough start in discussing Moses and the people of Israel.

Dictionary Definition of Charisma.

In current dictionary definitions of the meaning of charisma is seen in several settings, all of which attempt to get at the unexplainable nature of superhuman influence. Random House Dictionary places the theological definition first: "a divinely conferred gift or power." It is defined as "that special spiritual power or personal quality that gives an individual influence or authority over large numbers of people" and as "the special virtue of an office, function, position, etc., which confers or is thought to confer on the person holding it an unusual ability for leadership, worthiness or veneration, or the like."³

A Catholic Dictionary suggests that Saint Paul distinguishes three groups among the charismatic gifts: 1) "the fulness of knowledge of divine things", 2) "the power of miracles", and 3) "the power of expounding divine truth."⁴

²Michael Demarest (ed.), "The New Ministry: Bringing God Back to Life," Time, December 26, 1969, p. 41.

³Jesse Stein (ed.), "Charisma," Random House Dictionary (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 154.

⁴Donald Attwater (ed.), "Charismata," A Catholic Dictionary, 3rd edition (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 89-90.

Social Science Definitions of Charisma. Giving a sociological meaning to the term, D. G. MacRae defines charisma as "the qualities of those who claim or are believed to possess powers of leadership derived from some unusual sanction--divine, magical, diabolic-- or merely exceptional individuality."⁵ Max Weber deserves credit for bringing the term into the social sciences, borrowing it from R. Sohm (1841-1917). Weber felt that the charismatic individual was one who

a) restores emotion, awe, and magic to the conduct of affairs and b) would appear to himself and/or others to be endowed with an authority analogous to that of the original, i.e. theological, meaning of the word.⁶

In societies overwhelmed by the high development of science and extreme dependence on rationalization, Weber saw the search for a charismatic figure as a central concern. The Dictionary of the Social Sciences concludes:

It is now frequently argued that all leadership involves not merely authority, somehow or other legitimated, but also some ascription of charismatic quality. This is probably to extend the word too widely for the concept to be genuinely useful. It is true to say, however, that most, if not all, cases of legal or traditional dominance and authority have developed out of charismatic leadership through a process of routinization made necessary by the exigencies of everyday life.⁷

Charisma Defined for Use in this Thesis.

In applying this concept of charisma to Moses, Max Weber's

⁵D. G. MacRae, "Charisma," A Dictionary of the Social Sciences (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 84.

⁶H. H. Gerth, and C. W. Mills (eds.), Max Weber (London: Degan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1947), pp. 245ff.

⁷J. Gould, and W. L. Kolb, "Charisma," A Dictionary of the Social Sciences (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 84.

generalizing of this term extrapolated from the theological context will be accepted. This does not tear the term loose from its biblical moorings, but extends its basic meaning so as to make it useful for contemporary study. Christian social scientists can then investigate the human qualities of men like Moses without demeaning supernatural factors which expand these qualities in exceptional ways.

Since charisma has crept into the verbage of the social sciences without being stripped of its theological background, it remains ideally suited for a study such as this. Its usage does not preclude, as does much of the idiom of the naturalistic social sciences, the possibility of supernatural effect on human personality and social interaction processes.

In the first chapter, the great man as seen in the social sciences will be discussed. In applying their insights to Moses and his times, the relevance and irrelevance of their findings will be sifted. The probe will include historiography, Freudian psychoanalysis, Watson's behaviorist theory versus genetics, the social interaction theories of social psychology, and sociological studies of great men and their qualities of charisma.

CHAPTER I

GREAT MAN THEORY: SOCIAL SCIENCE INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITIES OF CHARISMA

Behavioral scientists have long had an interest in the unique qualities of great men. Popular military and political leaders have had their more unusual qualities scrutinized by theorists of all humanistic disciplines. Charisma, a term introduced into twentieth-century social science parlance by Max Weber, attempts to describe the unexplainable qualities of personality, especially as seen in social intercourse.

I. HISTORIOGRAPHY AND GREAT MEN

Historians before the modern scientific era were primarily concerned with the acts of great men and not overly conscious of the psychological, sociological, and genetic contributions to greatness in personality. For ages it was largely assumed that noble birth presumed at least the possibility of greatness, whereas humble birth brought with it low intelligence and probably immorality and general inferiority of character as well.

Daniel Webster's speech in the Massachusetts state constitutional convention argued the aristocratic attitude that "power naturally and necessarily follows property . . ."¹ Peter Oxenbridge Thatcher, a Boston judge and classical conservative held

¹Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Age of Jackson (New York: Mentor Books, 1945), p. 9.

these views concerning the virtues of inequality:

The diversity of poverty and riches is the order of Providence. ... Why are not all the flowers of the field equally beautiful and fragrant? Why are not all the fruits of the earth equally rich and wholesome? And why towers the oak in grandeur to heaven, while the shrub at its base is trodden under feet? Will vain regrets, and still vainer discontent change the course of nature?²

The American Quarterly Review judged that:

The lowest orders of society ordinarily mean the poorest-- and the highest, the richest. ... Sensual excess, want of intelligence, and moral debasement, distinguish the former-- knowledge, intellectual superiority, and refined social, and domestic affections, the latter.³

It is safe to say that Federalists at the time of the American Revolution tended to identify prosperity with character. Not even the Jeffersonians favored democracy. That there was a special gentleman class which felt it an inherent right to rule is obvious in these early nineteenth century opinions of the poor.

Such a view of the poor is very similar to that of Herbert Spencer and his fellow social Darwinists of the early twentieth century. The charismatic view of leadership does not fit into these theories of noble birth and although Moses, due to lack of evidence, may be fitted into either a noble or ignoble heritage, certainly the bullrushes were not the kind of place one would expect to find the greatest prophet of Israel.

Another concept of historians concerning the development of greatness is the crisis theory. Martin Van Buren suggested that

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 10-11.

similar crises in all countries and times, have brought about, namely, the production of great men by great events, developing and calling into action upon a large scale intellects the power of which, but for their application to great transactions, might have remained unknown alike to their possessors and to the world.⁴

Preferring to view the crisis theory as an opportunistic theory, Professor T. R. Abernathy took an opposite view from Van Buren. He suggested that Andrew Jackson, who had not been a great leader in Tennessee politics, therefore could not have been a genuine populist. Rather Jackson was an unprincipled opportunist, happening on the scene at the right time to lead a democratic movement purely through a set of accidents.⁵

The charismatic theory viewed on a naturalistic level may appear crisis oriented and to be the theatrical performance of an opportunist. Only as seen through the historical perspective of centuries can it be judged from a higher evaluation as truly charismatic. It is in the scope of history that Moses' life and work must be perceived.

In 1926, Catherine Morris Cox attempted to place an intelligence quotient on great men of history. Philosophers, theologians, political leaders, scientists, etc., were given intelligence quotients after an analysis of their early childhood accomplishments. This was done through the use of an ingenious device called "historiometry." John Adams, James Madison,

⁴Martin Van Buren, Inquiry into the Origin and Course of Political Parties in the United States (New York: Hurd, and Houghton, 1867), pp. 171-172.

⁵T. P. Abernathy, From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932), p. 241.

Abraham Lincoln and George Washington rated 120-130 I.Q. while John Quincy Adams rated an impressive 160-170.⁶

A recent "Time Essay" has indicated several current ideas on charisma. First, there are very few charismatic leaders on the present scene. Second, "charisma is not always a virtue"; examples, Nkrumah and Sukarno, who brought economic ruin to their countries. Third, in primitive cultures, the charismatic individual will likely be seen as a father figure. Yet in every society there is the sense of magic attached to the overpowering need for this man to rule. He draws out of the people their trust in times when they do not trust easily. Fourth, "nothing is so fatiguing as greatness-- to the nongreat." People "grow weary of the grand view from the mountaintop."⁷

When the crisis of war passed in Britain, Winston Churchill was exchanged for the bland Clement Atlee. The biblical text indicates that Moses would have been exchanged for undynamic leadership at several points had it not been for a new crisis and Yahweh's intervention (Ex. 5:15-21; 17:4; 32:1-6; Num. 11:1, 2; 12:2ff; 14:4ff; 16:1ff).

Time further suggests that fifth, "powerful leaders are the product of great national crises."⁸ This political thesis is allied to the behaviorist position to be discussed later. Men are the products of their environment, and leaders the products

⁶C. M. Cox, The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses, Vol. II., Genetic Studies of Genius (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1926), pp. 5ff.

⁷"Time Essay," Time, October 17, 1969, pp. 40-41.

⁸Ibid.

of their times. Political Scientist Sidney Hyman suggests that before there can be a Moses "there must be a people of Israel who want to get out of Egypt."⁹

Hyman's idea follows exactly the stimulus-response concept and indicates the weakness of this approach. As will be shown in some detail later, it was the charisma of Moses that climaxed and brought to fruition the expressed desire of the Israelites to leave Egypt. They did not want to go when they realized the cost of the venture. Furthermore, after leaving Egypt they yearned to return (Ex. 2:15a; 14:12b). Thus, unlike most leaders in history, the charismatic leader actually leads.

In discussing current aspects of historical determinism, William F. Albright lists three types: geographical, climactic, and economic. He notes that Toynbee's studies "have demonstrated with the utmost clarity that historical and cultural achievements are sometimes greatest where environmental conditions seem to be most unfavorable."¹⁰

Albright also debunks psychological determinism which will be discussed in the next section. As for his own position, he sees Mosaism as an abrupt break with the past, or what he terms "evolutionary mutation."

Like Christianity and Islam, Mosaism changed slowly but surely in the following generations, until gradual evolution was violently interrupted by the prophetic movement, which may be compared to the Wahhabi movement or the Protestant Reformation with respect to the zeal of its protagonists and their desire to restore primitive Mosaism.¹¹

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957), p. 108.

¹¹Ibid., p. 124.

The large question has always been how much effect an individual has in the larger context. One social scientist concludes: "If this variance among individuals makes sufficient difference, then the laws have to take the occurrence of a particular kind of individual into account."¹² A historian writes:

...if Caesar had not lived, Rome might have had to wait another generation or even longer for a man who combined the necessary ambition with the necessary abilities, and the resulting prolongation of senatorial anarchy might have had effects which would have been felt for centuries.¹³

II. PSYCHOANALYSIS: THE PATHOLOGY OF GREATNESS

This quality of greatness commonly defined as charisma in modern times is still not sufficiently understood in terms of how a man attains this unusual influence and these uncommon characteristics of personality. An early attempt at this in the scientific era was made by Sigmund Freud and students of his school of psychoanalysis. Basically, psychoanalytic theory holds that man develops psychic energy through repressing basic drives, particularly the sex drive, and sublimating this repressed energy for more socially acceptable enterprises.

As an admirer of Moses, Freud wrote Moses and Monotheistic Religion in which he explains his great man theory as a need

¹²May Brodbeck (ed.), "Methodological Individualisms: Definition and Reduction," in Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1968), p. 303.

¹³A. M. MacIver, Levels of Explanation in History and Philosophy, the symposia read at the joint session of the Aristotelian Society and the Mind Association at Cambridge, July 4th - 6th, 1947. Supplementary Vol. XXI., Aristotelian Society Proceedings (London: Harrison, 1947), p. 47.

for a father figure.

Why the great man should rise to significance at all we have no doubt whatever. We know that the great majority of people have a strong need for authority which they can admire, to which they can submit, and which dominates and sometimes even ill-treats them. We have learned from the psychology of the individual whence comes this need of the masses. It is the longing for the father that lives in each of us from his childhood days, for the same father whom the hero of legend boasts of having overcome. And now it begins to dawn on us that all the features with which we furnish the great man are traits of the father, that in this similarity lies the essence, which so far has eluded us, of the great man.¹⁴

As an outgrowth of Freud's influence psychological studies of famous personalities began to appear in the first decade of this century. Hitschmann, Sadger and Stekel were among the earliest, with Hitschmann claiming Freud's imprimatur.¹⁵ Freud himself considered these pathographies, i.e., medical studies of morbid conditions affecting famous personages, of little value in understanding their personality and works. However he did see psychoanalytic investigations of their emotional development from earliest childhood as helpful in understanding their motives and impelling their creativity.

Freud claimed to notice a similarity between neurotic behavior observed in his patients and the religious behavior of primitive Australian tribes about which he had read. He deduced that ability to explain neuroses might lead to an understanding of the origins of religion. Thus an ambivalence felt toward the father would be redirected to a religious substitute, often the

¹⁴S. Freud, Moses and Monotheism (New York: Knopf, 1939), pp. 172-173.

¹⁵E. Hitschmann, Great Men: Psychoanalytic Studies (New York: International Universities Press, 1956), p. vi.

product of one's imagination.¹⁶ Therefore Moses was the fortunate recipient of this father figure transfer by the Israelites.

The give and take between Moses and the Hebrews was to Freud a matter of totem and taboo. "The basis of taboo is forbidden action for which there exists a strong inclination in the unconscious."¹⁷ The totem symbolizes a feared desire.¹⁸ The desires of the Hebrews for Egypt and the culture they had adopted there were constantly frustrated by Moses' authority. Taboos included Egyptian food (Ex. 16:1-3) and religion (Ex. 32:1-6). Thus Moses is reduced to being the frustrating element that just happens to produce the kind of situation which leads to the exodus.¹⁹

William F. Albright cannot accept this psychological determinism. He says that Freud's Moses and Monotheism is

totally devoid of serious historical method and deals with historical data even more cavalierly than with the data of introspective and experimental psychology.²⁰

As for Freud's discussion of monotheism, Albright counters:

If ... the term 'monotheist' means one who teaches the existence of only one God, the creator of everything, the source of justice, who is equally powerful in Egypt, in the desert, and in Palestine, who has no sexuality and no mythology, who is human in form but cannot be seen by human eye and cannot be

¹⁶N. J. Demarath, and P. E. Hammond, Religion in Social Context (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 18-19.

¹⁷S. Freud, Totem and Taboo, trans. A. A. Brill (New York: Vintage Press, 1960), p. 44.

¹⁸Demarath, op. cit., p. 9.

¹⁹S. Freud, The Future of an Illusion (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1964), p. 25.

²⁰W. F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957), p. 112.

represented in any form-- then the founder of Yahwism was certainly a monotheist.²¹

To shed light on the psychoanalytic approach to great men, the following summary of studies made of Ezekiel will serve our purpose best. They represent a type of study done at the height of psychoanalytic popularity about twenty years ago. They indicate what can be done when a theory inconsonant with supernatural understandings is used to interpret that which is beyond the pale of human interpretation.

Edwin C. Broome follows Klostermann's pioneering study of Ezekiel's personality done in 1877. Of two conflicting views of Ezekiel's peculiarities: 1) "He was normal, if a mystic, and subject to experiences commonly had by mystics;" and 2) "He was somewhat abnormal, perhaps even subject to periodic seizures of an unknown sort," Broome prefers the latter.²²

Since no psychoanalytic study on the order of Broome's has been done on Moses, comparisons between Ezekiel's and Moses' experiences will be noted. Broome first states that evidence for mental abnormality is often cumulative. The crucial feature of Ezekiel's condition was his catatonic seizures in which the patient remains motionless for hours, oblivious to everything around him (Ezek. 3:15, 24; 4:4a, 5b, 8; 3:26). He remembers what had happened, however. These attacks indicate a fundamental psychic disturbance and are a form of schizophrenia which is true psychosis.

Mutism, immobility, and the sense that bands have been

²¹Ibid., p. 272.

²²E. C. Broome, "Ezekiel's Abnormal Psychology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (September, 1946), p. 277.

placed on him are typical of a psychotic. Hallucinations were common. He thought he was told to go to the "plain," to build a replica of the siege of Jerusalem, and to bake cakes of a weird recipe.

The type of schizophrenia must be determined through dream analysis. In psychoanalysis, dreams of flying are sexual as in Ezekiel's heavenly chariot. References to himself indicate a sense of self-importance typical of paranoia as are later symptoms of feeling abused, and pursued. At the beginning we have a fire-dream indicating anxiety over the nameless terror of a paranoid.²³ Conflicting narcissistic and masochistic elements force him to withdraw from inability to cope. The masochistic element becomes predominant with eyes haunting him.

Finally he hears rushing waters, symbolic of the birth waters, indicating regression into a pre-natal state. But the light and rainbow break through his protection and he retrieves the trauma, falling helpless to the ground as at birth.

The paranoid is very conscious of a "system of influences" on him which in Broome's analysis was Ezekiel's chariot-- "influencing machine" made up to fit his own specifications, but controlling his life. At the beginning of chapter 2, he hears a voice. The message of doom he cannot repeat because it is not in accord with his idea of reality. Briers, thorns and scorpions (2.6) are in his way, giving the prickling sensation of paranoia.²⁴

²³Ibid., p. 284.

²⁴Ibid., p. 288.

Broome uses an autobiography of a paranoid schizophrenic on file at Harvards Psychological Clinic as his frame of reference for Ezekiel. He says that "in suggesting that Ezekiel was a paranoid we are not rejecting his religious contribution to the world."²⁵ However Broome's material in chapters 40-48 sees the minute and fanciful detail of a paranoid in planning the religious, political and even geographical future of Judaism. Ezekiel's delusion of grandeur is obvious.

A summarization of the paranoid schizophrenic abnormalities of Ezekiel according to Broome include:

- 1) periods of catatonia; 2) the 'influencing machine';
- 3) a narcissistic masochistic conflict, with attendant phantasies of castration and unconscious sexual regression; 4) schizophrenic withdrawal; 5) delusions of persecution and grandeur.²⁶

Broome begins with a wholesale denial of the supernatural, thereby automatically categorizing voices and visions as psychic and unreal. Looking through Freudian naturalistic glass, he finds it impossible to believe that there was real persecution, or that Ezekiel was correct in assuming that he was the spokesman for deity. He fails to discuss other views on the personality of Ezekiel. Broome can be complimented on applying psychoanalysis in the clearest possible language in all its simplistic wonder.

Broome's analysis is devoid of empirical evidence and he manipulates his literary sources to fit his diagnosis. He has taken a strictly Freudian approach in interpreting an individual

²⁵Ibid., p. 291.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 291-292.

who has been dead for at least twenty-five centuries. It is quite possible for any "normal" person to be overwhelmed for seven days under pressure of actual opposition, which Broome chooses to believe did not actually exist. Moses' opposition nearly drove him to suicide (Num. 11:2,13) before God gave him assistance from the elders (11:17).

Dr. Carl Gordon Howie criticizes Broome's lack of professional credentials for such an analysis. As for the Freudian approach, Howie states that "a symbol must be interpreted in a specific historical context and in the light of allied events."²⁷ Fire is used as an example which was an Israelite illustration of visions of Yahweh (Gen. 15:17; Ex. 3:2; 19:16-19; 2 Kings 2:11; Isa. 6).

It was common for men of the sixth century to hear a voice calling them to divine service. Ezekiel cannot be judged against a twentieth century background, according to Howie. He states:

Few psychiatrists today accept sex as the only drive of life and very few would insist that Freud's symbols can be used without reference to a given historical context.²⁸

Since every person has certain schizophrenic symptoms, by picking and choosing any individual of ancient times may be proven mentally unbalanced, particularly a man like Moses who was surrounded by the miraculous.

Ezekiel has been compared with well known mystics. Howie sees mystics and Ezekiel as having a common visionary life,

²⁷C. G. Howie, "Psychological Aspects of Ezekiel and His Prophecy," in The Date and Composition of Ezekiel (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950), p. 75.

²⁸Ibid., p. 78.

commissioning, and transportation from one place to another. But mysticism and prophetism are not to be equated, since the prophet never becomes one with deity as the mystic does.

Broome and Howie represent two approaches to the value of psychoanalysis in the study of great men of history. Neither accepts a supernaturalistic approach, but there is a vast difference in how far they feel psychoanalysis can be applied to the symbols in the book. Howie leans toward a more realistic, less skeptical approach, believing that when the prophet claimed to be persecuted, he was probably being persecuted. This is much more in line with post-Freudian personality theorists like Gordon Allport and Erich Fromm.

Yet to depend on the best in psychoanalysis to assist us in understanding Moses would be a grave error. The burning bush was not the fire-dream of a paranoid, but God's unique call to the greatest prophet of all time (Ex. 3:1-6). There is no hint that Moses ever spoke to God in a dream. The pillar of fire was not a sexual symbol, but the sign of God's presence and guidance by night (Ex. 13:21). The references to waters were not indications of regression to the womb, but rather opened the way for progress at the Red Sea and quenched the thirst at Horeb (Ex. 14:26-29; 17:1-7).

Therefore the charismatic leader under the call of God is not psychotic (pathological), but rather he is endowed with a grace that lifts him to a supernormal state which defies the myopic investigation of psychoanalysts operating on a purely humanistic level.

The grist for the psychoanalyst's mill was missing in

in Moses' case. He was not a dreamer; the burning bush was not occasioned by sleep. His encounters with God were real-life affairs where real conversation is exchanged as "friend to Friend" (Ex. 33:11). He was not a celibate recluse as was Jeremiah, but rather he was a lover who was chided by Aaron and Miriam for indiscretion (Num. 12:1), and whose marital relations may be open to some question (Ex. 4:24-26; 18:1-9). His meekness was not that of an insecure quivering neurotic, but the disciplined, rightly used anger of a matured personality.

III. BEHAVIORISTS VS. GENETICISTS

The principal reason for Watsonian behaviorist researchers' steering clear of the great man theory is its lack of usefulness in predicting behavior. Stimulus-response theorists avoid theories which assume that only the outcome or response can be known. They reason that if the response can be known research will uncover the stimulus. Therefore, the beginning assumption of the great man theory, that there are unknown qualities making some men unique, even mystical characteristics, puts the great man theory in a very bad light for empiricists. The nonquantifiable nature of charisma automatically disqualifies it for the behaviorists.

Aldous Huxley asks:

Is it true that human beings are nothing but the products of their social environment? And if it is true, what justification can there be for maintaining that the individual is less important than the group of which he is a member?²⁹

²⁹Aldous Huxley, Brave New World Revisited (New York: Perennial Library, Harper and Row, 1958), p. 96.

Huxley argues for the equal import of heredity and environment.

John B. Watson, the father of behaviorism, declared that he found "no support for hereditary patterns of behavior, nor for special abilities (musical, art, etc.) which are supposed to run in families."³⁰

B. F. Skinner, an experimentalist from Harvard agrees:

... as scientific explanation becomes more and more comprehensive, the contribution which may be claimed by the individual himself appears to approach zero. Man's vaunted creative powers, his achievements in art, science and morals, his capacity to choose and our right to hold him responsible for the consequences of his choice-- none of these is conspicuous in the new scientific self-portrait.³¹

Huxley demurs that this kind of thinking would lead one to assume that "Shakespeare's plays were not written by Shakespeare, nor even by Bacon or the Earl of Exford; they were written by Elizabethan England."³²

William James joins in countering the behaviorist argument:

If anything is humanly certain, it is that the great man's society, properly so called, does not make him before he can remake it. Physiological forces, with which the social, political, geographical and to a great extent anthropological conditions have just as much and just as little to do as the crater of Vesuvius has to do with the flickering of this gas by which I write, are what make him. Can it be that Mr. Spencer holds the convergence of sociological pressures to have so impinged upon Stratford-upon-Avon about the twenty-sixth of April, 1564, that a W. Shakespeare, with all his mental peculiarities, had to be born there? ... And does he mean to say that if the aforesaid W. Shakespeare had died of cholera infantum, another mother at Stratford-upon-Avon would need have engendered a duplicate copy of him, to restore the sociologic equilibrium?³³

³⁰Ibid., p. 97.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³W. James, "Great Men, Great Thoughts and the Environment," Atlantic Monthly, XLVI (October, 1880), pp. 457-458.

Skinner's work, Science and Human Behavior,³⁴ briefly dismisses the genetic factors determining human behavior. Huxley deems it impossible to write the biography of an individual without considering his body, temperament, intellectual endowments, immediate environment from moment to moment, and his time, place, and culture.³⁵

Bertrand Russell understands the causes of historical change to be economic change, political theory, and important individuals

I do not believe that any of these can be ignored, or wholly explained away as the effect of causes of another kind. ... History is not yet a science, and can only be made to seem scientific by falsifications and omissions.³⁶

Roger Williams' The Human Frontier and Free But Unequal discuss differences between individuals:

As a result of this environmentally centered thinking and investigation, the doctrine of the essential uniformity of human infants has been widely accepted ... by a great body of social psychologists, sociologists, social anthropologists, and many others, including historians, legal scholars and men in public life.³⁷

The first real challenge to the environmentalists in recent years is being led by psychologist Arthur Jensen who has attacked the Head Start Program in the schools as unrealistic in terms of the inherent capacities of children. His claim is that a manufactured environment cannot significantly improve on the basic

³⁴B. F. Skinner, Science and Human Behavior (New York: Macmillan, 1953).

³⁵Huxley, op. cit., p. 99.

³⁶Ibid., p. 100.

³⁷Ibid., p. 101.

genetic environment.³⁸

To argue that charisma is the factor in producing the kind of leader Moses was to the Hebrews is to step only partially around this debate. Moses was a product of an enriched environment. (Ex. 2:10; Acts 7:22). However, this is not given as the reason for his success. Rather it is said that it was some unusual, unexplicable gift of God (Ex. 3:11,12). There are references that could reveal some indication of Moses' genetic inheritance (Ex. 2:2ff), but this is never alluded to in the text. Thus, although these factors must be considered, they do not serve to explain the nature of Moses' success.

IV. SOCIAL INTERACTION THEORY OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Social psychologists have considered at least six types of leadership structure that optimize effective group performance. The most effective group is one in which: 1) there is the most adequate all-around leader ("great man"); 2) members are chosen for their ability in the specific task; 3) membership selection is based on the sociometric choices of co-workers; 4) qualities of task ability and social ability are distributed among the members encouraging role differentiation and division of labor; 5) members are similar in values; 6) members are selected for their compatibility in personality characteristics, such as authoritarianism, major defense mechanisms, ascendance-submission, etc.³⁹

³⁸G. Voyat, "I.Q.: God-Given or Man Made?" Saturday Review (May 17, 1969), pp. 73ff.

³⁹Edgar F. Borgatta, et. al., "Some Findings Relevant to the Great Man Theory of Leadership," American Sociological Review, XIX (1954), pp. 755-759.

The concern of this paper is with the first of these approaches, the "great man theory of leadership". As we have seen, this is likely the oldest theory, receiving attention for many centuries, being the point from which much of history has been written. Also, if organizational performance can be determined by the manipulation of a single person, it provides for simpler analysis. Therefore much psychological analysis has been oriented toward the problems of selecting persons best fitted for a top position of leadership.⁴⁰ Yet little effort has been put into testing the validity of this theory in determining group performance under "great-man" leadership.

Social psychologists at Harvard's Laboratory of Social Relations have analyzed the effect of great men on productivity. Although the "great man" theory is generally rejected as an ineffective means of evaluating social interaction, an experiment was set up with 126 subjects in three-man groups meeting for twenty-four minutes in four sessions. Each subject met with four groups, with two different partners each time. To see if the same individual tended to be recognized as the "leader" in each group he attended, their interaction was analyzed under three criteria: 1) Task ability; leadership rating in twelve categories; 2) Individual assertiveness; total activity rating; and 3) Social acceptability; popularity. The researchers reasoned that a "great man" would need to possess each of these qualities in an enlarged measure.

Commonly, the productive individual and the group leader are not popular. The popular person is not usually the leader.

⁴⁰H. S. Resnik, "A Special Awareness About Mankind," Saturday Review, LV (February 21, 1970), pp. 35-38.

Researchers discovered that after the first session, eleven men were rated highest in their groups under all three criteria. After the third session, eight still held this position consistently. After the final session, seven were still at the top.

Conclusions showed that the groups these "great men" participated in were high in productivity. There were more suggestions and more agreements in these groups; thus better task facilitation. Less tension and higher solidarity (tension release) were noted. Satisfaction of members and task productivity were highest in "great men" led groups. They concluded that "great men" make for great groups.

... the great man principle of group composition appears to have much to recommend it. Further study should focus on testing some of the underlying assumptions of the various principles of group composition, especially in terms of the differential effect of the leadership structures on group performance.⁴¹

The nature of a slave society and its response to leadership of great men will come under study later in this report. At this point it should be noted that several high points of solidarity existed under Moses' leadership.

Before making his initial entree to Pharaoh, Moses solicited the support of the elders' council (Ex. 4:27-30). Support did not come easily in the face of the slave situation (Ex. 6:2-9). Yet at the conclusion of the plagues, Moses had even gained personal recognition by the Egyptians (Ex. 11:1-3). The high point of solidarity comes just after the parting of waters at the Red

⁴¹Borgatta, et. al., loc. cit.

Sea (Ex. 14:30-31), celebrating with songs and tambourine accompaniment. The final evidence of solidarity in Exodus comes with the building of the Tabernacle (35:1-36). Under the most unkind circumstances Moses produced a high state of productivity, solidarity, and even satisfaction.

Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt have studied the outcomes of authoritarian and democratic leaders on groups. See the Appendix for a list of these authoritarian and democratic characteristics.⁴² From their studies, these psychologists conclude that autocratic groups produced a high state of tension. As was seen above, the "great man" tends to reduce tension. They further conclude that there was a feeling of cooperative endeavor in the democratic group (as with the building of the tabernacle, Ex. 35, and in the passover celebration, Ex. 12:14-20). There was a feeling of "we-ness" and more constructiveness. Structural stability was also greater in the democratic group with inward harmony.⁴³

The intriguing results of these studies must be included in any appraisal of Moses. Lewin and Lippitt consider only the variables of authoritarian vs. democratic leadership qualities. Borgatta, Hare, and Bales ignore these variables, but conclude that the same outcomes are evident in groups led by "great men". It must be evident that the truly "great man" will be not only able, assertive, and popular, but also democratic enough to find

⁴²K. Lewin, and R. Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note," Sociometry, I (1938), pp. 292-300.

⁴³Ibid.

ways of involving the group in the total endeavor. Moses, living in a country with an extremely autocratic regime, met all of these qualifications when called to a position of leadership.

V. SOCIOLOGISTS AND CHARISMA

William F. Albright calls Max Weber (1864-1920) "probably the greatest sociologist yet to arise in Germany."⁴⁴ Weber saw religious, economic, and social factors as interdependent. His work has heavily influenced contemporary German students of Old Testament history. Albrecht Alt and his school have been particularly affected by Weber's thinking. Johannes Pedersen's sociological school⁴⁵ has been called "one of the most important contributions yet made to our understanding of Hebrew life and thought."⁴⁶

Max Weber and later Albrecht Alt, applied the term "charismatic" to the leaders of Israel in the time of the Judges.⁴⁷ The "judges" were not followed because of their tribal affiliations or hierarchical standing. Rather there was a special power or influence about them which seemed to those around them to be the mark of divine grace (charisma). This honor could be assumed by a remarkable military leader such as Samson (Judg. 15:14ff). It also applied to men of exceptional wisdom and prophetic gifts such as Samuel (1 Sam. 3:20).

⁴⁴W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957), p. 95.

⁴⁵J. Pedersen, Israel (London: Oxford University Press, 1947).

⁴⁶Albright, loc. cit.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 283.

The process of recognizing charisma probably took place over a period of time so far as the people were concerned. This is not to negate the fact that it was a gift of God, often conferred at birth (Judg. 13:5,25; and 1 Sam. 1:11). It took time for their wisdom and honesty to become known beyond their home area. Qualities of wisdom and honesty were supplemented by their reputations as special agents of divine power.⁴⁸

The combination of religious, social, and economic factors in Moses' charisma will become obvious when the biblical text is discussed later. It is important now to recognize that he did not inherit power in any of these spheres. The charisma was always conferred, whether prophetic (Deut. 34:10), military (Ex. 17:8-13), or political (Ex. 11:3). He was gifted beyond what could be expected if only human capacities were considered. No innate human capability has ever accomplished what Moses performed under charismatic impulse.

Weber's concern lay in the question, how and why do men voluntarily obey authority. His answer centered around three types of authority.

Men obey 'traditional' authority 'because it has always been,' ... they have been socialized to accept it. They obey 'charismatic' authority because its source is felt to be above men, supernatural, awesome, or fearful. They obey 'rational-legal' authority because it achieves valued goals in a rational or, roughly, an efficient manner. The latter type of authority Weber believed to be most clearly expressed in the form of association he termed bureaucracy.⁴⁹

⁴⁸S. N. Eisenstadt, "The Nature of Charismatic Authority and Its Routinization," in Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 48ff.

⁴⁹H. L. Ross, Perspectives on the Social Order, 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 297.

In this regard, the charismatic leader's authority lies in his person. Therefore, charismatic authority is non-rational and potentially revolutionary. Its unstable, transitory qualities demand that he constantly prove himself by demonstrations of the miraculous (Ex. 17:1-7; Num. 12:2-4; 14:4; 16:45; 17:1; 20:1-12; 21:5-9). Charisma is common in social movements during their early, first-generation stages. The leader's command-power is due him as a prophet, hero, or demagogue. As Weber explains:

In contrast to any kind of bureaucratic offices, the charismatic structure knows nothing of form or of an ordered procedure or of appointment or dismissal. It knows no regulated 'career', 'advancement', 'salary', or regulated and expert training of the holder of charisma or of his aids. It knows no agency of control or appeal, no local bailiwicks or exclusive functional jurisdictions; nor does it embrace permanent institutions ... which are independent of persons and of purely personal charisma. ... Charisma knows only inner determination and inner restraint.⁵⁰

In charismatic leadership there is what Talcott Parsons called a "crucial noncognitive aspect". It is "commitment" to a break with the established order.

Prophecy is by no means an intellectual exercise in metaphysical or theological speculation, but ... what Durkheim had in mind when he said of religion, c'est de la vie sérieuse. This in turn is associated with the frequent violent emotionalism of prophetic movements, sometimes-- as Weber emphasizes-- bordering on the pathological.⁵¹

Some of these elements of "violent emotionalism" which border on the pathological are evident in the history of the exodus.

⁵⁰H. H. Gerth, and C. W. Mills (eds.), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 245-246.

⁵¹T. Parsons, "Prophecy, Charisma, and the Process of Break-through," in Sociological Theory and Modern Society (New York: The Free Press, 1967), p. 50.

Periods of irrational reaction lead Moses himself to commit acts for which he later repents (Num. 20:11,12). After a period of contempt for God and His succeeding judgment upon them, the people rush off to battle, only to be soundly defeated (Num. 14:44-45). Such examples of the irrational are too numerous to recount further here.

Weber sees the "prophet" as unique from the "lawgiver" and "teacher". Moses uniquely plays all three roles (Acts 3:22; and 7:37, not to disregard Num. 12:6-8 where it infers that Moses is in a closer relationship to God than a prophet, as does Ex. 6:28-7:7). The entire book of Deuteronomy is Moses' teaching and Leviticus his lawgiving. The essential quality of the charismatic prophet is that he calls for a break with an established order. The Hindu guru is solely a religious "teacher" who implements an established order through his teaching rather than breaking with it and correcting it.⁵²

Constellations of executives have been studied in terms of their efficiency. They include the "group", an executive system of equals; the "pair", a structure in which one executive deals with external matters and the other deals with internal relations; and the "triad", which exhibits a great deal of instability in the internal status structure of the constellation.⁵³

Moses fits into the patriarchy constellation, which shows the executive functions built around a dominant figure. All of

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³R. C. Hodgson, et. al., The Executive Role Constellation (Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1965).

the functions of leadership have been centered in him, whether social, religious, or economic, or whether internal or external. At points where his sole leadership is challenged, he meets the challenge head-on (Ex. 5:15-21; 32:1-29; Num. 12:2-10; 14:4-23; 16:1-30). This is the very nature of charismatic leadership.

Movements Among the Lower Classes. Among the social functions of theodicies, dominance is the most appropriate function for the elite; mobility, economic gain, and rationality for the middle classes; and escape for the dispossessed lower classes. This lower class desire for escape has taken many forms. It may be this-worldly, as it was with the Hebrews under Moses, aiming at radical social change and political aggressiveness. It may be otherworldly, as essentially it was among the American Negro slaves where the adherent received deserved riches in a life after death.⁵⁴

G. G. Coulton, an historian, writes that the lower classes of medieval times were left under the care of roving monks who were marginal to the Church establishment, stressing a fervent other-worldly emotionalism while the Church emphasized rituals.⁵⁵

Norman Cohn in a study of revolutionary religious movements of the dispossessed in medieval Europe from pre-Christianity to contemporary totalitarianism, develops a concept of "revolutionary eschatology". This is a distinct and abiding world view

⁵⁴N. J. Demarath III., and P. E. Hammond, Religion in Social Context (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 54-55.

⁵⁵G. G. Coulton, Medieval Village, Manor, and Monastery (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), pp. 231-252.

which must be analyzed when studying lower class religious movements.⁵⁶

In Catholicism during the middle ages

... increasing emphasis on rational authority and bureaucratic structure had its costs. ... even a mild dose of rationality may be fatal to an institution that depends upon an arational mystique for its distinctive identity. ... the church is an extreme case and hence more vulnerable than most to change. ... the doctrine and its miraculous elements had been so codified that faith had been minimized.⁵⁷

Another writer argues that people became religiously satiated so that the mystery of religion had lost its compelling power.⁵⁸

... as the church defined itself as a rational instrument seeking to control all aspects of society, it lost much of its distinctive mystique and thereby jeopardized not only its potential but even the power it had already attained. The point is not only that the pursuit of 'absolute power corrupts absolutely' but also that it is dangerous to allow a latent function to become manifest.⁵⁹

May Brodbeck raises the point that "if a comprehensive theory of the social process is possible, the Great Man theory of history is false, for no particular, unique individual need be mentioned."

⁵⁶N. Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millennium (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957).

⁵⁷Demareth, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

⁵⁸J. Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages (London: St. Martin's Press, 1924), especially pp. 151-224.

⁵⁹Demareth, op. cit., p. 68.

also note these works:

M. Weber, The Sociology of Religion, trans. Ephraim Fischhoff (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963).

_____, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribner, 1928).

She reasons that "social determinism" would then be true "because all changes in the social process would be explainable in social terms alone."⁶⁰

Miss Brodbeck is absolutely correct. If social fact could be determined without reference beyond what man finds himself capable of measuring, then there would be no need to talk of charisma and the "great man" theory. But there is a limit to human scientific investigation beyond which the most capable social scientist is incapable of moving. Max Weber chose to term it "charisma". A better choice of terms could not have been made in giving insight into the divinely sensitized human capabilities of Moses which will now be taken up more specifically.

⁶⁰M. Brodbeck (ed.), Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1968), p. 240.

CHAPTER II

MOSES AND HIS PEOPLE: A BIBLICAL INVESTIGATION OF A CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

In a study of Moses what he was is intriguing as personality comes to life in his deeds and words. What gave him his phenomenal hold over the people he led? What happened to him to cause him to show powers of leadership far beyond natural capabilities in social and political leadership? This unusual giftedness referred to as charisma can only be discovered in the written record of Scripture. Words do not adequately convey this quality of personality, but we must accept them as the only available medium.

INTRODUCTION: THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Moses can be studied from the point of what Abraham Heschel terms his "consciousness". This he defines as the "totality of impressions, thoughts, and feelings which make up . . . being."¹ Thus a psychological study develops, but not with a theoretical bias such as those discussed in the first part of this thesis. Such a Freudian hypothesis as has been used in studies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel should not be imposed upon Scripture.

Instead Scripture suggests a supernatural God capable of

¹Abraham J. Heschel. The Prophets (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. xiii.

His sovereign will through natural (human) instrumentality in ways which clearly evidence a supernatural influence, control, and guidance. The concept of נשמה, breathing into, is in evidence here as it was in creation (Gen. 1:2; Ex. 28:3, 31:3, 35:31; Num. 11:17,25,26,29).² God becomes the superintendent of His purposes, but influencing men to yield themselves as His instruments is His chosen means of effecting these purposes.

The tension of the supernatural impulse working through exceptional human capabilities is the story of Moses. Heschel refers to the situation as being composed of

... revelation and response, of receptivity and spontaneity, or event and experience. ... The marks of the personal element are to be traced, not outside the prophet's act, but within it.³

Not only is God's inspiration involved, but Moses' own personality and temperament must be understood. Thus the pouring of the voice of God through a man brought out what Heschel terms pathos, man's tuning in to God's feelings. God's message came to Moses in his own Sitz im Leben. There is a subjective human influence playing a role in every God-given message. Moses' own sentiments were evident in his every speech and act.

Moses was at once a social critic, moralist, statesman, patriot, poet, and preacher. At this point concern is with those elements of his life which dealt directly with the leadership of the Hebrew people, particularly in what most would consider to be the political arena. Yet all of his talents

²note: Irving F. Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1904).

³Heschel, loc. cit.

played a part in the charisma of Moses.

First, an inductive study must be made to determine qualities Moses shared with his contemporaries and those which set him apart. Preconceived notions will be shunned in order to seek a relative objectivity. No rigid behavior patterns can be used as norms. We must deal on the level of understanding, not just explanation. The impact of the charismatic personality must be studied against its historical background.

This investigation will range over the literary sources of the Pentateuch and recent discoveries in the fields of human and mass behavior phenomena. It is beyond the scope of human inquiry to explain supernatural effects upon Moses' psyche and this study will attempt to avoid pat labels for these effects. Study will be confined to an understanding of his "consciousness" of occurrences. This must be done by what Heschel calls "unveiling the decisive features of . . . awareness, the essential structure of experience as reflected in that consciousness may become manifest."⁴

Empathy with Moses is appropriate here in the best sense. Feeling, thinking, and responding as Moses did must be symbiotically determined. This is not to explore the subconscious. That type of study is more speculative than inductive. Rather his overt conscious acts representing his thoughts and feelings are the subjects of the inductive probe.

⁴Ibid., p. xv.

To be dealt with are the

... motives which are consciously given, even if not explicitly stated, and which constitute or at least reflect the decisive categories or the structural forms of prophetic thinking.⁵

To this end an investigator will brobe, inspect, savour, and pry. In all things care must be taken to know what is seen rather than to see what is already suspected from previous study.

I. SLAVERY IN HUMAN TERMS

The primary concern here is to establish the mental attitude of the Israelites upon leaving Egypt. First the nature of Egyptian slavery and its impact on the psyche of the Hebrews must be understood. The Hebrew and Greek (LXX) terms used to depict their condition in Egypt are a good place to begin.

Biblical Slavery Defined.

The Hebrew word עֶבֶד is the common word for service. Immanuel Benzinger points out that "among the Hebrews, as in the ancient world in general, there was no such thing as free labor in the modern sense; servants were the property of their masters-- . . . slaves."⁶

Therefore in terms of psychological effect, it probably makes little difference what term is used to depict the condition of servitude. Yet, there were several classes of slaves

⁵Ibid.

⁶Immanuel Benzinger, "Slavery," Encyclopedia Biblica, ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, vol. IV (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1903), pp. 4653f.

which shall be noted later.

Discussing the Greek word used in the LXX translation, one authority says of δούλος:

Hence we have a service which is not a matter of choice for the one who renders it, which he has to perform whether he likes it or not, because he is subject as a slave to an alien will, to the will of his owner. ... stress is rather on the slave's dependence on his lord ... the passive element in δούλος.⁷

The word "slave" does not appear in the English Version; has only two italicized occurrences in the Authorized Version, neither of them in the Pentateuch. The Revised Version uses "slave" twice (Deut. 21:14; 24:7) for פָּדָה לְעַבְדָּךָ "deal with as a slave (margin chattel)"; Authorized Version "make merchandise of".⁸ All other occurrences are עַבֵּד, translated "servant". Ancient Hebrew did not have a word for a female slave from the main root, so עַבְדָּה, usually translated maid, handmaid, maidservant, represents the female servant in Ex. 21:7.⁹

עַבֵּד is a very general word and can be translated as servant, slave, vassal, the subordinate of a king, or anyone in a submissive position in relation to a superior.¹⁰ It refers to Israel in Egypt in Ex. 13:3,14; 20:2; Deut. 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:6,11; and calls on Israel to remember its servitude in Egypt in Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18,22. Another derivation from

⁷K. H. Rengslof, "δούλος", Theological Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), p. 261.

⁸Benzinger, loc. cit.

⁹Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1890), pp. 887f.

¹⁰B. Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1963), pp. 582f.

this root is used of Israel's labor as captives in Egypt in Ex. 1:14; 2:23,23; 5:11; 6:6; 5:9, etc. (seventeen times altogether).¹¹ It is in this relationship of slave to master that concern with the term is important here.

עֶבֶד "a servant, doer, tiller, slave", occurs seventy-eight times in Genesis, thirty-four times in Exodus, three times in Leviticus, once in Numbers, and ten times in Deuteronomy.¹² Slavery was a common institution in the ancient Near East; one into which a person could fall in bad times with little difficulty.

Isaac Mendelsohn writes of the difficulty in finding extra-biblical sources for Egyptian slave conditions, describing the position of the Hebrews. The Hebrews preferred light perishable papyrus over cumbersome clay tablets; therefore "the only source for the state of slavery in early Israel is the Bible."¹³

Slave Conditions.

In the ancient Near East there were at least seven ways to become a slave: 1) by capture (Gen. 14:21; Num. 31:9; Deut. 20:14; 21:10f) going back to roughly 3000 B.C. and probably further;¹⁴ 2) by purchase; such as, the experience of Joseph,

¹¹W. Gesenius, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), pp. 712f.

¹²R. Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), pp. 861-865.

¹³I. Mendelsohn, Legal Aspects of Slavery (Williamsport: Bayard Press, 1932), p. 36.

¹⁴I. Mendelsohn, Slavery in the Ancient Near East (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), pp. 1-3.

which was not uncommon; 3) by birth (Gen. 15:3; 17:12,13,27);¹⁵ 4) by restitution (Ex. 22:3); 5) by default on debts (Ex. 21:2-6; 7-11; Deut. 15:12-18);¹⁶ 6) self-sale (Lev. 25:39-43, 47f);¹⁷ and 7) by abduction. Stealing a person was made punishable by death by Moses (Ex. 21:16; Deut. 24:7).¹⁸

The enslavement of the Hebrews was somewhat unusual in that it broke with the ancient rules of asylum. The Hebrews had at one time been protected by the Egyptians and saved from starvation through Joseph, one of their number who had attained high office as a vizier under an earlier Pharaoh. Harold M. Wiener says that "the custom of fleeing to specially sacred places to obtain the protection of a deity is found all over the world."¹⁹

Israel provided both the asylum of the altar (1 Kings 1:50; 2:28; Ex. 21:12f) and of the six cities of refuge, the regulations for which were established in Num. 35; Deut. 19:1-13; and Josh. 20.²⁰ No doubt Israel's concern about hospitality was partially dictated by her memory of the unfortunate circumstances of asylum in Egypt.

Cruelty to the Israelites is recounted in Ex. 1:8-22; 2:1-4;

¹⁵K. A. Kitchen, "Slave, Slavery," The New Bible Dictionary, 1st edition (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962), pp. 1195-99.

¹⁶Mendelsohn, op. cit., pp. 23, 26-29.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 14-19.

¹⁸Kitchen, loc. cit.

¹⁹H. M. Wiener, "Asylum," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939), pp. 316-317.

²⁰W. Ewing, "Cities of Refuge," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. IV (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939), pp. 2545-2546.

and Acts 7:19,34. In Gen. 43:32 Egyptians are recorded as refusing to eat with the Hebrews. The Hebrews themselves were not extremely concerned with non-Hebrew slaves. They could be held in perpetuity (Lev. 25:44-46) and were left unprotected by laws concerning good treatment (Lev. 25:43,46). Even his Hebrew slave could be punished "to within an inch of his life". If the slave died, the master could be punished. Yet if the slave lived for a day or two, he would not be punished; "for he is his money" (Ex. 21:20f).²¹

The institution of slavery was everywhere cruel and inhuman. Slavery was perpetual not only for the slave himself, but his wife and children remained in the possession of his master if he was married after becoming a slave (Ex. 21:3f).

Yet ancient Near Eastern slavery did provide for the elevation of particularly industrious slaves. Eliezer was a foreign slave in a Hebrew household (Gen. 15:2), and Joseph was a Hebrew slave in Egypt (Gen. 39:4). Marriage between slave and master was not uncommon (Ex. 21:7-10; Deut. 21:10-14), nor was concubinage (Gen. 16:1,2,6; 30:3,9). Conceivably the Cushite woman whom Moses married (Num. 12:1) was a slave.

Abraham used slaves as soldiers (Gen. 14:14). Not only were they not excluded from religious participation, it was insisted that they be circumcised (Gen. 17:13,27; Ex. 12:44) and must enjoy religious privileges with the master's household (Deut. 12:12,18; 16:11,14; 29:10,11). Sabbath rest was included in this (Ex. 20:10; 23:12; Deut. 5:14).

²¹W. E. Raffety, "Slave," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. IV (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939), p. 2816.

Nevertheless, slavery was to be avoided and the effects on the slave were degrading. Slavery was often threatened as a national punishment if Israel disobeyed (Deut. 18:68; Joel 3:7,8). The degrading element in Egyptian slavery is particularly evident in the cowardice shown by the Israelites (Ex. 14:11,12; 16:3; Judg. 5:16-18,23).²²

The slave mentality of the Hebrews is probably most evident in their constant desire to return to Egypt after they had crossed the Red Sea into freedom. Parallels to this kind of mental servitude can be found in history. Two very closely analyzed historical parallels would be that of North American Negro slavery and the incarceration of German Jews during the regime of Adolph Hitler. In both cases there was deterioration of what was believed to be an inborn desire of all men to be free.

Naturally making the situational comparisons across millenia is not easy and a critical eye must be peeled. Yet evidence seems conclusive concerning the tendency of masses of people to accept servitude as a normal way of life. This is what highlights the unusual character of Moses' leadership and warrants the application of the term charisma. It is the thesis of this study that Moses was the only man in history to take an enslaved people and tear them loose, mentally as well as physically, from their bondage.

²²O. J. Nave, Nave's Topical Bible (Chicago: Moody Press, n.d.), pp. 1260ff.

II. THE MOVEMENT: STAGE I

THE HEBREWS IN EGYPTIAN SLAVERY

The first step in this process of emancipation took place in Egypt, under the eye of Pharaoh and his taskmasters. All references given in brackets will be from the book of Exodus unless otherwise noted. Andre Neher calls our attention to the similarity between Moses' experience (2:11) and that of the Jews in Auschwitz. As Moses saw the Egyptian taskmaster smiting his Hebrew brother

... suddenly his Jewish conscience strikes him. ... in an atmosphere of filth, sweat, and blood Moses recovers his Jewishness. ... like Moses, the twentieth-century Jew has lived in the illusion that he was like the others. Till Auschwitz. Then in the filth, the sweat and the blood, he awoke to the realization of an irrevocably different destiny.²³

Possibly the only effort to study Egyptian slavery in depth was accomplished by Abd El-Mohsen Bakir in a doctoral dissertation. He notes that there are differences in conditions giving rise to slavery and in the status of the slaves themselves in different countries.

... the economic status of Egypt was entirely based on the exploitation of the productive power of the soil. ... Under such conditions, it was not capital that was wanted, but labor. ... All these circumstances resulted in a social structure in which solidarity, cooperation and authority were essential features.²⁴

²³A. Neher, Moses, trans. Irene Marinoff (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), pp. 24-25.

²⁴A. Bakir, Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt (Le Caire: Imprimerie De L'Institut Francais D'Archelogie Orientale, 1952), p. 2.

Even the condition of the Egyptian proletariat was deplorable: "For the last eighteen days we have been putrifying with hunger," as a contemporary cry of the native peasants.²⁵ Yet these artisans still had the means of preserving their individuality through revolt.

However, as pointed out by Bakir, even in the Egyptian corvée system, "From the Old Kingdom onwards the people thus engaged appear to have enjoyed no rights . . ." He writes that there were two outgrowths of the Egyptian economic expansion: "a) a de facto status of bondage to the land; b) compulsory service."²⁶

In Egypt, just as in the North American slave system, the tendency was toward a loss of freedom. As Neher suggests, this no doubt proved to be more difficult for the foreign Hebrews than for the native Egyptian proletariat. The Hebrews' culture and language made them distinct. Even at the time of Joseph's ascendancy, there was little social interchange between the two peoples (Gen. 43:32). It is doubtful that much intermarriage or other cultural absorption could have taken place after the Hebrews were recognized as slaves. One authority concludes that the "Egyptians did not accept foreigners as being like themselves.

Egyptian texts describe slaves as having "no hearts". Heart represents personality in the orient; slaves are seen as having no

²⁵Neher, op. cit., pp. 69-73.

²⁶Bakir, op. cit., p. 25.

²⁷J. A. Wilson, "Egypt," in Before Philosophy (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1949), p. 78.

individuality.²⁸ Bakir adds: "In some transfers these people were regarded as res and mentioned with cattle and land."²⁹

Under later Roman law a slave was judged a person owned by another, with no rights; a form of personal property to be used and transferred at the wish of the owner.³⁰ Bakir's work with Egyptian evidence has disclosed no code distinguishing between freemen, slaves and bondsmen. Also, these terms varied from age to age, as did the economic conditions, depending on whether the emphasis was on agriculture or city building. Nevertheless, Bakir maintains that

... slavery in the full [Roman] sense is certainly to be found. There are persons who are the property of others, in the sense that those others have full and exclusive rights to make use of them by sale, exchange, hire and so forth, as of other movable property.³¹

Captives apparently belonged to the Egyptian king who could dispose of them as he pleased. They were given to military leaders as compensation for service or put to work on temples and public works. The rights of the slave were completely in the hands of the king.³²

Writing of the legal aspects of slavery, Bakir concluded:

... there is no doubt that a definite class is specified as being chattels without any distinct rights. The condition of this class, although not clearly defined as slavery proper, seems to

²⁸Neher, op. cit., p. 73.

²⁹Bakir, loc. cit.

³⁰K. A. Kitchen, "Slave," New Bible Dictionary (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962), p. 1195.

³¹Bakir, op. cit., p. 8.

³²Ibid., pp. 4,5.

be so remote from the mere exploitation of its services, that it is quite in order to describe it as slavery.³³

Documents prior to the XVIIIth dynasty lead to the conclusion that "neither a male nor a female slave possessed any rights." Punishment came as a result of violating the king's orders (as noted in Ex. 5:1-9). As for emancipation, "The texts are silent on the matter . . ."³⁴ Punishment for the master who mistreats a slave was not discussed in any of the documents.³⁵

In the sales of slaves, their origins were stated in the contracts. This may be because slaves from the North, Lower Egypt, or Syria were more valuable. It also may indicate that there was difference in the status and treatment of native and foreign slaves.³⁶

To summarize:

... from the Old Kingdom to the beginning of the New ... the slave possessed no rights. The master enjoyed exclusive power, though the acquisition of slaves was registered at a government office.³⁷

A slave was regarded as chattel from the New Kingdom on. His services could be sold by his master. However some texts indicate that he possessed some rights as a man. It is quite possible that there were marriages between slaves. These were probably not legally recognized since none are recorded. They

³³Ibid., p. 54.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 66-69.

³⁵Ibid., p. 80.

³⁶Ibid., p. 72.

³⁷Ibid., p. 81.

certainly had no rights over children from a marriage preceding enslavement.

... although such relationships of kindred and affinity as parent and child, husband and wife, were necessarily recognised after enslavement, the rights and authority normally attaching to these were not recognised.³⁸

The slave had the right of marriage to a free person only with the approval of the master. Other family relationships were only recognised under the authority of the master.

A slave, although he could acquire property, had no free control of it. He was not allowed to bequeath it and how he could acquire it is not known.³⁹ F. Petrie considers the Israelites as having the status of a tribe heavily taxed with labor,⁴⁰ thus maintaining their cultural identity.

As chattel, the slaves social position was the lowest. A slave's family remained in slavery. Captives of war and other foreigners became slaves, but Bakir knows of no enslavement of native Egyptians except those accepting voluntary servitude who enjoyed a more favorable social rank.⁴¹

The main source of slaves was through capture. Captives were branded with the king's name. Attempts were made to acculturate them, teaching them Egyptian language, customs and

³⁸Ibid., pp. 81-82.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 85-87.

⁴⁰Sir W. M. F. Petrie, Egypt and Israel (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1923), p. 31.

⁴¹Bakir, op. cit., pp. 97-103.

religion.⁴² It is likely the Hebrews, although their enslavement was under unusual circumstances (Ex. 1:8-14), would have come within this category.

The captured were considered the chattels of the king. He had the right of their disposal. Working under an overseer, they manufactured cloth, ploughed fields, tended cattle, grew corn, and also made bricks and acted as builders (1:14).⁴³

It is not fair to simply recite legal aspects of Hebrew slavery in Egypt. Nelson Glueck maintains that their oppression went beyond the simple need for a labor supply to embrace political reasons for enslavement.

... the Egyptians were afraid of an aggressive coalition of the foreign people of Israel at the northern frontier with their other northern enemies ...⁴⁴

There was much more involved than simple economic considerations on the part of the Egyptians as exemplified by Pharaoh's sadistic reaction to Moses' initial request for the right of worship (5:1ff). His concern was not simply to increase production, but rather to break the spirit and humiliate the Hebrews by forcing them to obtain straw for their brick-making (5:7,14) and through beatings.⁴⁵

Earlier tactics of Pharaoh had included an attempt at race extermination (1:8-22). Along with this attempted genocide

⁴²Ibid., p. 122.

⁴³Sir W. M. F. Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes (London: B. Zuaritch, 1897), pp. 24-26.

⁴⁴N. Glueck, "Egypt," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, 1941 edition, IV, pp. 5-11.

⁴⁵Neher, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

there was included the policing of the people by their own, currently termed "Toniism" in the United States (1:15-22).

This has always proven to be a potent psychological weapon in slave or POW control. Neher claims that half of the taskmasters were Hebrews.⁴⁶

Physical torture including forced labor, murder of children at birth, searches, sanctioned sadism, brother pitted against brother, and population density had their psychological effect for years to come. One writer suggests that "Israel's slavery in Egypt had a double character, for besides the deprivation of freedom it involved their being unable to serve God. Egypt is the land of servitude par excellence."⁴⁷

It took a charismatic figure in the person of Moses to break this cycle of psychological dependency by the Hebrews on their Egyptian masters. In the Exodus movement a complete break was made with the past.

All the values of misery were overthrown, and the men in whom they were incarnate were swept along in this movement. ... The historical importance of this event lies in the fact that the movement rested on the lowest social stratum. ...

[Moses] in killing the Egyptian slavedriver (Ex. 2:11-12), ... prepares the breach which divine intervention will later enlarge. ... Here he anticipates in one single act of wrath all that the Exodus will later realize prudently and patiently. ... Breaking through the selfishness of his own ego, he discovers his neighbor. It is this discovery which, in the last resort,

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 90

⁴⁷M. Carey, "Slave," Jean J. von Allmen, ed., Vocabulary of the Bible (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), p. 410.

brings about the Exodus.⁴⁸

Leviticus 26:13 states the change in the spirit of the Hebrews from that of a slave mentality to that of a free people: "I have broken the bars of your yoke, and made you go upright."

Egyptian and North American Slave Systems Compared.

That slavery creates a subservient mentality has been well established in recent social science literature. In discussing the American Negro's problem of identification as a people with pride of ancestry, a Jewish journalist, Charles E. Silberman states that "Negroes have been unable to recall their experience of slavery in the same light" as the Jews.⁴⁹ To the Jews, their slavery is central to their religion. To the Negroes, enslavement is a break with what has lately been painted as a glorious African past, an embarrassment. He was made into a childlike Sambo creature, expected to exhibit a limited mentality and a fawning vocabulary.

The Jews were commanded to celebrate the memory of their slavery (12:42).

After all, the Jews, under Moses' leadership, freed themselves, and they went from Egypt to Mount Sinai; slavery was followed almost immediately by a moment of spiritual glory.⁵⁰

It is the opinion of this writer that the systems of slavery in Egypt and the United States were dissimilar only in their endings. Both systems were closed; manumission, although permitted

⁴⁸Neher, op. cit., p. 92.

⁴⁹C. E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 78.

⁵⁰Ibid.

in both, seldom actually occurred. Both were aimed at the economic exploitation of their victims. Both were maintained with sadistic episodes, including the turning of slaves into spies among their own people. Both maintained a social distance between the "superior" native slave-owners and the "inferior" foreign stock. Both, to a certain extent, attempted the acculturation of the "inferior peoples" through expecting them to work in the language of the home peoples and through giving assent to the home religion. Both peoples found themselves on foreign soil with no easy means of escape. It was expected in both Egypt and the United States that the alien types would keep their place; meaning, remain in an inferior position (Ex. 1:9).

It is possible that in some ways the situation of the Hebrews was preferable. They were probably able to maintain a cultural distinctiveness through limited practice of their religion and use of the Hebrew language. There is no specific evidence of this but it seems likely in terms of their capacity to organize their grandiose escape and their public acknowledgment of Yahweh.

In both systems there were exceptional slaves who escaped the most brutal features of the system, some of whom attained their freedom. The three layers of slave society may be seen in Moses, who was free and was raised as an Egyptian, with access to the best education available; the taskmasters, placed in supervisory positions over their brothers; and the common laboring slave.

In the United States' system these three layers were represented by Frederick Douglas, who purchased his freedom and

became the conscience of the abolitionist movement in the North. Nat Turner was a craftsman-slave who was a self-educated preacher, leading a slave revolt in Virginia which led to the deaths of fifty-five whites. On the bottom of this hierarchy was the field-slave, living in filth and ignorance of his human capacities.

The length of the Hebrew's enslavement in Egypt is impossible to calculate; extending from the "Pharaoh who knew not Joseph" to the time of the Exodus. By either the early or late chronology, Neher puts the time at approximately ninety years.⁵¹ Although the first twenty Africans were brought to Jamestown in 1619, it was not until the 1660's that their status as slaves was fixed in law.⁵² This puts the length of Negro slavery in the United States at about two hundred years. During this period new slaves were constantly fed into the system. However it is not the length of the slavery, as evidenced by the German concentration camp effects in World War II., but the intensity of the dehumanizing characteristics that are important here.

It is noteworthy that God did not choose one of the lowest level Hebrew slaves to lead the exodus revolt. Rather He chose a man whose mind was free from the authority system that had caused the Hebrews to see themselves as an inferior race. The same is the case in the American slave revolts. Not one of the major revolts was planned by plantation laborers, but rather by Negroes whose leadership qualities had developed in some degree

⁵¹Neher, op. cit., pp. 34ff.

⁵²O. and M. F. Handlin, "Origins of the Southern Labor System," William and Mary Quarterly, VII (April, 1950), pp. 199-222.

of freedom outside that dehumanizing atmosphere.

Gabriel's revolt in 1800 was led by a free Negro blacksmith who lived just outside Richmond. In 1822 a plot was executed by Denmark Vesey, a freed Negro artisan who had been born in Africa and had served on a slave ship. Nat Turner, who operated the only nonaborted revolt, was an enslaved but literate preacher who led the bloody massacre in Virginia in 1831.

Leadership studies indicate that there is a point at which any organization becomes incapable of changing itself from within. This point had occurred among the Hebrews at least forty years before the Exodus when the Hebrew resented Moses' authority after he had shown his desire to wield it in killing the Egyptian (2:11-15). New and constructive patterns of behavior could be introduced only from outside the group "since a cycle of superior-originated interactions, increased tension, and low performance had become established."⁵³ Leadership climate "molds patterns of expectation on the part of both supervisors and supervised."⁵⁴

Moses: The Charismatic is Injected.

To qualify as a charismatic leader according to Talcott Parsons, the first step is focusing on the individual

who takes the responsibility for announcing a break in the established normative order and

⁵³R. H. Guest, Organizational Change (Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1962), p. 96.

⁵⁴E. A. Fleishman, et. al., Leadership and Supervision in Industry (Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research, 1955), monograph #33.

declaring this break to be morally legitimate, thereby setting himself in significant respects in explicit opposition to the established order.⁵⁵

The crucial question to be asked at this point is how did Moses break this established order of hopelessness among the Hebrews? How did he create the desire for freedom among these dehumanized slaves? How did he organize for revolt a people who had only been organized for manual labor? What happened to change the attitudes of the Hebrew taskmasters who had sold their loyalty to Pharaoh? All of these questions are involved in the charismatic leadership of Moses under the direction of God.

As has been stated, the Hebrews were slaves of Pharaoh himself. Moses was asking the slaveowner to release his own slaves. Beyond this, Moses was dealing with a man who was considered to be the one mediator between the people and the gods, who could "merge with his fellow-gods and could become any one of them."⁵⁶

A further difficulty for Moses was that the Pharaoh's divine person was too holy for direct approach. Ordinary mortals could only speak "in the presence of" the king.⁵⁷ After presenting the three signs to Pharaoh (4:1-9), and making his request to "let my people go" (5:1-9), Moses meets with opposition from his own people when their burdens are increased (5:15-21). This occurs at the height of the active phase of the movement in which the Hebrews have become involved through their elders (4:27-30). It is at the apex of this triple conflict, Moses

⁵⁶J. A. Wilson, "Egypt," in Before Philosophy (Baltimore: Pelican, 1946), p. 73.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 84.

vs. Pharaoh, Moses vs. the people, Pharaoh vs. the people, that Moses complains to God (5:22-6:1). Although charismatic powers had been given for the first encounters with Pharaoh (4:1-9; 6:2-9); it was obvious to Pharaoh that Moses was simply a representative of a god. Added to the difficulty of representing a nonsupporting people (6:10-13), this brought the negotiations to a stalemate.

God then introduced a most unusual element in establishing Moses' charisma. As Moses complained of inferior status (6:30), God replied, "I have made thee as God to Pharaoh" (7:1). Thus he would no longer speak "in the presence of" Pharaoh, but would deal with him directly. If Pharaoh refused to recognize his new status, Moses could then operate through his "prophet" Aaron (7:1).

Since Moses was only as God to Pharaoh (he never was as God to the Hebrews) this was not to be confused with the monophysite Egyptian belief which maintained "the principles of consubstantiality and free interchange of being" between men and gods.⁵⁸

H. A. Frankfort holds that only with Israel

do we find this dissociation of a people from its leader in relation to the divine; with the Hebrews we find parallelism while everywhere else we find coincidence.⁵⁹

The Hebrew leaders were never seen as infallible in their personal decisions nor as objects of worship. Yahweh was always the focal point for all adoration. He shared His glory with no man and submitted to no man's control.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 75.

⁵⁹H. A. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 341.

III. STAGE II. THE PLAGUES

AUTHORITY IS TRANSFERRED

After countering the person of the Pharaoh, Moses moved on to dealing with the belief of the people that there was some connection between nature and Pharaoh's power. G. Ernest Wright suggests that there is

a distinct contrast between the faith of Israel and that of the polytheist. The latter lives in a world that is more tolerant, ... emphasis is upon order, harmony and integration. ... the status quo is the focus of attention. The aim of the gods is to preserve the established order. ... none of them has ever produced a thorough-going social revolution.⁶⁰

The king of Egypt was the source of Egypt's fertility, a sort of medicine man whose magic ensured good crops. He controlled the water of the Nile, Egypt's life-blood. Food, water, and the seasons were in his control.⁶¹

The plagues were meant to affect Egypt by breaking into the established order. In Egypt the government, society and nature were paternalistic extensions of the person of the king. This kind of thinking had to be snapped once and for all for the Hebrews. This was done in the plagues. Even the Egyptians had second thoughts about the Pharaoh's powers (9:11; 10:7; 11:3) as compared to God and Moses. Hebrew thought hereafter

excluded, in particular, the king's being instrumental in the integration of society and nature. ... To Hebrew thought nature appeared void of divinity, ... in Hebrew religion alone-- the

⁶⁰G. E. Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment (London: SCM Press, 1950), pp. 44-45.

⁶¹Wilson, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

ancient bond between man and nature was destroyed.⁶²

The well-being of Egypt was directly associated with the king's. He was responsible for maintaining the cosmic order established by Re'. He was Re's successor, tracing his lineage back through human dynasties and the rule of the demigods to the god-dynasties upon earth which he would join in death (Isa. 19:11).⁶³

The capabilities of the Egyptian magicians must be quickly passed over. Two of them are named in 2 Tim. 3:8, Jannes and Jambres. They were capable of reproducing Moses' fetes of turning rods into serpents (7:11), turning water into blood (7:22), and in producing frogs (8:7). They failed to produce lice (8:19), and were incapacitated by the boils (9:11). As J. S. Wright states, "The account leaves us free to decide whether they were clever conjurors or whether they used occult methods."⁶⁴ Such speculation is not germane to this thesis.

The People Are Involved in the Movement.

In defining an effective political party as opposed to a faction, Max Weber says that a party has "active leadership" and a "freely recruited following".⁶⁵ A durable and regularized

⁶²Frankfort, op. cit., p. 342.

⁶³H. W. Fairman, in Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, S. H. Hooke, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), pp. 74-104.

⁶⁴J. S. Wright, "Magic and Sorcery," New Bible Dictionary (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962), p. 767.

⁶⁵W. N. Chambers, "Nation Building and the Rise of Parties," in Political Parties in a New Nation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 27.

relationship between leaders and followers is a mark of a true party structure as opposed to a faction whose relationships are built on purely emotional grounds. With a party there are definite emotional overtones, but there must be a distinguishable set of perspectives or ideology. As these perspectives are emotionalized, they develop into beliefs, which in turn emerge as a faith. Identification with a cause becomes loyalty. William Chambers states that "If men are available, attachments to revered leaders may reach charismatic intensity."⁶⁶ Any opposition to the cause creates an "in group" versus "out group" conflict.

Throughout the movement from slavery to Canaan there were attempts by Moses to involve the people. This was a crucial course in establishing his leadership. The early phase of the movement's development saw the transfer of the people's allegiance from Egypt and Pharaoh to God and Moses through the effectiveness of the plagues. This transfer was the most important feature in overcoming the slave mentality of the Hebrews.

Studies of group climates produced by democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire leadership indicates that democratic involvement produces more favorable responses in terms of "reduced aggression, more enjoyment, the absence of scapegoating, [and] more imaginative productivity."⁶⁷ A University of Michigan Survey Research Center's study concluded that "person-centered" leaders

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 29.

⁶⁷R. White and R. Lippitt, "Leader Behavior and Membership Reaction in Three 'Social Climates'," in D. Cartwright and A. Zander, eds., Group Dynamics (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1953), pp. 585-611.

have more positive effects than "production-centered" leaders.⁶⁸ It is this quality of involvement and personal concern for human needs that most distinguishes Moses' leadership, even to the point of wearing him down (18:13-23).

During this period of leader-follower contact Moses was busy counseling the Hebrew leadership which Pharaoh had evidently permitted to exist as a means of maintaining his control over the people. These were the shapers of the opinions held by the silent masses. Immediately upon his return to Egypt from Midian Moses had set out to "radicalize" this group of elders (4:29-31). He experienced an early success. This success was countered by Pharaoh's increasing the work load, his most important lever of control over the people (5:1ff), turning the people against Moses.

Throughout the plagues, Goshen, the home area of the Hebrews, was protected (8:22; 9:26; 10:23; 11:7). A distinct separation was established between the Hebrews and Egyptians; their deities and leaders, and thus their allegiances. This situation may be a precursor of the Black Power movement for producing a segregated sense of self-worth. God actually makes sport of the Egyptians (10:1,2) to give the Hebrews a sense of their relative superiority. Pharaoh's servants are seen pleading for relief (10:7-11). Only a complete turning of the roles of master and slave could bring about an equalizing of the sense of worth for these demoralized Hebrews.

This view of Hebrew self-worth comes to a peak (11:3) when Moses is recognized for his greatness by both the Hebrews and

⁶⁸R. Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961).

the Egyptians. The people themselves are favored by the Egyptians, thus driving a wedge between Pharaoh and his people.

It was in this moment that the cycle of oppression was broken. Social psychologists suggest that we see ourselves as others see us. We learn self-respect as others respect us.⁶⁹ Thus in gaining the respect of the Egyptians, the Hebrew slaves began to recognize their own humanity and began to crave freedom. Even Moses shows an exalted self-concept as he storms out of Pharaoh's presence in "hot anger" (11:8). The people were sufficiently emboldened to despoil the Egyptians (12:36).

Even as the charismatic-miraculous phase is hitting its climax, Moses begins the formal-institutionalized structuring of the experience in the Passover celebrations. Meticulous instructions are given for its observance (12:1-27). The command is that this is to be a perpetual observance (13:3), a remembrance of slavery and their escape. Moses is not unaware of the fleeting nature of the emotional, and therefore institutionalizes their experience early.

600,000 escape after 430 years in Egypt led by cloud and fire (12:33-13:22). Where was the Hebrew who had informed on Moses when he killed the Egyptian forcing him to escape into Midian exile (2:11-15)? Where was he and his kind the night of the exodus? Every slave revolt in the United States produced its traitors to the cause of Negro freedom. At this moment in

⁶⁹T. M. Newcomb, et. al., Social Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965), p. 142.

see also: C. H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York: Scribners, 1902).

history a social miracle was consummated. Every slave exchanged his loyalty to his master Pharaoh for loyalty to God and Moses.

Pharaoh pursues (14:5-9). As an example of how fleeting their new self-image as free people was, the Hebrews show the timidity of slaves as they remind Moses of their former plea. "Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians" rather than attain to freedom (14:12b). The deep psychological roots of slavery are evidenced already and continue to crop up in every difficult situation (12:1-3; Num. 11:5; 14:1-4; 16:12-14) until their last recorded murmur (Num. 20:2-5). Moses' leadership was so closely tied to the exodus that it was consistently challenged along with the expression on the part of the people of a desire to return to Egyptian slavery (Num. 14:4 and 16:12f).

Eventually, seeing that most of the people would not sufficiently overcome their dehumanized state to become a nation of conquerors God condemned the entire generation to wander in the wilderness until they had passed from the scene (Num. 14:23). Only two men, Caleb and Joshua, were capable of recovering a sense of self-worth (Num. 13-14:30).

The high point of Hebrew solidarity follows the drowning of the Egyptian army (14:30-31). The people express fear of God and belief in Moses. The Israelites and Moses join in song, noting how their enemies fear them and the women join Miriam on the tambourines (15:1-21).

From this point on the wilderness experience is one of constant strain for Moses, mediating between God and the people. A water-sweetener is provided at Marah (15:22-25a). In Exodus 16 quail and bread are provided. The people turn against Moses

due to a water shortage and prepare to stone him (17:1-4) before God provides a rock which Moses strikes for water (17:6). In chapter 17 Joshua defeats Amalek as Moses' hands are held aloft. Amalek is to be exterminated (genocide) by God (17:14). Again, there is the lesson of difference between Yahweh, His people, and those who serve other gods and who are lo ami, not God's people.

IV. STAGE III. FORMAL ORGANIZATION OF THE MOVEMENT

With the charismatic phase moving at a fanatically emotional level, Jethro, Moses' father-in-law and priest of Midian, joins the scene (18:1-9). In their third month out of Egypt a phase of formal organization is instituted. It is quite often the case that the charismatic figure prefers to operate on the level of the emotional and fails to see the need for formalizing the structure so that there is no need for his unusual gifts which were so important in the founding stages. Yet if some structure is not established, the movement dies with its founder.

Sociologists suggest that

Charismatic and traditional authority are related in this way: once a movement becomes established and organized routinization begins, life can no longer be lived in the high pitch of emotional commitment to the 'miraculous' cause but must become routine. Charismatic authority ... inevitably gives way to more traditional forms of authority.⁷⁰

Jethro was the "organization man". He proposed organizational streamlining to ease Moses' load. Moses had been

⁷⁰R. P. Lowry, and R. P. Rankin, Sociology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969); p. 460.

carrying on all of the day-to-day operations of the government himself (18:13-23). Jethro suggests establishing an organization whereby able men are chosen as "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens" (18:21). Having fulfilled his function as management consultant, Jethro leaves (18:27).

This organization by Jethro defied the nature of Moses' charismatic leadership. Max Weber says that charisma

by its very nature is not an 'institutional' and permanent structure, but, rather, where its 'pure' type is at work, it is the very opposite of the institutionally permanent. ... The holders of charisma, the master as well as his disciples and followers, must stand outside the ties of this world, outside routine occupations, as well as outside the routine obligations of family life.⁷¹

It was evidently on a mission to routinize Moses' family life that Jethro initially came (18:2). Jethro's title as "priest" was likely an institutional role in Midian. Possibly as an organizational fixture himself, he resented Moses' charismatic role attained since leaving Midian. Looking at later stages of the movement in which there was renewed charismatic injection, there are indications that it may have been only family pressure and not personal conviction that led Moses to accept this new structure. This will be discussed at greater length when other charismatic periods occur later.

⁷¹H. H. Gerth, and C. W. Mills (eds.), Max Weber (London: Dignan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1947), pp. 247-248.

Codification of the Laws.

As a part of the organizational stage comes a period in which the laws are established (19-23). With the formal apparatus to handle cases (18:21), legal codes are set down. "Charisma may become routinized into traditional forms, and tradition may be transformed into legal forms."⁷²

Two central problems of institutionalized life are identified by Weber. They help to bring about a transition to formalized, codified structure. One problem is the succession of leadership, which may have been foreseen by Jethro and the elders of Israel and even Moses himself (18:18). Having passed his eightieth birthday Moses was no doubt feeling the pressures of the daily routine as well as those brought on by crises.

A second problem tending to bring about a transition to a more formal structure is security for the official staff. It is quite conceivable that leaders (18:21) who had come to the top through personal qualities wanted their positions to become more secure through receiving official recognition and titles.

Moses was now living in a period in which the original charismatic nature of the movement was existing side-by-side with more traditional forms of authority. Following the codification of the laws there is another charismatic period preceding a more mundane setting down of specific ordinances. In Exodus 19 God discusses a Covenant with Moses through which the people will be uniquely attached to God as "a holy nation",

⁷²M. Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 364f.

a "kingdom of priests", (19:6). Thus the formal title of "priest" is to be transmitted charismatically to the entire nation. The elders were informed and the people agreed (19:7-9a). The people are consecrated for this charismatic experience and warned not to approach the Mount where God addresses the people as the One who delivered them from Egyptian slavery (20:2). The people experience fear of the phenomena and are counseled to "sin not" (20:20).

After the lofty Decalogue is delivered more specific ordinances are given. During this encounter, Moses, the elders, and the people are shown as distinct in their distance from God (24:1,2,9-11,12-14); Moses alone going into the presence of God (24:15-18). The pattern of the Tabernacle is then established (25:1 - 31:17).

As Moses receives the two tables of law, the people are asking, Whatever became of Moses? (32:1). Aaron complies with their request to make gods and God passes the word on to Moses. God wants to consume these people who are still showing their allegiance to Egypt, still rejecting their own unique identity (32:10). Moses pleads for their protection, reminding God of His oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (32:13). This is simply a continuation of the slave mentality problem with which Moses has had to deal in taking Egypt and slavery out of the people. The Levites are enlisted, similar to Mao's Red Guards, to purify the revolution by purging the opponents of Yahweh (32:25-29).

V. STAGE IV. A REACTIVIST STAGE:

RENEWED CHARISMA

This institutes what may best be termed a Reactivist Stage. Having come full cycle, Moses has led the people into a second period of charismatic rule following a period of formal organization which may have been instituted too early. The people are forced to drink the water into which the ground gold has been thrown (32:15-20). Sin would be dealt with individually rather than by permitting the leader to atone for the people (32:30-34) as Moses had done in the past (32:13).

This leads the people into a period of mourning and worship (35:1-6). Moses and God hold a private conference as the uniqueness of Moses' position as God's friend is disclosed (33:11). Moses then holds a forty-day fast (34:1). A purging of foreign elements which had caused their corruption then takes place (34:10-17).

The numinous is introduced as Moses' face shone when he returned from recording the Covenant (34:29-35) and the people were afraid. After experiencing renewal a freewill offering was taken by those whose hearts were stirred (35:20-29). Their emotion is indicated in that they had to be restrained from giving too much (36:6,7). Max Weber found that

Frequently charisma quite deliberately shuns the possessions of money and of pecuniary income per se, as did St. Francis ... Charismatic political heroes seek booty and, above all, gold. But charisma, and this is decisive, always rejects as undignified any pecuniary gain that is methodical and rational.⁷³

⁷³Gerth, op. cit., pp. 247-248.

Overemotionalizing its constituency has often led to the corrupting of a charismatic movement.⁷⁴

The efforts of the purified movement are then thrown into activity, building the tabernacle (35:10 - 40:38). Moses' participation in its erection shows his charismatic participation with the people (40:16-33) in this second year after their departure from Egypt (40:2).

Evidence of charisma not only is prominent in the major phases of the movement, but is scattered throughout the Exodus history. Joshua is in a prominent position, going up into the tent during Moses' talk with God as "his friend" (33:11), as well as joining him on the mountain (24:12-14). Bezalel, the general contractor, and Oholiab are filled with the Spirit of God for craftsmanship to work on the tabernacle, a unique kind of charismatic gift (31:3, and 35:30-35).

VI. STAGE V. LATER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MOVEMENT:

FORMAL DEVELOPMENT WITH INJECTIONS OF CHARISMA

Following these first four stages of the movement as recorded in Exodus, the political, social, and religious development of the Israelites settled into a more formal organization with periodic injections of the charismatic. A solidification has already begun in the setting down of feasts, legal codes, and a place of worship. This is continued in the establishment of formal religious practices (Lev. 1-7),* including a hierarchy

⁷⁴L. Festinger, et. al., When Prophecy Fails (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956), pp. 193ff.

*The following references are from Leviticus.

of priests.

Deviation from the set ritual ends in death for two of Aaron's sons, Nadab and Abihu (10:2). The people are to maintain unswerving allegiance to God (11:44,45; 20:7) as a holy people, "for I am holy". Worshipers of Molech will be stoned to death (20:2). Yet the people are to maintain the highest social relations with other peoples within Israel (19). This indicates some sensitivity that they not repeat the unkindness shown them in Egypt.

By the time the 603,550 people left Mount Sinai their basic organizational structure had been met and their customs developed. A period of unrest broke out with desire for Egyptian food (Num. 11:15)** instead of manna. Moses complains that God has made him a "nursing-father" (11:11) to an infantile people.⁷⁵ He is almost ready to commit suicide (11:15).

The Charismatic Stage Renewed.

At this point God has Moses bring in seventy elders on whom He will confer his charisma ("the Spirit which is upon thee", (11:17)). God promises enough flesh to eat that it will come out of their nostrils (11:20) because of their complaining. Thus, after a period of passivity on the part of the people as Moses worshipped and received the Law, they find a point around which they can build a contention, complain, are rebuked, and a new injection of charisma is given. This is typical of the remainder of their history in the desert.

**The following references are from Numbers.

⁷⁵S. Freud, Moses and Monotheism (New York: Knopf, 1939), p. 32.

It is interesting that with the previous attempt at formal organization at the suggestion of Jethro, there was no sealing with charisma. There is no indication in the text that God had given special gifts to those chosen to rule. It may be that God had a timetable which was superseded by Jethro's suggestion. If so some of the intervening events should be studied in this light.

That the charismatic gifts were not Moses' alone is indicated in 11:26-29, where Eldad and Medad prophesied. Moses expresses the hope that "all Jehovah's people were prophets", (see 1 Cor. 12:2f; 11:4; Acts 2:17f; 19:6).

An incident over Moses' miscegenation with a Cushite woman led to a challenge of Moses' charisma (12:1,2). Miriam and Aaron ask: "Hath Jehovah indeed spoken only with Moses? hath he not spoken also with us?" (12:2). In a tabernacle conference with Moses and his siblings, God makes it clear that Moses is unique among prophets. God speaks with him "mouth to mouth" and not in visions or dreams (12:6-8). Miriam is turned leprous, which condition is terminated after seven days due to Moses' intercession (12:10-15).

At the peak of this new charismatic phase, Moses sends spies to Canaan on a forty day mission (13). Presentation of the negative majority report brings a negative reaction from the people. Again they express a preference for the passive existence they had in Egypt (14:2-4), along with a call for new leadership. God threatens pestilence (14:12) and Moses chides them with the thought of what the Egyptians would think if they heard of him injuring the Israelites (14:13).

It was then determined that the generation that complained would not see Canaan (14:23), but would wander in the desert forty years. The ten who presented the majority report died of the plague (14:37), whereas Caleb and Joshua were exempted from the curse of not seeing the promised land (14:30). The people were then shown that they lacked the qualities which brought them this far. They were roundly defeated in a battle God had not authorized (14:44,45) when only human capacities were at their disposal.

Moses' special standing was challenged by the rebel Korah in Numbers 16. Korah told Moses and Aaron, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy . . ." (16:3). This is an interesting argument for generalized charisma. As sons of Levi, Korah and his company had been put in a favored position similar to that Moses had enjoyed in Egypt. They were not impressed with Moses' special gift for leadership. Therefore Moses established a test to confirm who had God's special blessing (16:16-30). Moses' charismatic leadership was confirmed when the earth opened to swallow Korah and his followers (16:32). Thus the special standing of the people as "holy" was not to be equated with Moses' charismatic gift for leadership.

When the people then complained to Moses about the mass execution, "Ye have killed the people of Jehovah," God offered to consume them (16:41-45). Moses' atonement halted the plague after 14,700 had died in the Korah rebellion (16:46-50). Aaron was then promoted to special responsibility through a miraculous budding of his rod (17:8).

A new rebellion was initiated after the death of Miriam in

Kadesh. Again the people expressed a desire to return to Egypt due to the lack of water (20:2-5). Moses was told to speak to the rock (20:8), but after making a speech Moses struck the rock twice with his rod (20:11), producing the desired water. At this, God made clear that the charisma Moses held was a gift. Moses would not see Canaan because of his disobedience. God would find another leader (20:12,13).

Unlike Pharaoh's claim to divinity, Moses held his authority at the behest of deity and he was never to be confused with the divine person.⁷⁶ Along with Moses, his brother Aaron was carried to the grave because of the waters of Meribah (20:24-29).

The last recorded murmur of the people against God and Moses and in favor of Egypt (21:5) occurs just after a military triumph for which the people had plead (21:1-3). God's reaction was swift. Fiery serpents bit many who died of the poison (21:6). When they repented, a brazen serpent was made which the people looked at and were healed (21:9).

As the people began to mix more with foreigners the problem of religious integrity is presented (Num. 25). Baal worshippers are slain (25:5) as is a man of Israel found with a woman of Midian (25:6-15), Moses' wife's home. The Midianites are to be smitten (25:16). At this point the people number 601,730 (Num. 26).

⁷⁶K. A. Kitchen, "Egypt," New Bible Dictionary (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962), p. 351.

Transfer of Charisma.

As Moses approaches his death (27:12), Joshua is introduced as "a man in whom is the Spirit", a definite charismatic appellation (27:18). According to Weber this cannot happen. He says that at the point of transfer the charismatic power embodied in the leader becomes institutionalized. The new leader takes on authority through a process of coronation. The new leader may not embody charisma in his person, but has the mantle of the office placed upon him.⁷⁷

Tithing had already been instituted (Lev. 27:30-33; Num. 18:21-24; Deut. 12:6,7,17,19; 14:22-29; 26:12-15), so that the financial structure had been set for the support of the government and priests. The official structure is no longer at the mercy of freewill offerings (Ex. 36:6,7). Max Weber maintains:

For charisma to be transformed into a permanent routine structure it is necessary that its antieconomic character should be altered. It must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization to provide for the needs of the group and hence to the economic conditions necessary for raising taxes and contributions.⁷⁸

In the first several chapters of Leviticus, which takes place at the Sinai encampment, there is a discussion of the status structure within Israel. One writer sees this as a part of the formalization process:

... the moment an emerging organization begins to establish a budget to finance its operation, routinization is under way. Changes occur in

⁷⁷M. Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1947), pp. 368-369.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 370.

every aspect of the movement including the character of the leadership.⁷⁹

Therefore, it is intriguing that Joshua had received a direct gift for leadership of the Hebrews.

Besides this intrinsic gift, Moses is to "put of thine honor upon him" (27:20) in an Elijah-Elisha type inauguration. Considering the difficulty of transferring political charisma in modern times, it is significant that Joshua already has charisma in him before Moses confers a special honor upon him.

In the final section of this work, final conclusions will be drawn from what has already been set out at length.

⁷⁹R. P. Lowry, and R. P. Rankin, Sociology: The Science of Society (New York: Scribners, 1969), p. 462.

CONCLUSION

To Moses preeminently belongs the concept of charismatic leadership. He fits perfectly Max Weber's description of the charismatic type:

as one at the vanguard of wrenching, large scale, social changes. ... combines magic and creativity, ... blazes new paths and is able to compel others to follow. He deploys his own exceptional qualities to allay the fears that accompany change. He exists totally outside of existing establishments but is able to envelop his followers and thus provide a nurturance and structure all his own.⁸⁰

Walter L. Wilson reflects on whether or not Moses can be considered a "type" of the future Messiah. He mentions Moses' work as a mediator between God and the people and that Moses was rejected by Israel the same number of times that Jesus was rejected while on earth. Similarities can be seen in Jesus' being clothed with glory on the Mount of Transfiguration and Moses' experience on Mount Sinai (Deut. 18:15).⁸¹

Yet much clearer parallels can be drawn between Jesus and Moses than these improbable coincidences. Notice in the discussion by Milton Rokeach of Jesus' charisma the points already discovered in Moses' capacities for leadership:

- 1) Jesus' own charisma has stood the test of constant emulation.
- 2) ... he was infinitely credible to his followers as one of extraordinary dimensions. Here was a man proclaiming a mission against enormous odds, a mission that sought to impose a new cultural order by altering traditions and structures. ... The

⁸⁰W. J. Demerath, and P. E. Hammond, Religion in Social Context (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 60.

⁸¹W. L. Wilson, Wilson's Dictionary of Bible Types (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 313.

aura of magic and miracles was crucial to both the mission and its wider acceptance. Indeed, in the light of such magic and miracles, the mission became less important than simply following the man.⁸²

Yet as with Jesus, Moses was even more than charismatic. He was traditional; note his identifications with Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (Ex. 2:24; 3:6,15,16, etc.). His appeal was also rational; note the specific character of his legal work in Leviticus. But above all he was charismatic. From the day of the burning bush call he was ignited with a flaming heart for his mission.

Moses was not a democratically chosen leader although there are elements of the democratic in his assuming of a new role. We have already discussed his meetings with the elders prior to the exodus and his constant interaction with the people throughout his lifetime. He did not have royal blood in his veins. His elevation to the job was as charismatic as his performance on the job. He worked under the guidance of God even at the displeasure of his human constituency.

If the question were to be asked, "Was Moses the kind of leader the people would have freely chosen?" it would have to be answered, "yes and no". The question must be placed in a time context. At the time of their oppression in Egypt the Hebrews seemed prepared for drastic remedies (Ex. 2:23) as would be presented by Moses. Yet they were not prepared for Moses' leadership prior to his escape into Midian exile when he struck the first blow for freedom (2:12). The divine call and the

⁸²M. Rokeach, Three Christs of Ypsilanti (New York: Knopf, 1964), p. 102f.

accompanying performance of magic were certainly necessary to prove that this was not just another plot to be aborted by an Uncle Tom informer. Yet not even proof of divine guidance was enough to convince them that they should endure misery for their future good.

History has been notably unkind to charismatic leaders during their lifetimes. As soon as England had accomplished the defeat of her enemies in World War II., Winston Churchill was replaced as Prime Minister by Clement Atlee, a notibly uncharismatic figure. Only in times of crisis is the charismatic leader popular. There are men of charisma in history who have used manufactured crises to maintain power for this reason. Fidel Castro has exploited the rhetoric of fear to convince his people that the United States would move into the vacuum if he were removed from the scene, a statement with sufficient historical proof to be believable. Charles DeGaulle's majorities in Presidential elections were measured by the felt insecurity of the French people at the time of the election.

Praise of Moses was at its peak immediately following a crisis which the people realized they would not have survived without his leadership (Ex. 11:1-3). It was during periods of relative calm and security that explosions of antipathy erupted with moves to replace him. He was almost stoned after God had provided quail and bread to provide an atmosphere of security (Ex. 16:13f). In Moses' speeches in Deuteronomy he makes constant references to crises through which he had led them thus maintaining his position as their deliverer. He reminds them of their former state of bandage, hunger and destitution in

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Egypt (Deut. 6:12,21; 7:8,18; 8:14; 10:19; 11:3,10; 13:5,10; 15:15; 16:1,3,6,12; 17:16; 24:17,22; 26:5,6; 28:27,59,60,68; 29:16,25). Never did he permit them to forget their former state from which he had led them.

Moses refused to feel jealousy over the favor shown lesser men by the people even when God wanted to destroy his enemies (Ex. 32:1-10). His standing had not been established by political maneuvering, but by unusual qualities of leadership and divine favor (Num. 12:2-10; 14:4ff; 16:1-30).

Moses' leadership, if it had been by election of the Hebrew people, would have been on the order of that discussed in the book of Judges. There the charismatic leaders were called upon only in times of crisis. Moses would have been on the scene at the Red Sea to provide the miracle necessary for that day, but would have been immediately deposed until the crisis of hunger came at which time he would have been recalled for another miracle. Charismatic leaders may be seen as mother-types in that they are the security required for troubled times.

Moses' most significant social achievement was that of taking an enslaved people, obviously dehumanized, and leading them to freedom in spite of their unwillingness to go. At this point his charisma was at its pinnacle. This will set Moses apart from all other men for all time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Abernathy, T. P. From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932.
- Adorno, T. W., Elsa Frenkel-Brunswick, D. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Albright, William F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1942.
- _____. The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra: An Historical Survey. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963.
- _____. From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957.
- Allis, O. T. God Spoke By Moses. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1951.
- Allport, Floyd H. Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1924.
- Aptheker, Herbert. American Negro Slave Revolts. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Atlas, Samuel. Moses in the Philosophy of Maimonides. Cincinnati: Spinoza and Solomon Maimon, 1954.
- Auerbach, Elias. Moses. Amsterdam: G. J. A. Ruys, 1953.
- Baldwin, James. The Fire Next Time. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1963.
- Bales, Robert F. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.
- _____. Alexander P. Hare. Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Barclay, William. "Acts," in Daily Study Bible. Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1953.
- _____. "Hebrews," in Daily Study Bible. Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1953.
- Barnard, C. I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948.

- Barnes, Albert. An Inquiry into the Scriptural Views of Slavery. Philadelphia: Perkins and Purves, 1846.
- Bensman, Joseph. Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy: The Evolution of Contemporary Society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Berger, Peter L. A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969.
- The Bible: American Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.
- Blong, Georges. The Great Migrations, Trans. Frances Frenaye. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Bowie, Walter R. Great Men of the Bible. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.
- Bradbury, William C. Mass Behavior in Battle and Captivity: the Communist Soldier in the Korean War. Research Studies directed by William C. Bradbury, Ed. by Samuel M. Myers and Albert D. Biderman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Breasted, James H. A History of Egypt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.
- Buber, Martin. Moses: The Revelation and the Covenant. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Bull, L. The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East. Ed. Robert C. Denton. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955, pp. 3-34.
- Carmichael, Stokely, and Charles V. Hamilton. Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Chace, William M., and Peter Collier (eds.). Justice Denied: The Black Man in White America. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.
- Chandler, Albert R. Beauty and Human Nature. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934.
- Childs, Brevard S. Memory and Tradition in Israel. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 37. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, 1962.
- _____. Myth and Reality in the Old Testament. 2nd ed., Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 27. London: SCM Press, 1962.

- Cohen, Morris R. Reason and Nature: An Essay on the Meaning of Scientific Method. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931.
- Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millennium. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribners, 1902.
- Cottrell, Leonard. Life Under the Pharaohs. London: Evans Brothers, 1955.
- _____. The Lost Pharaohs. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Coulton, G. G. Medieval Village, Manor, and Monastery. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.
- Cox, Catherine M. The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses, Vol. 2. Genetic Studies of Genius. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1926.
- Cronin, Edmund D. Black Moses. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.
- Davies, John T. Sublimation. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- Davis, R. Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptians, Hebrew, Roman. London: Methuen and Company, 1951.
- Demarath, N. J. III., and Phillip E. Hammond. Religion in Social Context: Tradition and Transition. New York: Random House, 1969.
- de Wit, Constant. The Date and Route of the Exodus. London: Tyndale Press, 1960.
- Elkins, Stanley. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional Life. 2nd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Elliott-Binns, L. From Moses to Elisha, Old Testament, Vol. II., The Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Fairman, H. W. Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Ed. Samuel H. Hooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Falls, Cyril Bentham (ed.). Great Military Battles. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.
- Festinger, Leon, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter. When Prophecy Fails: A Social and Psychological Study of a Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956.

- Fishel, Leslie H. Jr., and Benjamin Quarles. The Negro American: A Documentary History. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.
- Fleg, Edmond. The Life of Moses. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1928.
- Flight, John W., and S. L. Fahs. Moses: Egyptian Prince, Nomad Sheikh, Lawgiver. Boston: Beacon Press, 1942.
- Frankfort, Henri A. Ancient Egyptian Religion. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1955.
- _____. Kingship and the Gods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans, 3rd ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Frazier, Thomas R. (ed.). Afro-American History: Primary Sources. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.
- Freud, Sigmund. The Future of an Illusion. Trans. W. D. Robson-Scott. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1964.
- _____. Moses and Monotheism. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1939.
- _____. Totem and Taboo. Trans. A. A. Brill. New York: Vintage Press, 1960.
- Fromm, Erich. Escape From Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- _____. Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1947.
- _____. The Sane Society. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1955.
- Galton, F. Hereditary Genius. London: The Macmillan Company, 1925.
- Gardiner, Sir Alan H. Egypt of the Pharaohs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Gerth, H. H., and C. Wright Mills (eds.). Max Weber. London: Digan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1947.
- Gilbert, G. H. The Psychology of Dictatorship. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.
- Glanville, S. R. H. (ed.). The Legacy of Egypt. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Goodman, Paul (ed.). The Federalists vs. the Jeffersonian Republicans. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

- Guest, R. H. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1962.
- Hall, Harry R. The Ancient History of the Near East, 11th ed. London: Methuen, 1960.
- Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.
- Hayes, William C. Scepter of Egypt. New York: Harper, in cooperation with the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1960.
- Healy, W. Personality in Formation and Action. New York: W. W. Norton, 1938.
- Herzberg, A. The Psychology of Philosophers. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, 1929.
- Heschel, Abraham J. The Prophets. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Hillis, Newell D. Great Men as Prophets of a New Era. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922.
- Hirsch, Nathanael D. M. Genius and Creative Intelligence. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Sci-art Publishers, 1931.
- Hitschmann, Edward. Great Men: Psychoanalytic Studies. Ed. Sydney G. Margolin with Hannah Gunters; forward by Ernest Jones. New York: International Universities Press, 1956.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements. New York: Time Incorporated Book Division, 1963.
- Hopkins, John H. A Scriptural, Ecclesiastical, and Historical View of Slavery, from the days of the Patriarch Abraham, to the Nineteenth Century. New York: W. I. Pooley, 1864.
- Horne, Charles F. Great Men and Famous Women. New York: S. Hess, 1894.
- Huizinga, Johan. The Waning of the Middle Ages. London: St. Martin's Press, 1924.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. Palestine and Its Transformation. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912.
- Huxley, Aldous. Brave New World Revisited. New York: Perennial Library, Harper and Row, 1958.
- Jacobsen, Thorhild. The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man. Edited by H. and H. A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson, and William A. Irwin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.

- James, Fleming. Personalities of the Old Testament. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- Jay, William. An Examination of the Mosaic Laws of Servitude. New York: M. W. Dodd, 1854.
- Kees, Hermann. Ancient Egypt: A Cultural Topography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Kittel, Rudolf. Great Men and Movements in Israel. Trans. Charlotte A. Knoch and C. D. Wright. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Klineberg, Otto. Social Psychology, rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1954.
- Lansing, Marion F. Great Moments in Freedom. Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, 1930.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., William H. Sewell, and Harold L. Wilensky, (eds.). The Uses of Sociology. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967.
- Lebon, Gustave. The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind. London: E. Benn, 1896.
- Levy-Bruhl, Lucien. How Natives Think. Trans. Lilian A. Claire. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1926.
- Likert, R. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Lombroso, Cesare. The Man of Genius. London: W. Scott, 1891.
- Lowry, Ritchie P., and Robert P. Rankin. Sociology: The Science of Society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Maglish, Bruce. Psychoanalysis and History. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall (Spectrum), 1963.
- Mendelsohn, Isaac. Legal Aspects of Slavery in Babylonia and Palestine, A Comparative Study (3000-500 B.C.). Williamsport, Pennsylvania: The Bayard Press, 1932.
- _____. Slavery in the Ancient Near East. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Messner, Gerald (ed.). Another View: To Be Black in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.
- Mielzinger, Moses. The Institution of Slavery Among the Ancient Hebrews. Cincinnati: Block Printing Company, 1894.

- Moscatti, Sabatino. The Face of the Ancient Orient. Trans. from the Italian original. London: Routledge and Paul, 1960.
- Neher, Andre. Moses: And the Vocation of the Jewish People. Trans. Irene Marinoff. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a Student Community. New York: Dryden Press, 1943.
- _____. Ralph H. Turner, and Philip E. Converse. Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Neustadt, Richard E. Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Nisbet, Robert A. Emile Durkheim: With Selected Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Norwood, Frederick A. Great Moments in Church History. New York: Pocket Books, 1961.
- Packard, Vance. The Status Seekers. New York: Pocket Books, 1961.
- Parsons, Talcott. Sociological Theory and Modern Society. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- _____, and Robert F. Bales. Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.
- Pedersen, Johannes. Israel: Its Life and Culture. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Petrie, Sir William M. F. Egypt and Israel. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1923.
- _____. Six Temples at Thebes. London: B. Zuaritch, 1897.
- Pinkney, Alphonso. Black Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Moses. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Rankin, Oliver S. Jewish Religious Polcmic of Early and Later Centuries. Edinburgh: University Press, 1956.
- Rawlinson, George. Moses: His Life and Times. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1887.
- Renan, Ernest. History of the People of Israel. Vol. I. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1888.

- Resh, Richard (ed.). Black America: Confrontation and Accommodation in the Twentieth Century. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1969.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1935.
- Rokeach, Milton. Three Christs of Ypsilanti. New York: Knopf, 1964.
- Ross, H. Laurence. Perspectives on the Social Order: Readings in Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Sanders, Frank K. History of the Hebrews: Their Political, Social, and Religious Development. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Schlessinger, Arthur M. Jr. The Age of Jackson. New York: Mentor Books, 1945.
- Seale, Keith C., and George Steindorff. When Egypt Ruled the East. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Carolyn Sherif. Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.
- Silverman, Sondra (ed.). The Black Revolt and Democratic Politics. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1970.
- Skinner, B. F. Science and Human Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Smith, Arthur L. Rhetoric of Black Revolution. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.
- Stampp, Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Slave and Citizen: The Negro in the Americas. New York: Vintage Books, 1946.
- Teggart, F. J. Theory of History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.
- Thiselton-Dyer, Thomas F. Great Men at Play. London: Remington and Company, 1839.
- Trotter, W. D. Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War. London: T. F. Lewin, 1916.
- Van Buren, Martin. Inquiry into the Origin and Course of Political Parties in the United States. New York: Ford, and Houghton, 1867.

- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions,
Trans. John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism,
Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner, 1928.
- _____. The Sociology of Religion, Trans. Ephraim Fischhoff.
Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- _____. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, ed. of
Talcott Parsons; trans. A. A. Henderson and Talcott Parsons.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Weisfeld, Israel H. This Man Moses. New York: Bloch Publishing
Company, 1966.
- Wexberg, Erwin. Individual Psychology, Trans. W. Biran Wolfe.
New York: Cosmopolitan Book Corporation, 1929.
- Williams, Roger. Free and Unequal: The Biological Basis of
Individual Liberty. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1953.
- _____. The Human Frontier. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Com-
pany, 1946.
- Wilson, John A. The Culture of Ancient Egypt. Chicago: Univer-
sity of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Wright, G. Ernest. God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital.
Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 8. London: SCM, 1952.
- _____. The Old Testament Against Its Environment. Studies
in Biblical Theology, No. 2. London: SCM, 1950.
- Wood, Irving F. The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature. New
York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1904.
- Yetman, Norman R. Life Under the "Peculiar Institution": Selec-
tions from the Slave Narrative Collection. New York: Holt,
Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Young, Edward J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Zilboorg, Gregory. Psychoanalysis and Religion. New York:
Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES,
AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Albright, William F. Approaches to World Peace. New York: Council on Science, Philosophy and Religion, 1943.

Bakir, Abd El-Mohsen. Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt. Le Caire: Imprimerie De L'Institut Francais D'Archeologie Orientale, 1952.

Bloomhardt, Paul F. The Great Man in History. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, Vol. L., 1941, pp. 233-243.

Fleishman, E. A., W. E. Burt, and E. F. Harris. Leadership and Supervision in Industry: An Evaluation of a Supervisory Training Program. Columbus, Ohio: Monograph No. 33, Bureau of Educational Research.

Hodgson, R. C., D. J. Levinson, and A. Zaleznik. The Executive Role Constellation: An Analysis of Personality and Role Relations in Management. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, Division of Research, 1965.

Howie, Carl G. "Psychological Aspects of Ezekiel and His Prophecy," chapter 4 in The Date and Composition of Ezekiel. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950.

MacIver, A. M. Levels of Explanation in History and Philosophy, the symposia read at the joint session of the Aristotelian Society and the Mind Association at Cambridge, July 4th - 6th, 1947. Supplementary Vol. XXI., Aristotelian Society Proceedings. London: Harrison, 1947.

Wright, John Stafford. "The Bearing of Psychical Research Upon the Interpretation of the Bible," in the Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, Vol. LXXX, pp. 33-55. London: The Institute, 1948.

C. PERIODICALS

- Berger, Peter L. "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (December, 1963), pp. 940-950.
- Borgatta, Edgar F., Arthur S. Couch, and Robert F. Bales. "Some Findings Relevant to the Great Man Theory of Leadership," American Sociological Review, XIX (September, 1954), pp. 755-759.
- Broome, Edwin C. "Ezekiel's Abnormal Psychology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (September, 1946), pp. 277-292.
- Demarest, Michael (ed.). "The New Ministry: Bringing God Back to Life," Time (December 26, 1969), p. 41.
- Handlin, O, and M. F. Handlin. "Origins of the Southern Labor Systems," William and Mary Quarterly, VII (April, 1950), pp. 199-222.
- Hyman, Herbert H. "The Psychology of Status," Archives of Psychology, No. 289 (1942).
- James, William. "Great Men, Great Thoughts and the Environment," Atlantic Monthly, XLVI (October, 1880), pp. 441-459.
- Jenson, Arthur. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, XXXIX (Winter, 1969), pp. 3-41.
- Kueng, Hans. "Charismatic Structure of the Church," Christian Heritage Magazine (January, 1966), p. 27.
- Lewin, Kurt, and Ronald Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy," Sociometry, I (1938), pp. 292-300.
- Mendelsohn, Isaac. "Slavery in the Ancient Near East," Biblical Archaeologist (1946), p. 88.
- Resnik, Henry S. "A Special Awareness About Mankind," an essay review of History and Human Survival by Robert Jay Lifton, Random House, Saturday Review, LV (February 21, 1970), pp. 35-38.
- Rowley, H. H. "Moses and the Decalogue," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (January, 1951), pp. 81ff.
- "Time Essay: What Ever Happened to Charisma," Time (October 17, 1969), pp. 40-41.
- Voyat, Gilbert, "I.Q.: God-Given or Man Made?" Saturday Review, LII (May 17, 1969), pp. 73ff.

Zaleznik, A. "Managerial Behavior and Interpersonal Competence," Behavioral Science (1964), pp. 156-166.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Breasted, James H. "The Foundation and Expansion of the Egyptian Empire," chapter 3 in The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. II., eds. J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. 40-66.

Brodbeck, May (ed.). "Methodological Individualisms: Definition and Reduction," in Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1968, pp. 280-303.

Chambers, William N. "Nation Building and the Rise of Parties," in Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 1-52.

Eisenstadt, S. N. "The Nature of Charismatic Authority and Its Routinization," in Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building, section 6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 48ff.

Kelley, H. H. "Two Functions of Reference Groups," in Readings in Social Psychology, Rev. ed., Eds. Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley. New York: H. Holt, 1952.

Parsons, Talcott. "Prophecy, Charisma, and the Process of Break-through," in Sociological Theory and Modern Society. New York: The Free Press, 1967, pp. 49ff.

Rossiter, Clinton. "Alexander Hamilton and the Politics of Federalism," in Alexander Hamilton and the Constitution. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964, pp. 113-149.

Terman, L. M. "Talent and Genius in Children," in the New Generation, Eds. Victor Calverton, and Samuel D. Schmalhausen. New York: Macauley, 1930.

Wilson, John A. "Egypt," in Before Philosophy: The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, Eds. H. and F. A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson, and Thorkild Jacobsen. Baltimore: Pelican, 1946, chapters 2,3,4.

White, R., and R. Lippitt. "Leader Behavior and Membership Reaction in Three Social Climates," in Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, Eds. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1953, pp. 585-611.

E. ENCYCLOPEDIA, DICTIONARY, AND LEXICON MATERIALS

- Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Attwater, Donald (ed.). A Catholic Dictionary, 3d ed. New York: Macmillan, 1958.
- Benzinger, Immanuel. "Slavery," Encyclopedia Biblica, Ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, Vol. IV. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1903, pp. 4653f.
- Carey, M. "Slave," Vocabulary of the Bible, Ed. Jean J. von Allmen. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958, p. 410.
- Davidson, Benjamin. "Servant, Slave," The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1963, pp. 582-584.
- Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1890, pp. 887f.
- Ewing, W. "Cities of Refuge," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, pp. 2545-2546.
- "Genius," Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed, X, p. 116.
- Gesenius, William. "Serve," A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907, pp. 712-716.
- Girdlestone, Robert B. "Service," Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1897, p. 248.
- Glueck, Nelson. "Egypt," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, IV, 1941, pp. 5-11.
- Gould, Julius, and William L. Kolb (eds.). A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 84.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. u. Verlagstalt: Graz, Akademische Druck, 1954.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. "Egypt," The New Bible Dictionary, 1st ed. London: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, pp. 343-351.
- _____. "Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian Magic," The New Bible Dictionary. London: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, pp. 766-771.
- _____. "Moses," The New Bible Dictionary. London: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, pp. 843-850.

- _____. "Slave, Slavery," The New Bible Dictionary. London: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, pp. 1195-1199.
- A Lexicon: Abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1871.
- Mackae, D. G. "Charisma," A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 84.
- Nave, Orville J. "Servant, Cyrus, Egypt," Nave's Topical Bible. Chicago: Moody Press, n.d.
- Orelli, C. von. "Prophecy, Prophets," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, pp. 2459-2466.
- Pinches, T. G. "Cyrus," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, pp. 773-776.
- Posener, Georges. "Syria," Dictionary of Egyptian Civilization. London: Methuen and Company, 1957, pp. 147, 150-161.
- Raffety, William E. "Slave, Slavery," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, pp. 2815-2817.
- Rengslorf, Karl H. "δουλος," Theological Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, p. 261.
- Stein, Jesse (ed.). Random House Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Wiener, H. M. "Asylum," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, pp. 316-317.
- Wilson, Walter L. Wilson's Dictionary of Bible Types. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957, p. 313.
- Wiseman, D. J. "Cyrus," The New Bible Dictionary. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, p. 286.
- Wright, John S. "Magic and Sorcery," The New Bible Dictionary. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962, pp. 766-768.
- Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance of the Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d., pp. 861-865.

F. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Burkow, Elihu. "The Psychology of the Prophetic Personality," Cincinnati, 1961, Restricted, Prize Essay, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

AUTHORITARIAN VERSUS DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP¹Authoritarian

All determination of policy by the strongest person (leader).

Techniques and steps of attaining the goal ... dictated by the authority, one at a time, so that future direction was always uncertain to a large degree.

The authority usually structured autocratically the activities of each member-- the task and whom to work with.

The dominator criticized and praised individual's activities and remained aloof from group participation. He was always impersonal rather than outwardly hostile or friendly ...

Democratic

All policies a matter of group determination encouraged and drawn out by the leader.

Activity perspective given by an explanation of the general steps of the process ... during discussion at first meeting. Where technical advice was needed the leader tried to point out 2 or 3 alternative procedures from which choice could be made.

The members were free to work with whomever they chose and the division of tasks was left up to the group.

The leader attempted to be a group member in spirit but not in actual work. He gave criticism and praise, generally in regard to the group as a whole.

Conclusions.

1. A higher state of tension existed in the atmosphere of the autocratic group as shown by the following:
 - a) A much higher volume of social interactions (55% more) in spite of the fact that the ongoing activity demanded less communication than in the democratic group.
 - b) A less stable group structure was maintained.
 - c) More ascendancy and less submissiveness and objectivity of members toward each other.
 - d) The development of two scapegoats during twelve meetings.

¹K. Lewin, and R. Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy," Sociometry, I., 1938, pp. 292-300.

- c) About thirty times as much hostility was expressed between members as in the democratic group.
- 2. More cooperative endeavor emerged in the democratic group.
 - a) A much higher incidence of offering and asking for cooperation.
 - b) Many more occurrences of praise and expressions of friendliness.
- 3. More expressions of an objective attitude in the democratic group.
 - a) Many more constructive suggestions offered.
 - b) More give and take of objective criticism without personal involvement.
- 4. Constructiveness was higher in the democratic group.
 - a) Superiority of the group products.
 - b) More careless and unvinished work in the autocratic group.
 - c) Greater incidence of constructive suggestions in the democratic group.
- 5. The feeling of 'we'ness' was greater in democracy, and that of 'I-ness' was greater in the authoritarian group as shown by test situations and by analysis of the stenographic records.
- 6. The group structure was more stable and tended to maintain a higher degree of unity in the democratic group. When the authority withdrew his influence on the situation the group structure tended toward disintegration in the autocratic group.
- 7. Twice in the autocratic group a situation arose where the group combined its aggression against one individual, making him a scapegoat. In both cases the scapegoat quit the group. No such lack of harmony existed in the democratic group.
- 8. The feeling for group property and group goals was much better developed in the democratic group as shown by test situations and the stenographic.
- 9. Following the one exchange of group members, there was a decrease in dominating behavior for those transferred to the democratic group and an increase in like behavior for those changed to the authoritarian group.