

Title Page

**MOSES AS A MODEL FOR PEACEFUL SUCCESSION IN NIGERIAN
DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL LEADERSHIP (NUMBERS 27:12-23)**

BY

**JAMES, UBASINACHI ETHEL
PG/MA/16/83756**

**DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION AND CULTURAL STUDIES
FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA, NSUKKA
ENUGU STATE**

FEBRUARY, 2019

Requirement Page

**MOSES AS A MODEL FOR PEACEFUL SUCCESSION IN NIGERIAN
DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL LEADERSHIP (NUMBERS 27:12-23)**

BY

**JAMES, UBASINACHI ETHEL
PG/MA/16/83756**

**A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION AND CULTURAL
STUDIES, FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF
MASTERS DEGREE IN RELIGION AND CULTURAL STUDIES**

SUPERVISOR: DR. (MRS.) U. F. ECHETA

FEBRUARY, 2019

Approval Page

This dissertation has been supervised and approved as meeting the requirement for the award of Master of Arts (M.A) in Department of Religion and Cultural Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

By

DR. MRS. U. F. ECHETA
SUPERVISOR

DATE

DR. B.C.D. DIARA
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE



PROF. LUKE .E. UGWUEYE
EXTERNAL EXAMINER

DATE

REV. FR. PROF. H.C. ACHUNIKE
DEAN, FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE

DATE

Certification Page

We verify that James, Ubasinachi Ethel (PG/MA/16/83756) has satisfactorily carried out all the corrections on this work as suggested by the External Examiner.

Dr. (Mrs.) U.F. Echeta
Supervisor

Dr. B.C.D. Diara
Head of Department

Prof. Leonard I. Ugwu
Dean of the Faculty

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I heartily wish to express my gratitude to my assiduous Supervisor Dr.Mrs.U.F. Echeta for her magnanimous assistance, love, effort, patience and support so far in making this work a reality. Her teachings, advice and mentorship not just in this work, but throughout the period of my study are deeply appreciated.

I am also highly indebted to the members of staff of the Department of Religion and Cultural Studies. The first on the list is the Head of the Department, Dr. B.C.D. Diara for his relentless services towards the growth of the department. In the same vein, I will not cease to appreciate Prof. C.O.T. Ugwu, Prof. M.I. Okwueze, Assoc. Prof. S.O. Onyeidu, Rev. Fr. Prof. H.C Achunike, Rev. Assoc. Prof. E.A. Ituma, Rev. Sis. Dr. Mary Jerome, Rev. Dr.O.K. Ngele, Dr.Mrs.A.B. Okoli, Ven. Dr. C.I. Ugwu, Dr.Mrs.N.G. Onah, Dr. F.U. Nnadi, Rev. Fr. Dr. Lawrence Okwuosa, Dr.C.N. Ibenwa, Rev. Canon. S.N. Nweze, Dr.Mrs.C.T. Nwaoga, Rev. Fr. Madubuko, J.C, Rev. Fr. Dr. E. Ngwoke and Rev. Dr. Chris Okwor, Rev. Dr.EkeneEze, Dr.Nche George, Mrs. Gift Chukwuma, Miss Ukeachusim Precious, Mrs Joy Ezugwu, Mr. E. Anizoba, Mr. Damian Odo, Mr. Kingsely Uwaegbute and other members of the academic staff for guiding me as my Lecturers throughout the period of my study.

I will not forget the relentless effort of my wonderful Parents Chief & Lolo J.O. Nwoko and brothers Ogbonna and Victor who have showered me with so much love, care and support. I am deeply grateful for their sacrifices.

I also wish to acknowledge my friends and loving classmates, Ugwuowo Chisom C., Okpala Ikemdinachukwu, Nvene Nonso, Onah Nelson and many others. I also wish to thank the Chief Librarian of the Department of Religion and Cultural studies for providing for me some of the necessary materials for this work. My appreciation also goes to my friends Uroko Favour and Nwagu Umunna Godson for their time, efforts and support in making this work a success. Finally, my unreserved thanks and gratitude goes to God Almighty for his enabling grace, wisdom and understanding to put down this work.

Abstract

This study unravelled the succession problem in Nigerian democratic political leadership using Moses as a model from the text of Numbers 27: 12-23. Over the years, succession in Nigerian political leadership has not followed the due and laid down processes befitting of a democratic state and dispensation. This is because some of the Nigerian political leaders approach the leadership of the country from a selfish perspective. They want to be covertly or overtly politically relevant till death and this to them is of greater importance than the welfare of the country and its citizens. This attitude of Nigerian political leaders against the handover of power in an orderly and prescribed manner has brought about retrogression underdevelopment, backwardness and untold hardship in the country and upon the masses.

This study employed the historical-critical method and also the narrative analysis method of research. The historical-critical method of research used, took into consideration the historical development of the text studied and the historical development of the problem of succession in Nigerian democratic political leadership, while the narrative analysis was used in analyzing the text studied as a biblical narrative. These methodologies were employed to reach the target of unearthing Moses' model of leadership succession as conveyed by the text. It was discovered in the text studied that Moses' succession efforts and prayers concerned generations after him. In line with his request, God appoints a leader, a successor who has the spirit of wisdom. In leadership succession exercise, present leaders are to be prepared to leave and allow the people to make choice of their own leaders after God's direction in a manner after Moses who considered God's interest and the People's interest in appointing a successor. Nigeria as a nation cannot prosper without faithful and gifted leadership, hence the significance of Mosaic leadership succession model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[illegible]

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3
1.3	Aim of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4
1.4	Scope of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4
1.5	Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4
1.6	Research Methodology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5
1.7	Definitions of Terms	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Succession in Nigerian Democratic Political Leadership	-	-	-	-8
2.2	Leadership Succession in Religion-	-	-	-	-14
2.3	Leadership Succession in the Old Testament-	-	-	-	-16
2.4	Summary of Literature Review	-	-	-	-23

CHAPTER THREE: EXEGESIS OF NUMBERS 27:12-23

3.1	Translation of Numbers 27:12-23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-24
3.2	Historical and Literary Context of the Text	-	-	-	-	-	-	-26
3.3	Structure or Plot Arrangement of Numbers 27:12-23			-	-	-		-30
3.4	Close Reading of Numbers 27:12-23-	-	-	-	-	-		-34

CHAPTER FOUR: MOSES TRANSFER OF LEADERSHIP IN THE NIGERIAN POLITICAL CONTEXT

4.1	Orderly Transition of power for Continuity -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-41
4.2	Neutrality on the Choice of a Successor-	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
4.3	Executive and Complementary Support for a Successor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-44
4.4	Power as Transient, Succession as Permanent-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-45
4.5	Predecessor and Successor as Shepherds in Leadership Succession	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-45

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-47
5.2	Limitations of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-48
5.3	Suggestions for Further Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-48
5.4	Contributions to Knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
5.5	Recommendations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49
5.6	Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49

References

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Moses was one of the greatest leaders in the Bible times. He was a charismatic leader whose leadership trait and personality is worthy of emulation by world leaders of different epochs, times, generations and history after him. Moses was no doubt a quintessential leader in Israel history; he was meek, teachable, open-minded and obedient.

His humility as a leader was portrayed in his actions when he was rejected as a leader by the Lord. Moses disobeyed the Lord's instruction at the waters of Meribah by hitting the rock, instead of speaking to it to release water(Num. 20) which consequently led to his being rejected as the leader that would take the Israelites to possess their Land of Promise. In the text of study Numbers 27:12-23 the Lord informed him of the punishment for his disobedience, he immediately pleaded for a successor who would continue from where he stopped and lead the Israelites into Canaan. His major interest and concern at the moment was the welfare of the Israelites. He beckoned on the Lord to appoint a shepherd for the Israelites who would continue from where he stopped to ensure that the Israelites reached their Land of Promise.

Succession in Nigerian political leadership has posed a serious challenge to the country even before the inception of civilian leadership. Olaniyi and Umar (2014) note that

Leadership succession has been a problem facing Nigeria since 1960. The mode of transfer from one government to another has been characterized by tension, anxiety and even loss of lives. These were because, in those years of military leadership, the leaders were imposed on the led. But with the inception of democratic leadership in 1999, there was a glimpse of hope among Nigerians who were expectant of a more peaceful approach to the transfer or handover of leadership from one government to another. The reverse however, became the case as Nigerians continued to experience

more chaos and crises which often lead to loss of lives at every handover of government in Nigeria (p.1)

Lack of peaceful succession in Nigerian leadership has manifested itself in so many obvious ways given that the political leaders have failed to observe the rules guiding the process; thereby engaging in violent actions, rigging election, manipulating the election results and not adhering to the electoral laws. Political succession is the acceptable and constitutional method of transferring power from one group to the other or from one individual to the other, but the law and the constitution of the country, regarding political succession in Nigeria have not been effectively or minimally put to use (Kabir, 2010). This has led to the problems of political succession Nigeria has had, since political independence in 1960 till date.

It has been observed that Nigerian political leadership is bedevilled with leaders who are power intoxicated and unwilling to transfer leadership to another government. Some of them have a strong desire to rule and continue to rule. This is where succession problem in Nigeria is rooted. Nigerian political leaders are generally given to holding power for so long and not willing to let go even when the constitution has made it compulsory that they must leave office at a given time. Lamenting on the problem of hoarding political power among Nigerian political leaders, Eric (2018) says

Nigerian politics is an old school game; it is a game that is recycling within the same political inclination, same political ideology, same political system including same mind set, same objective with the same motive. It is a game that is played by the players without substitute, a game without new tactics. Nigerian system of government is actually an old wine in a new bottle; it is a system of using old products and rebranding them to suit the present market situation. It is simply a strategy of packaging old products that cannot yield any result or satisfaction to the consumers (p.1).

How can the country experience a remarkable progression when the political system is always flooded by the same persons who have failed democracy and the expectations of the masses overtime? The worst is that they can utilize any possible means to manipulate their way again and again into leadership. Because of this selfish attitude towards power and leadership, the country has experienced and is still experiencing a lot of succession crises; a big threat to its fragile democracy.

1.2 Statement of Problem

Research is a systematic inquiry into an existing problem. Any good research work therefore must have a pressing problem or issue in the society it addresses. The problem which gave rise to this work is the succession problem in Nigerian democratic political leadership. It is a problem which has been ravaging the country in both past and recent history of its democracy. In the history of Nigerian democracy to its present, the country has not witnessed a succession of leadership from one government to another devoid of killings, attacks, bloodshed, violence and the likes of them. The leadership of the country keeps revolving in the hands of few individuals who have refused to transfer or handover leadership to new set of individuals and can do anything possible to keep this power to themselves.

Sometimes, in the bid to continue enjoying the wealth of the nation, the well known political leaders of Nigeria project puppets or cronies into various political offices who would be satisfying their selfish interest at the expense of the nation's development and general wellbeing of its citizens. Moses was ready to quit his leadership in obedience to God's instruction. He did not argue for an extension or force his choice of a successor on the people. Having the People's choice in leadership succession in obedience to God is the mosaic model that is lacking in the choice of successors in Nigerian democratic leadership.

1.3 Aim of the Study

The main aim of the study is to proffer a solution to the succession problem in Nigerian democratic political leadership by using the lessons derived from Moses' transfer of leadership to Joshua in Numbers 27:12-23. The further aims of this study are to:

- 1) discuss the succession of leadership in the Old Testament
- 2) discuss the problem of the succession of leadership in Religion
- 3) discuss the causes of succession problem in Nigerian political leadership
- 4) analyze Moses' transfer of leadership to Joshua from the text of Numbers 27:12-23
- 5) apply Moses' model of leadership succession to Nigerian situation.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The thrust of this work is centred on Nigerian democratic political leadership and the text of Numbers 27:12-23. Moses' disposition on this issue of succession is critically analyzed in the text of Numbers 27:12-23, and presented as a panacea to the problem of succession in Nigerian democratic political leadership.

1.5 Significance of the study

This work will serve as:

1. A tool not just to ameliorate succession problems in the Nigerian political leadership but to every sector of the society that observes periodic succession of its leadership.
2. The research will help to guide outgoing leaders of the University of Nigeria Nsukka on how to conduct an orderly transfer of leadership for continuity.
3. Also, the research will enable Nigerian political leaders understand the need to be neutral in the choice of their successors while having the interest of the masses at heart.
4. The research will make Nigerian outgoing political leaders understand the need to direct, encourage and strengthen their successors to achieve the nation's goal.

5. Also, the work will add to the numerous already existing Literatures on the problems of political leadership in Nigeria, hence will be useful for future research works related to this topic.

1.6 Research Methodology

The research adopted the narrative analysis and the historical-critical methods of research. The historical-critical method was employed because the research approached the study of the text of Numbers 27:12-23 from the historical point of view. It also studied the various ways succession problem has manifested itself in the history of Nigerian democratic political leadership.

The narrative analysis method was adopted because the text of study Numbers 27:12-23 is simply a narrative that tells the story of the commissioning of Joshua as Moses' successor. It starts by narrating how Moses requested for a successor and why he finds the immediate appointment of a successor very necessary. The stages of narrative analysis as employed by the research include; the setting of the text or narrative, the structure or plot arrangement of the narrative, the theme, characterization, the time of the narrative and the point of view of the narrator.

Sources of data for this research include commentaries and Bible Dictionaries, Textbooks, Journal articles, Internet materials, Newspapers.

1.7 Definition of Concepts

The definition of the major concepts or words as they are used in the study is expedient because it paves way for the proper understanding of the work. The following concepts are defined;

Leadership

Leadership has been variously defined, depending on the angle from which one views it. Mumford (2000) defines leadership as an all-encompassing concept in that it includes not

only the leaders but also the led, and that the main essence of leadership is problem solving. In any human organization, problems are bound to occur. This is because the needs of people are numerous while the means of meeting these needs are limited in supply. Leadership is therefore concerned with how the demands of the people are met in just and fair manner, which necessarily involves politics and the allocation of resources.

For Jacob and Jacques (1990), leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve collective purpose. The implication of this definition is that, leadership has to do with the ability of the leader to show the right path to the group or people he leads and to be able to make them see the need to go the way he wants them to go. Gill (2012) wrote that “Leadership is showing the way and helping or inducing others to pursue it. This entails envisioning a desirable future, promoting a clear purpose or mission, supportive values and intelligent strategies, and empowering and engaging all those concerned” (p. 9).

Sharma and Jain (2013) see leadership as “a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organisation in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent” (p. 310). For Omolayo (2005) leadership is an essential oil that keeps the wheel of government working without any difficulty. With all these definitions and more, it becomes clear that leadership is a vital organ of any organisation or society that ensures its future survival or growth. For the definition which is apt for the purpose of this study, this research will define leadership as the process of controlling the day to day affairs of the nation, aimed at promoting the interest of the masses leading to sustained growth of the country.

Leadership Succession

Succession means orderly transfer of political power from one group to another. Orderliness in the process of power transfer is also used in determining the level of state

maturity. Boeker (1997) defines leadership succession as a process which provides an opportunity or a chance for the alteration of the existing power contact, for the introduction of better strategic system and for strategic change to occur. Speaking in the same vein, Hutzschenreuter, Kleindienst & Greger (2012) note that, leadership succession can be seen as a process whereby a new leader, takes the place of a retiring leader and inherits all the rights and responsibilities of the former leader's position.

Additionally, according to Matser & Lievens (2011) leadership succession can be defined as the transfer of leadership from incumbent leader to a successor in order to ensure continuity in an organization. For a working definition, the researcher will define leadership succession as the transfer of handover of leadership from one individual (s) to another. In the Nigerian political context, it is a periodic exercise which follows a laid down procedure with an intention to facilitate equity, mutual recognition, expression of public opinions leading to continuous growth and advancement of the country.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, relevant scholarly materials that are related to the subject would be discussed.. The materials will be reviewed thematically.

2.1 Succession in Nigerian Democratic Political Leadership

Violence has always featured in almost all electoral processes in the history of Nigerian democratic leadership. This is one of the obvious ways succession problem has manifested itself in Nigerian political system. Its frequency and magnitude of occurrence in the country since the return of the country to democratic rule in 1999 has assumed a democratic dimension. Attesting to the above, Ezeife, (former Governor of Anambra) cited in Adeyemo (2009) states that:

democracy is associated with elections. How have the elections gone since 1999 till date? 1999 elections were disputed and engulfed in violence, but it was vastly better than the 2003 elections. People shouted foul about the 2003 elections, but that was infinitely better than the non-elections of 2007. Each election has been worse, more filled with violence than the one that preceded it. We cannot be getting a democracy by running further away from it (p. 5).

The unwillingness to handover or transfer leadership to another person by Nigerian leaders has caused the use of violent means to achieve their aim. This has been so because, power is to Nigerian politicians what breast milk is to sucklings. It is always difficult for politicians to leave power without struggle just as babies cry and protest when weaned of breast milk (Diminas, 2017). Baffour (2003) argues that the cultural attitudes toward leadership in Africa, hinder smooth political succession. According to him, leaders see themselves on top of the people they govern. They also view as people who were born to rule till death. The people also sadly aided this undemocratic attitude as they see these so-called

political leaders as either 'Father of the Nation' or God's appointee. Baffours' position here regarding the masses could be interpreted as a false accusation. This is because, Nigerian masses or majority of them do not view their leaders in such a great pedestal as 'God's appointees'

On the other hand, some of these leaders see opponents as enemies of nation and anti-people. Some politicians justify the actions by equating the political kingdom with heaven. Omoruyi, (2007) argues that these attitudes prompted the politicians to conclude that there is no vacancy in the Presidential or Governor's lodge whenever the election is approaching. They prevent competition in the election to fill the vacancy; they encourage violence to achieve their end; they use police and other security agencies to rig, if need be

Olaniyi and Umar (2014) see the ideology of political leaders as another factor that hinders smooth succession in Nigeria and other African states. Speaking from the past, most of politicians today are one time in the cabinet of undemocratic government who at initial stage has no passion for democracy. They did everything possible to undermine democracy in the past. The attitude of politicians has given the impression that they are not tolerant of opposition parties. The politician's behavior, conduct and even their statement suggests that the rules of the game and opposition parties do not exist.

The conduct of political leaders while in office and their belief that to do their best on the job is the major factor prompting them to adopt even undemocratic measures to retain the power. Highly corrupt leaders according to Baffour (2003) would alter the process of succession once they don't trust the successor; engage in gerrymandering to anoint a successor whom they hope to control. Powerful politicians sometimes constitute themselves into gods or godfathers who forcefully plant puppets as successors to indirectly perpetuate their expired tenure. Nigerian political system is dominated by political "godfathers," who are at once

intolerably powerful and often unimpeded by law, as in the cases of Chris Uba and Alhaji Lamidi Adedibu. Their hold on power is the primary means of acquiring more wealth and, therefore, more power. Mbamara (2004) observes that *godfatherism* is the invasion of the political candidate by discarnate powerful sponsor, tending to complete possession for the purpose of selfish gratification. It is a huge challenge to the nascent democracy in Nigeria, and is badly affecting the lives of the masses in Nigeria. Ogbonmwan (2005) rightly asserts that *Godfatherism* is an evil building block for corruption, retrogression, under development, mediocrity, backwardness and perpetual poverty of the people. This is because the political *godsons* would continue to satisfy the interest of the political godfathers who have put them in such political positions against the interest and wellbeing of the masses.

Excessive power the constitution seems to have given political leaders and politicians in Africa, especially Nigeria remains a salient challenge to smooth transfer of power. These excessive powers encourage what Bassey (2008) called 'prebendal politics'. By prebendal politics, the political offices should be competed for the personal benefit of office holders and their supporters. The behavior of most of these leaders clearly illustrates Bassey's position. Besides the award of contracts as well as the manoeuvring of security agencies, the control of the electoral management bodies constitute the other challenges that hinders smooth transition from one government to the other as declared Baffour (2003). The constitution entrust the appointment of principal electoral official to the President. This made the manipulation of the electoral bodies by the ruling party easier. Equally, as well, orderly succession in fourth republic became a do or die affair with the politicians resolutely determined to 'win' at all cost.

Ethnic influence has been discovered as one of the factors that inhibit smooth succession of leadership in Nigerian democratic system. Some Nigerian leaders and masses allow ethnicity and tribal motive to influence their choice of political leaders. Umar (2011) states that it is disheartening to note that ethnicity and religion had prevented the citizens from voting in

terms of credibility, they are more interested in their tribal men and not the good candidate. Metumara (2010) lucidly observes that, “Without any doubt, Nigeria is an amalgamation of ethnic groups pitched against each other in a contest of power and resources that have reflected in the political processes, sometimes threatening the corporate existence of the nation” (p. 93). The administrative style adopted by the British, created distrust, suspicion and cleavages, which resulted in rivalry among the major ethnic groups for the control of the soul of Nigerian state. According to Bamgbose (2012)

The colonialists who ruled us...(sic) in the past poisoned the minds of Nigerians against Nigerians. This colonial mentality is still much around us. That explains why whenever a given southerner emerges victorious in presidential elections the north boils which dovetails to violence with numerous human lives and properties lost in the process (p.219).

A former Minister of External Affairs, Professor Bolaji Akinyemi (2015) warned of a possible post-election crisis before the 2015 elections and the need to do everything possible to avert or minimize it. He stated that the certainty of violence after the 2015 elections is higher than it was in 2011. If President Jonathan wins, the North would erupt into violence as it did in 2011. If General Buhari wins, the Niger Delta will erupt into violence. The violence of 2015 is going to be horrendous and worst than the one of 2011 for the simple reason that the illegal massive importation of weapons into the country has reached such alarming proportions.

Each election that approaches in Nigeria democratic leadership always witness a lot of succession conflicts. Obasanjo did everything possible under the sun to remain in office by 2003. Alemika (2007) notes that he attempted to mutilate the amendment bill passed by the National Assembly on the 2002 Electoral Act before he could sign it into law. The overwhelming public outrage stopped him from doing so but it did not however stop the regime from manufacturing rigging tactics and techniques in the 2003 federal and state

elections. The process of rigging is intended, to eliminate or neutralize opposition and facilitate the commission of electoral fraud. The security organs of the state were not able to prevent the fraud neither were they able to prosecute the perpetrators. Unfortunately, the ruling party protected those involved in the 2003 election violence especially those of the ruling party, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). According to Bamgbose (2012)

The Obasanjo's administration organized a transition election in 2003. Political violence at this period took a disproportionate shape; there were incidences of political assassinations. The president in early 2002 warned that politicians were raising private *militias* that could make the elections bloody and indeed, the election turned out to be bloody. In November 2002, disturbances broke out in Kaduna State with high profile killings with clear political undertone.

Also, his Vice President Atiku Abubakar, in an attempt to hold on to his political empire in Adamawa in 2003, threatened to slap the chairman of the Adamawa State Electoral Tribunal in 2003, Justice Kassim Zanna for daring to declare that Governor Bonni Haruna, did not win the 2003 election (Ocheroeme, 2014). In the same vein, Obakhedo (2011) reports that, "the 2003 elections were more pervasively and openly rigged than the flawed 1999 polls, and far more bloody" (p. 105). "There was abundant evidence of large scale rigging, fraud and intimidation in many parts of the country" (Lewis, 2003, p.142).

The above case was not the beginning or the end of electoral violence in the country. The 2007 elections were not left out in the tussle. Domestic and foreign observers ranked it as the worst in Nigeria's history. Nwolise (2007) states that when the 2007 election was drawing near, President Obasanjo told surprised Nigerians, other Africans and the world at large that the 2007 elections would be a "do or die affair." Available evidences had it that the 2007 elections were most deadly and frightening in nature. The 2011 election was not left out of

the hook. There were many cases of killing and destructive activities which even grew worse when Goodluck Ebele Jonathan was declared winner and assumed office.

It was with the above ugly political scenario that Nigeria marched into another political transition in 2015. Nnonyelu (2015) states that there were palpable fears and anxiety across the length and breadth of the country as to the possible scenario that the nation will find itself after the 2015 general elections. However, in the build up to the elections which were rescheduled to hold on 28th March and 11th April, 2015, all the candidates of political parties contesting the presidential election signed a peace pact committing themselves, their followers and parties to a code of conduct contained in the Nigerian Electoral Act of 2010. Despite the pledge of the dominant parties and their supporters to play by the rules, the elections were not without some pockets of violence. But compared to other previous elections democratically conducted in the country, the 2015 general elections could be described as relatively peaceful. This relative peace was attributed by some people to the laudable decision of former President Goodluck Jonathan to concede defeat even before the official final results were announced.

The just concluded 2019 General Elections also witnessed a level of violence which sent some persons into their early graves. Onwuka (2019) notes that the death and violence that trailed the 2019 election left a sour taste in the mouth. Different sources reported that 3 persons were killed in Oyo state, two were killed in Bayelsa state, two were killed in Delta State, and one was killed in Oyo state. Olu (2019) reports that the 2019 election violence killed at least 39 people across Nigeria, and that is not counting the severely injured. In one incident, six people were killed by security agents in Rivers state. There was mayhem in Lagos, with 100 ballot boxes burnt and at least three people killed.

From the foregoing cases of irregularities and high level of violence that have become regular feature of the Nigerian democratic transition, one can see that Nigerian political leaders and

actors have not demonstrated strong resolve and commitment to consolidate and deepen the course of democracy in the country. Elections in Nigeria have not made a clear departure from the kind of elections that were witnessed in the First Republic which were characterized by rancour, acrimony, ethnocentrism, parochialism, violence and sundry irregularities. It then becomes worrisome to any well-meaning Nigerian on the atmospheric tension created by the problem of succession in the Nigerian political leadership. From the above development, Nigerians were forced to form an orientation that no election could be organized by a civilian government without conspicuous corruption, brazen electoral malpractices and violence capable of destroying lives and properties with reckless abandon

2.2 Leadership Succession in Religion

In recent times, Nigerian church leadership conflicts mostly manifests itself when there is going to be a change of leadership. There are cases of those who have complied the terms provided by the church constitution but are not willing to go. Also, there are those who want to be in the church leadership at all cost. They see leadership as do or die. They are ready to blackmail, kill or destroy those they consider as obstacles to achieving their goals. Thus elections into leadership positions today in the church are sometimes mar with manipulations, use of charms, verbal assaults and the like which eventually water down the spiritual lives of the members after elections. Thus leadership conflict has continued to have devastating effects on the total ministries of the church and the expansion of God's kingdom on earth

In Nigerian church today, people fight for position of authority. They see it as a do or die affair. It appears every Christian wants to lead and nobody wants to be a servant. Some Christians run down a leader because they want to be appointed in his/her place. Awojobi (2011) posits that conflict for power is one of the major factors responsible for conflict in the church today. Adetunji (2010) towed Awojobi's line when he declared thus:

Conflict is also a serious issue in the church, if not among the rank and file, then among the leaders and would-be leaders. Conflict, in form of cold war, is even worse among Christian leaders. Very sad to write but very true that many of us have failed our master and Lord along this line with unnecessary envies, black mailing and gossips, and many times, writing strongly worded letters against another Christian brother to destroy him but God through Jesus Christ not destroying such individual, lying against one another in the attempt to destroy another before the Chief Executive officer or president of a Christian institution. We see these happening every day. (p.121).

According to Awojobi (2011) most of the tussles in our churches today are more of personality than theological or doctrinal. They always arise from struggle for power, which resulted from a basic dislike of one person for another member opposing the leadership when they are not the kind of persons they like or they are not acting according to their own expectations

Historically, according to Adetunji (2010) most indigenous churches in Nigeria were embroiled in leadership conflict after the death of their founders. For instance, after the death of Pastor Bilewu Oshoffa, several law suits were filed by ministers in Celestial Church of Christ (CCC) who claimed to have received the blessing of the later leader to succeed him. There were allegations of using charms by rival claimants to suppress one another. This resulted in withdrawal of membership. Similarly, Robert (2002) notes that in the Four Square Gospel Church in Nigeria, there was a serious legal battle for succession to the top position after the expiration of the tenure of Rev. Wilson Badejo as the General Overseer. There were litigations in courts over the issue. The church of God Mission under Archbishop Benson Idahosa also experienced leadership conflict after his demise. In spite of many protests, his wife Margaret Idahosa was ordained as his successor. This made some bishops and pastors in

the church to float their own ministries Robert (2002). This is because they were dissatisfied with the choice of his wife. They argued that the late leader did not name his wife as his successor before he died. Again in 2010, there was a lawsuit in the Federal High Court, Lagos on who was to succeed Pastor E.H. Olusheye as the head of Christ Apostolic Church worldwide. A faction led by Pastor Olusheye and another faction led by Pastor Akintola (Robert, 2002).

Also, Alokun (2013) reports that Federal High Court, Lagos on Friday fixed January 22 for hearing in a case of leadership conflict involving Cherubim and Seraphim church in Nigeria. The suit was filed by Mr. Tunji Gomez on behalf of one Prince Adepoju Arogundade, an elder in the church in February 2009. Arogundade is seeking an order of court to reinstate the plaintiff as the rightful leader of the church. In Kaduna State Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN) drag each other to court. It was the face-off between Ayo Oritsejafor, the Preside of CAN and Samuel Kujiyat, Chairman of the Kaduna State Chapter. The crisis between the two leaders became so deep that they have to seek redress in the court of law.

Lack of proper succession plan for church leadership can cause tension and conflict in the church. There is the need for every church to have comprehensive guideline on the qualifications and criteria of ascension to the leadership of the church in the constitution and by-laws. It is also important that every member of the church respect the constitution and the by-laws of the church on the choice of leadership.

2.3 Leadership Succession in the Old Testament

The Bible illustrates the prevalence of succession at key junctures in the Old Testament. Biblical succession begins with Adam, continues through the patriarchs, the judges, kings, and prophets of Israel. A common element among ancient tribal communities regarding succession featured the passing of authority and goods to the oldest son of the clan,

a practice portrayed in the deceit of Rebekah and Jacob to wrest such family control from Esau, the rightful heir (Gen. 27).

Moses and his young assistant Joshua were the first to provide the detailed picture of an organized plan of succession, all within the context of a modified theocracy. Unfortunately, the healthy leadership transition from Moses to Joshua did not continue in the period of the judges. Bulter (2009) adumbrates that Joshua's failure to train future leaders has led to Israel not knowing Yahweh, not obeying Yahweh, and thus not driving out the people who remain. In Judges, this portrayal of Joshua's leadership sets the pattern for leadership. No judge trains someone to follow. A footnote to Othniel's success as a military leader who defeated the King of Aram typifies the pattern of single generation rule: "So the land had peace for forty years, until Othniel son of Kenaz died" (Judg. 3:11). Other judges had numerous children, but none filled the role their father's death left vacant.

Samuel's predecessor and mentor, Eli, failed to discipline his adult sons. Kay (2004) notes that though they could have expected to inherit their father's position, authority and power, by their own wilfulness and sinfulness, they so offended the Lord, and their father, that they were disqualified from even being servants. Ironically, Samuel's children likewise proved themselves unfaithful to the ethical and spiritual maturity needed to succeed their father. God chose Samuel to then appoint Saul as the first king of Israel, a man whom God rejected for rash decisions and disobedience. Saul's on his own part, had the intention to kill David in order to deny him the opportunity to become the future King of Israel. In the book of 1 Samuel, it emerges that the intention of Saul was to have his son Jonathan succeed his throne and not the anointed David, son of Jesse.

This demonstrates the deeply woven roots of the desire of a father to preserve his leadership legacy by having his own children take over when he is gone. This reveals the reach of nepotism to the earliest biblical days. Although Saul was the first king of Israel and there

were no established succession rules that mandated a king to be succeeded by his first born son, Saul was already cultivating this culture, which would subsequently become embedded in the succession customs of Israelis for generations to come. Saul openly stated that his son Jonathan had no chance of succeeding him as long as David remained alive, and hence his strategy to kill him in order to secure the throne for his own son. The death of Saul and his only surviving son Ish-Bosheth marked the end of one family's rule and ushered in the reign of David, a man of whom God said, "Your house and your kingdom will endure forever before me; your throne will be established forever" (2 Sam 7:16).

A notable succession process is chronicled in 1 Kings 19:16-21 and 2 Kings 2:1-

11 in which God instructs Elijah to anoint "Elisha ... to succeed you as prophet" (1 Kings 19:16). Thus, Elisha "set out to follow Elijah and became his attendant" (v. 21). Elisha is a silent companion to Elijah until the day of Elijah's unusual leave taking. Because Elisha fulfilled his mentor's requirement that he be present when Elijah was taken away, the double portion of Elijah was available to his successor. Konkel (2006) highlights that Elijah introduced the cloak as a symbol of succession (2 Kgs 2:13) when he first anointed Elisha as his successor (1 Kgs 19:19).

Horward et al (1996) elucidates that the Book of Exodus introduces the beginnings of Israel's centuries-long existence as a virtual theocracy, with the non-hereditary leaders elected by divine call and acknowledged by the people. This leadership process began with Moses, continued through Joshua, the judges, and concluded in the life of David, the second king of Israel, when David asserts his authority in declaring his son Solomon successor to his throne. The succession plans of Moses to Joshua and David to Solomon bookend this Old Testament view of leadership transitions. Before Moses, the patriarchs assigned succession to sons from a variety of positions in the birth order. After David, at least in the southern kingdom of Judah, succession moved in most cases from father to son.

Speaking on the pre-succession/mentoring relationship that exists between Moses and Joshua, Merrill (2009) states that the first mention of Joshua occurs abruptly in Exodus 17 as Moses selects him to lead the Israelites into battle against the Amalekites. Joshua is mentioned again in Exodus 24:13 when he accompanies Moses up Mount Sinai to receive the Ten Commandments. Robert (2009) notes that Joshua's first reported words may reveal something of his military instincts. As he and Moses descend Mount Sinai, Joshua immediately interprets the shouting coming from the direction of Israel's camp as 'the sound of war' (Exodus, 32:17).

In Exodus 33:11, Joshua seems to be a guard or keeper in the tent of meeting "The LORD would speak to Moses face to face, as a man speaks with his friend. Then Moses would return to the camp, but his young assistant Joshua son of Nun did not leave the tent (NRSV)." Marten (1981) notes that the word "aide" or "assistant" used to describe Joshua in his relationship to Moses is a common designation of one who serves another. It also refers to service in the sanctuary (Num. 4:12; 2 Chron. 24:13). Hamilton (2011) explains that apparently what the Levites do for the sanctuary tent, Joshua does for the tent of meeting (v. 11b). Anybody can approach the tent if they are on a God-seeking mission (Ex 33:7b); at least they can go 'out' to it, but not necessarily 'into' it. Perhaps that is why Joshua seems to be a permanent resident in the tent: to prevent unauthorized entrance. As a companion to Moses inside the tent while the Lord spoke, Joshua could have been more than simply an observer, a privilege afforded him later, during the succession process.

Speaking on Moses' plea for a successor, Milgrom (1989) infers that Moses uses a more intimate second person to communicate with God. Here, as evidenced perhaps by a loss of intimacy in the face of perceived guilt or shame, Moses adopts the third person address characteristic of the sinful petitioner who has fallen out of grace.

The first prescribed method for Moses' transfer of leadership to Joshua is to lay his hands on Joshua. This ceremony is significant and can accompany a blessing, a sacrificial offering, or serve as a dedication to office. The purpose of these rituals seemed to centre around the transference of a quality or responsibility from one to another. Erwin (2003) notes that in later times, the laying on of hands accompanied one's admittance to the office of rabbi, and in Christian practice it accompanied the designation of leaders or the conferring of a spiritual gift (Acts 6:6; 13:3; 1 Tim. 3:14; 2 Tim. 1:6).

The final passages referring to the succession of Joshua as leader of Israel are found in the fifth book of Moses called Deuteronomy, literally "second law." However, according to Craigie (1976) it is not a separate set of laws from those already presented by Moses. Instead it is a literary record of a spoken address (or series of addresses) which has been given the form of a covenant document.

Jack (2013) notes that God uses three words to describe Moses' responsibility toward his successor: commission, encourage, and strengthen. The first word refers to the public transferral of authority and leadership referred to in Numbers 27. The final two words imply a personal friendship naturally resulting from their close, long-term relationship. It is also a stock expression, elsewhere formulated as a command: "Be strong and courageous" (Deut. 31:6, 7, 23). Expressed in Deuteronomy 31 and repeated by God in Joshua 1, this command elicits allegiance from a young leader stepping into an almost impossible role as successor to Moses. It also serves as a mandate for the people of Israel to step up and support him.

Hubbard (2009) states that many of the experiences of Moses are mirrored in the life of his successor, such as a commissioning by God, a dramatic, miraculous crossing of a body of water, uplifted arms during battle, proclamation of instructions, farewell speeches, a covenant ceremony, burial report, and an editor's eulogy. In the end, the narrator affirms the Moses-like stature that Joshua achieves by posthumously awarding him the same prestigious title

that Moses, ‘servant of the Lord’ (24:29) bore. The fulfilment of land acquisition and conquest by Joshua and the tribes of Israel indeed secured his place alongside his mentor as a faithful steward of a great nation. Ironically, Greg (2013) highlights that Joshua makes no provision for a successor, and the only indication of the future shape of leadership in the post-Joshua situation is of a nation with a decentralized governmental structure consisting of elders, ancestral heads, judges, officers and priests (23:2; 24:1, 24, 31, 33).

The succession of Solomon to the throne of Israel is recorded in 1 Kings 1 and 1 Chronicles 28-29. However, everything about this event from the two authors’ perspectives and purposes differ radically. Bill (2005) notes that,

David’s reign and Solomon’s accession read very differently in 1 Chronicles compared to Samuel and Kings. For example, it is an interesting question how to harmonize the accounts of the transition from David to Solomon in Kings and Chronicles: the weak, indecisive and vengeful David of 1 King 1-2 seems far removed from the authoritative figure in 1 Chronicles 22 and 28-29 who makes preparations for Solomon’s temple, instructs Solomon in his duties, and secures the people’s allegiance for him (p. 201).

Of the first three sons born to David in Hebron, the seat of his rule over Judah, two sons met their demise either through war or murder, beginning with Amnon, David’s oldest. Absalom rose up in opposition to his father, declaring himself king, but he was killed in the battle between his followers and those of his father. The biblical silence surrounding the second born, Kileab, leaves Adonijah as the rightful successor. This, in turn, contributes to the intrigue of 1 Kings 1. Richard (1998) states that the author of 1 Kings presents an aged king of approximately seventy who is not able to ‘know’ either his new concubine or the court intrigue that is taking place around him. McKenzie (2000) notes that this situation of the King was intolerable. The king was the symbol of his nation, its strength and fertility.

Israel simply could not have an impotent king. In short, it was time to choose a replacement for David.

The next son in line to the throne, Adonijah, observes no move toward succession from his father so he gathers influential people around him in a banquet setting outside the city to declare his intentions to be the next king of Israel. “But he did not invite Nathan the prophet or Benaiah or the special guard or his brother Solomon” (1 Kings 1:10). Word reaches the palace, and Nathan approaches Bathsheba, setting in motion a plan to move the king to counter the elder son’s gambit. Both players in the drama fill their roles admirably, repeating an assertion that David had earlier promised the kingdom to Solomon, although there is no independent record of that promise in Scripture. Indeed, Bathsheba’s insertion into the David narrative intrigues scholars who see her thread of influence begin even with the scheduling of her bathing episodes in Jerusalem. McKenzie posits,

Solomon is no doubt seen to be the replacement for the first son of David and Bathsheba who died as punishment for their sin (2 Sam 12:24-25). But the name is also pregnant with meaning in other directions. It could be taken as “Uriah’s replacement” in a continuation of the attempt to cover up the sin. Then of course, it could also be “David’s replacement.” (p. 182).

According to Sweeney (2007), in Solomon’s becoming king, four separate acts comprise the ascension process. First, Solomon is placed on David’s own mule for the ride to the Gihon spring where, second, the public anointing occurs. Zadok “took the horn of oil from the sacred tent” (1 Kings 1:39) and anointed the new king. Solomon is the first of many kings to receive this anointing by prophets and priests in a public setting (2 Kings 9:6; 11:12; 23:30). The third action of ascension was the blowing of the shofar and the declaration, “Long live King Solomon” (1 Kings 1:39). Sweeney (2007) points out that the shofar, made from a ram’s horn, again adds a divine blessing to the event as the shofar announces

celebrations such as the New Year (Num. 29:1), the Jubilee year (Lev. 25:9), and revelation of Torah at Mount Sinai (Exod. 19:16),³⁷ as well as other major cultural events. Finally, Solomon ascended the throne of his father. The acts of anointing and sounding a trumpet elicited such a crowd reaction that “all the people went up after him, playing flutes and rejoicing greatly, so that the ground shook with the sound” (1 Kings 1:40). Although various elements of the ascension to the throne or coronation are symbolic of divine favour and presence, there is no direct influence from the LORD in the events of the day: no voice from within a cloud directly addressing the new king as happened in the succession of Joshua.

However, Solomon’s successor, Rehoboam, suffered the loss of ten tribes of Israel through opposition and his own failure to discern the times. Volkmar (2003) states that other kings followed in what became two contiguous kingdoms with occasional solutions to the succession conundrum, yet they were few and far between. In fact, the procedure of getting rid of a dynasty by killing the son and successor is repeated a number of times in the history of Israel (see 1 Kgs 16:2; 2 Kgs 15:10, 14, 25, 30).

4.4 Summary of literature review

The literatures reviewed in this section revealed that scholars have delved into the study of succession problem in Nigerian political leadership, Succession problem in Religion, and succession of leadership in the Old Testament with an inclusion of Moses to Joshua leadership succession. But no considerable amount of attention has been given to studying the implication of Moses’ transfer of leadership to Joshua in Numbers 27:12-23 to Nigerian democratic political leadership succession. So, it is the concern of this work to fill this gap in scholarship by using Moses as a model to solve the succession problem which has posed a serious challenge to the country.

In every study of this nature, it is imperative to carry out an exegetical analysis of the given text to pave way for a proper understanding of the text. The Bible as the word of God was not written in an angelic or supernatural language but in the words of human beings inspired by the Spirit of God. The Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew, and translated to other languages including the Septuagint-the Greek translation of the Old Testament. So, the focus of exegesis is to read a given text the way it appeared in its original language. Palmer (2013) asserts that the focus of biblical exegesis should be the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts. The text of study will be translated from the original Hebrew language to English language to enable the readers have a good understanding of the text and research.

```
'haer>W hZ<+h; ~yrIßb'[]h' rh:i-la,  
hle²[] hv,êmo-la, `hw"hy> rm,aYOÝw12  
`lae(r"f.yI ynEib.li yTit;Ðn" rv<iä]  
#r<a'êh'-ta,  
@s:ßa/n<rv<iä]K; hT'a'_-~G: ^yM,Ð[;-la,  
T'îp.s;a/n<w>Ht'êaoht'yaiär"w> 13  
^yxi(a' !roðh]a;  
ynIvEiyDIq.h;l. hd"ê[eh'¥ `tb;yrIm.Bi  
!ciª-rB;d>miB. yPiø ~t,'yrIm. •rv,a]K; 14  
p `!cI)-rB;d>mi vdEÐq' tb;îyrIm.-yme(  
~he² ~h,_ynEy[el. ~yIM:ßb;  
'rmo*ale hw"ßhy>-la, hv,êmorBEåd:y>w: 15  
`hd"([eh'-l[; vyaiÐrf"+B'-lk'l. txoßWrh'  
yheîl{a/ hw"ëhy>dgoåp.yI 16
```

rv<åa]w: ~aeÞyciAyrv<ia]w: ~h,êynEp.li
 'aboy" rv<Üa]w: ~h,^aynEp.liaceäyE-rv,a]
 17
 `h[, (ro ~h,Þl'-!yaerv<ia] !aCo\$K;
 hw"ëhy>td:ä[] `hy<h.ti al{Üw> ~ae_ybiy>
 vyaiÞ !Wnë-!Bi [;vuäAhy>-ta, `^l.-xq;
 hv,^amo-la, hw"÷hy>rm,aYO"w: 18
 `wyl'([' ^ßd>y"-ta, T'îk.m;s'w> AB=
 x:Wrå-rv,a]
 ht'îyWlciw>hd"_[eh'-lK' ynEßp.liw>
 !heêKoh; rz"å['l.a, `ynEp.li At^aao
 T'äd>m;[]h;¥w>19
 `~h,(ynEy[el. Atßao
 `lae(r"f.yIynEiB. td:Þ[]-lK' W[êm.v.yI
 ![]m;äl. wyl'_[' ^ßd>Ah)me hT'ît;n"w> 20
 ~yrIßWah' jP;îv.miB. Al± la;v'îw>dmoê[]y:
 `!heKoh; rz"Ü['l.a, ynE"p.liw> 21
 aWh± Wabo^ay" wyPiä-l[]w>Waøc.yEwyPi'-l[];
 hw"+hy> ynEâp.li
 `hd"([eh'-lk'w>ATàai laeîr"f.yI-ynEB.-
 lk'w>
 [:vu^aAhy>-ta, xQ:åYIw:
 At=aohw"ßhy>hW"ïcirv<±a]K; hv,êmo
 f[]Y:åw: 22
 `hd"([eh'-lK' ynEßp.liw> !heêKoh;
 rz"å['l.a, `ynEp.li `WhdE'mi[]Y:)w:
 `hv,(mo-dy:B. hw"ßhy>rB<ïDIrv<±a]K;
 WhWE+c;y>w: wyl'Þ[' wyd"²y"-ta, %moõs.YIw
 23

:

The English Translation of the Text (NRSV)

12 The LORD said to Moses, "Go up this mountain of the Abarim range, and see the land that I have given to the Israelites.

13 When you have seen it, you also shall be gathered to your people, as your brother Aaron was

14 because you rebelled against my word in the wilderness of Zin when the congregation quarreled with me. You did not show my holiness before their eyes at the waters." (These are the waters of Meribath-kadesh in the wilderness of Zin.

15 Moses spoke to the LORD, saying,

16 "Let the LORD, the God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint someone over the congregation

17 who shall go out before them and come in before them, who shall lead them out and bring them in, so that the congregation of the LORD may not be like sheep without a shepherd."

18 So the LORD said to Moses, "Take Joshua son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay your hand upon him;

19 have him stand before Eleazar the priest and all the congregation, and commission him in their sight.

20 You shall give him some of your authority, so that all the congregation of the Israelites may obey.

21 But he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the decision of the Urim before the LORD; at his word they shall go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he and all the Israelites with him, the whole congregation."

22 So Moses did as the LORD commanded him. He took Joshua and had him stand before Eleazar the priest and the whole congregation;

23 he laid his hands on him and commissioned him-- as the LORD had directed through Moses.

3.2 The Book of Numbers

The book of Numbers is the fourth book of the Pentateuch. The book is called "Numbers" in English because it records a series of censuses that Moses took of the tribes of Israel. Censuses were taken to quantify the human and natural resources available for the economic and governmental affairs. The narrative recorded in the book of Numbers took place in that wilderness region that is neither Egypt nor the Promised Land. The Hebrew name or the title of the book *Bemidbar* which can be literally translated as "in the wilderness" describes the main action in the book- Israel journey through the wilderness of Sinai. The Nation of Israel in this book of Numbers progresses from Sinai towards the Promised Land, concluding with Israel in the region east of the Jordan River.

The book of Numbers was purportedly written by Moses. Many critics question Mosaic authorship of Numbers because of their view of sources in the book. Some argue that the book would not have been written by Moses because the narrator or author assumed the position of an observer or third person. Therefore, it is not possible that Moses who was involved in the events of the narrative wrote the book at the same time the events were happening. However, Malick (2014) submits that it is better in view of the underlying assumptions of JEDP and the supporting historical evidence to give the book the benefit of doubt and assume Mosaic authorship which was then edited at later times into its present

canonical form. It seems correct to assume that the substantial portions of the history and legislation of Numbers originated with Moses during the thirty years of desert wandering that the book recounts (Num.33:38) only on the ground that he wrote them after the events have occurred and he decided to take the position of an omniscient narrator or that he dictated them to a scribe.

3.3 Historical and Literary Context of the Text

Moses' request for a successor and God's instruction to appoint Joshua was not without some factors that necessitated it. This request and instruction signified that Moses' work and position as a spiritual leader, prophet, spokesman, judge, and a mediator between God and the Israelites was gradually coming to an end. There are reasons which can also be called problem that led to the rejection of Moses as a leader and that prompted the appointment of Joshua as a successor.

Historically, Moses' sin and disobedience at the Mount of Meribah in Numbers 20 informed the reason for the abrupt end of his leadership and Joshua's appointment in Number 27:12-23. Several factors must have led to Moses' disobedience. One of them may be the death of Miriam in the earlier verses of Chapter 20 of Numbers. Milgrom (1983, p.448) notes that "Moses was distracted by the death of his sister and showed callous indifference to the thirst of the people". Of course as Moses' elder sister and being a leader of some importance within the wilderness community, Moses must have suffered a great shock at her death. To Heinrich (1978) the mention of her death and burial in Numbers implies that she was an important leader and figure in the wilderness community. The reason for this assumption can be because there was no record of the death and burial of Moses' father-in-law and wife who also played significant roles in the life of Moses. Also, "Miriam's death and burial brought a pause to the Wilderness Journey, just like the death of Aaron and Moses" (Budd 1987, p.

120). This depicts that she was a leader whose death must have brought pain to Moses and caused him to lose control over his emotions at the waters of Meribah.

Gill (1851, p.642) has defined Moses' disobedience as "a doubt that God was really willing to satisfy such a rebellious people". In his word "Must we fetch you out of this rock?" (20:10), Moses saw them as unworthy of the miracle because of their unruly and insubordinate heart; and he was therefore reluctant to perform it. For Keil and Delitzsch (1985) Moses' and Aaron's disobedience was a sign of unbelief but not a total distrust in the omnipotence of God, rather was a momentary wavering of that immovable assurance, which the two heads of the nation ought to have shown the congregation, but did not show. "Perhaps Moses and Aaron doubted that God would again give them water from the rock as he had done at Rephidim (Exodus 17:1-7), and unbelief caused them to share the fate of their generation" (John, p.199). Espin and Thrupp (1871) argue that in striking the rock and not speaking to it and speaking to the people harshly, Moses expressed a violent irritation. In the same vein, Charles (1872) said that Moses struck the rock not once, but twice in impatience, as if he were trying to secure water by physical strength rather than by spiritual word and divine power. In this way he displayed want of faith, disrespect and disobedience to God's command. All this means that as far as YHWH is concerned, Moses and Aaron have not trusted and obeyed him in a way that would have proven to the children of Israel that he was the holy one. .

Therefore, the immediate context of the text of study Numbers 27:12-23 is the sin and disobedience of Moses in Numbers 20:9-13. This made the Lord to be extremely displeased with Moses and Aaron. God's punishment was harsh, "Because you did not trust in me, to show my holiness before the eyes of the Israelites, therefore you shall not bring this assembly into the Land that I have given them" (NRSV. Num.20:12). Theology of Work Project (2014) adds that Moses and Aaron like all the people who rebelled against God's plan earlier

(Num.14:22-23), will not be permitted to enter into the Promised Land. The text of Numbers 20:12 names the underlying offence directly, “You did not trust in me”. Moses leadership faltered in the crucial moment when he did not trust God and acted on his own impulse. At this moment, appointing a new leader who would take over from Moses to lead God’s people into their land of Promise became a matter of necessity.

Another immediate context of the text under study is the death of Aaron in Numbers 20:22-29. In verse 13 of the text under study, God told Moses that he would be gathered to his people as his brother Aaron was. This means that this conversation took place shortly after the death of Aaron. It has been stated above that Moses and Aaron disobeyed God at the water of Meribah in Numbers 20:9-13, which consequently led to their rejection as the leaders of the people. Aaron was divested of his office and robes before he died, and they were transferred to his son Eleazar in his sight. Eleazar is now chosen as a priest on his stead who would continue to inquire of the Lord for the people of Israel just like his father did. Aaron’s death and burial took place on Mount Hor.

It would then not be an exaggeration to infer that Moses expected this moment in Numbers 27:12-23, after observing and presiding over the transfer of priesthood from Aaron to his son Eleazar shortly before his brother’s death. As the two leaders who have disobeyed the Lord’s instruction and waiting for him to carry out his judgement, Aaron has received his own punishment for disobedience; this would of course make Moses to anticipate his own judgement from the Lord. It was at the last section or locale in the division of the book of Numbers- the plains of Moab, that the activities in the text of Number 27:12-23 took place.

The book of Numbers is largely a narrative as far as its genre is concerned. The book is arranged in narratives in form of story. It is a continuation of the narrative that runs through Genesis to Exodus and Leviticus, and even continued to Deuteronomy. It narrates the activities of the Israelites during the 40 years of their wilderness wandering. This informs the

reason the narrative analysis method is employed in this study. From the beginning to the end of the book appears in prose form.

From the point established above, it becomes clear that the text, Numbers 27:12-23 is arranged in narrative form. The text is included in the last chapters of the book of Numbers. It is the period of the new generation of Israelites after the old one was destroyed as a result of unbelief. This new generation is to enter into the Promised Land and possess it as the Lord has promised. This text begins in form of a conversation between God and Moses. It started with God's instruction to Moses to climb the Abarim Mountain where he would have a distant view of the Promised Land and be gathered to his people on the same mountain just like Aaron his brother because of their disobedience. And ended by accounting how Joshua was commissioned as a new leader of the people.

3.3 Structure or Plot Arrangement of Numbers 27:12-23

Determining the structure of a selected text for exegesis is one of the indispensable tasks to be carried out in biblical exegesis. Munde (2012, p.43) says that "the sense one gives to a text depends fundamentally on the organisation one recognizes in it". This organisation in itself is the structure of a text. An investigation of the structure of a text will indeed help one to gain a deeper understanding of the text and unearth thoughts in the text (Gorman, 1998, p.44).

The text of Numbers 27:12-23 can be divided into four coherent structures. This text as has been stated earlier can be summarized as an account of Joshua's appointment as Moses' successor. The first part of this narrative is centred on the command God gave to Moses to go up to the Abarim Mountains where he would see the Promised Land before he dies (vv.12-14). The command goes this way "the Lord said to Moses" "go up this mountain of the Abarim range, and see the land I have given to the Israelites". This instruction ended by God reminding Moses of his disobedience with Aaron at Kadesh, hence, the punishment of

not entering the Promised Land. The sin of Moses was a turning point in the whole narrative sequence. It creates a tension and a conflict within the narrative; because Moses, the faithful servant of YHWH, the one to whom God speaks face to face (Num.12:6-8) is denied the privilege of leading the Israelites into the Promised Land. John (2003 p. 135) was very blunt in explaining the reason why the sin of Moses brought a turning to the narrative. He stated thus:

Moses is the man to whom God used to bring the Israelites out of their captivity in Egypt. He leads them into freedom through the sea, and we fully expect him to lead the Israelites through the Jordan River into the Promised Land. But suddenly and dramatically, that hope is extinguished. Moses strikes a rock and is immediately disqualified from leading the Israelites to their geographical goal.

This first or initial structure of the narrative assumes the climax or the critical moment of the story which must be resolved as the story unfolds. This is because any careful reader of this narrative would immediately at this point be thrown into suspicion of what Moses' reaction would be. Will he be sad or bitter that he would be allowed to die without taking the Israelites to the Promised Land himself? Will he plead to God for more days to accomplish his forty years dream of entering into Canaan with the Israelites? Will God carry out this punishment on his servant Moses for his disobedience or would he later be granted pardon? Who would take over from Moses if he is eventually going to die? These are the possible questions which would run to and fro the mind of the reader and which will be eventually answered as the story unfolds.

The second part of the structure is the beginning of the story's denouement. It dwells on Moses' request for a successor (vv.15-18). "Moses spoke to the Lord saying," "let the Lord the God of the Spirits of all flesh appoint someone over the congregation". Moses at this point surprises any reader and at the same time begins to answer the numerous questions in

the reader's minds by making a request that is very significant and at the same time very essential- a successor. This request is very typical of Moses who from the beginning of his leadership has shown a great compassion, concern and keen interest on the welfare of the Israelites. This explains the reason why at the moment he was told by God that he wouldn't enter into the Promised Land which he has laboured for with the Israelites for almost 40 years, did not make a fuss about this harsh punishment nor did he appeal to be allowed to enter into this Land of Promise. Rather he expressed his care and worry on what would be the fate of God's people and humbly requested in clear terms that a leader would be appointed for them.

The third structure of the text, vv. (18-21) majors on God's response and direction as regards how Joshua is to be commissioned as the new leader of the Israelites. He responded that Moses should anoint Joshua the son of Nun and commission him before all the people. He also instructed him to give him some of his authority, so that the congregation of the Israelites may obey him.

The last structure of this text covers vv.22-23. It is the point where the story is brought to an end, where it reaches the last stage of its denouement and therefore concluded. Here, Moses obeyed just as the Lord commanded him. He had him stand before Eleazar the Priest and commissioned him before all the people. By doing this, Moses smoothly and successfully transferred leadership to his successor Joshua.

Any narrative of this nature has a theme which is the central idea, message or of view which it embodies and expands in the course of the story. The central theme in this narrative or pericope which covers from Numbers 27:12-23 is Joshua's appointment as Moses' successor. A careful look at the structure or plot arrangement above reveals that the narrator was telling the story of what preceded and finally led to the appointment of Joshua as Moses' successor, including how the appointment was done.

There are two major characters in the pericope. They are God and Moses. The text under study is majorly a conversation between the two persons and they played the following roles in the narrative:

God: The first major or leading character whose voice was introduced by the narrator at the beginning of the narrative. He gave out commands or instructions to Moses. First, concerning his punishment for his disobedience at the waters of MeribahKadesh and secondly on the appointment of Joshua as a leader to the Israelites.

Joshua: The second major character who requested for the appointment of another leader after receiving his punishment and, also carried out the commissioning of the appointee before the Israelites just as he was instructed by God.

Three minor or flat characters who were only mentioned in the narrative when God was giving instruction to Moses following his request for another leader include; Eleazar, Joshua and the Israelites. The voices of these characters were not heard in the course of the narrative and they did not carry out any significant task or action in the narrative. From the instruction of God, they have the following roles to perform:

Joshua: He is to take over leadership from Moses. He was chosen by God and commissioned by Moses as a leader before the Israelites.

Eleazar: He is to witness the commissioning of Joshua and he is to inquire for Joshua before the Lord; Joshua and the Israelites are to go out and come in at his words.

Israelites: They are to witness the commissioning of Joshua and also are to be obedient to him as their leader.

The actions in the narrative were happening during the last year of the Israelites' wilderness wandering. At this time, the Israelites have passed through Kadesh where Moses and Aaron disobeyed the Lord's instruction and have entered into the plains of Moab where judgement is passed on the leaders and a new leader commissioned.

The narrative was done from the third person perspective or point of view. The narrator who assumed the position of the third person or omniscient narrator may have lived and observed the events at the time they occurred, thereby telling the story from what he observed or saw.

3.4 Close Reading of Numbers 27:12-23

It has been established above that the structure of the text under study is divided into four parts. In this section, each structure will be properly reviewed distinctively to create room for a better understanding.

The Punishment for Disobedience (vv.12-14)

This is a suitable title for this part, because here, God let Moses know the consequences of his disobedience at Meribah kadesh. It starts with a command “go up this Mountain of Abarim, and see the land that”. The verb, $\text{h}\bar{\text{l}}\text{e}^2 [\text{ }]\text{'}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{l}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{h}}$ which can be literally translated as “go up”, is an imperative. It is in the second person masculine singular. In Hebrew grammar, the imperative tense is used to give command or order by a higher force to a lower one. God gives a command to Moses to go up to the Abarim Mountains also known as the Moabite mountain where he would see the Land he has given to the Israelites. The verb $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{e}^2\text{r} > \text{W} \text{ } \bar{\text{u}}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\text{u}}'\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{h}}$ a qal imperative masculine singular which is derived from the root $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{r}$ can also be translated in its original usage to mean, to look at, to consider, to predict or to perceive. These therefore suggest or clarify the understanding that Moses is commanded or instructed by the LORD to view the Land of Canaan from Mount Abarim. As a consequence of his disobedience, he is refused entrance into the Land when he is almost close to his goal.

Another great punishment for Moses' act of disobedience could be seen in verse 13 “when you see it, you also will be gathered to your people as your brother Aaron was”. The

verb $\text{ʕ s : } \beta a / n < ne'ésap$ also means, “to receive”, “to remove or to take away”. This implies that Moses would be received by his people- the holy patriarchs, in otherwords, it denotes that Moses was being told by the LORD that he would die. Mathew (1991) notes that Moses must die, but death does not cut him off; it only brings him to rest with the holy patriarchs. It also suggests that Moses would die as the patriarchs have died, having lived as they did. This view can be said to be correct, judging from the fact that the verb $\text{ʕ s : } \beta a / n < ne'ésap$ was used in Genesis 25:8 in the case of Abraham. It was also used in Gen. 49:33, in the case of Jacob to denote the death of the Patriarchs.

Moses' request for a successor (vv.15-18)

In verse 15, Moses boldly requested from God a successor that will lead the Israelites after him. Friedman (2001 p. 521) notes that this was the last time that Moses is quoted as saying anything to God. In Deuteronomy 31, Moses reported his past conversations with God to the Israelites, but here, he was saying his last words to God in the Torah.

$\text{rmo}^*ale \quad hw" \beta hy > -la, \quad hv, \hat{e}mor \text{rBE} \hat{a}d : y > w :$ “Moses spoke to the Lord, saying” (v. 15), the verb $\text{rBE} \hat{a}d : y > w :$ from the root rbd is a piel, vav consecutive imperfect, 3rd person masculine singular which means to speak. This gives the understanding that Moses is the one making the demand by himself. Binnie (2010) states that it was Moses who sued for a successor; it was not the people who urged on the business. No sooner does Moses receive notice to demit than he prays for a successor, and begs that he eyes may see him before he dies. Mathew (1991) notes that Moses begged earnestly that the work of God might be carried on, though he might not have the honour of finishing it. Coffman (1999) adds that it should be noted that Moses offered no complaints when God told him of his impending death. He did not protest, or plead for any change or

delay in the sentence. His only thoughts appear to have been concerned with the safety, the leadership, and the continued progress of Israel. What a noble and self-effacing attitude.

“Appoint a man over the congregation”. The phrase “Appoint a man” denotes cluelessness and not being definite or particular about whom should be appointed. $\text{VY}\alpha\dot{\iota}\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ as used here means a man or a person, an indefinite singular masculine noun. The use of this word deserves an unbiased attention as regards the personality of Moses. This implies that Moses had no one in mind when he was making this request. He did not make an attempt to influence the Lord’s decision by suggesting the appointment of any particular person. Of course, the man Moses had always played active role regarding some of the decisions of Yahweh over the nation of Israel. For example, in Exodus 32:30-35, Moses intercedes for the people when God decided to destroy them after the Golden Calf incidence. Again, in Numbers 14:13-20 Moses pleaded on their behalf because God had resolved to disinherit the people of Israel. But in this situation, Moses was careful enough to allow God be the sole arbiter and decision maker. This exposes his level of humility; he does not arrogate the right of appointment to himself but submissively brought the matter to God to choose someone who would lead his people. Elicott (1905) also observes that instead of Moses appointing one of his own family or the man of his own choice as his successor, he decided to let God handle the matter, and pleads that he will appoint someone who would be a true shepherd to the flock. Coke (1803) adds that Moses did not take one step to perpetuate the leadership in his own family or posterity; a convincing proof of his disinterestedness, and one which shows him to have been actuated by a principle that raises him above all law-givers who generally took care to advance their own families.

His major reason and interest for requesting for a successor is clearly buttressed in verse 17; $\sim\text{ae_ybiy}>\text{rv}<\text{\AA a}]w:$
 $\sim\text{ae}\text{PyciAyrv}<\text{\AA a}]w:$ $\sim\text{h},\hat{\text{e}}\text{ynEp.li}$ ‘aboy”

rv<Üa]w ~h,^aynEp.liaceäyE-rv,a] “who will go out before them and who will come in before them and who will bring them out and who will bring them in”. Moses was by and large requesting for a successor who would act as both a shepherd and a military leader to God’s people and properly fit into the task at hand. There is uniformity in the views and opinions of scholars in their commentaries as regards the type of successor or leader Moses was asking for. Gill (1999) suggests that Moses here means, someone who would command them in battle and bring them back in peace, who would lead them to conquer their enemies. George (2017) posits that Moses begs that his successor may be enabled to conduct the multitude in both peace and war. He notes that “to go in and out” means to govern; it also includes all the occurrences of life. Elicott (1905) further elucidates the meaning of the verb. To him, it denotes leading out and bringing in, just like a shepherd would cause his flock to go out and come in.

The selection of Joshua (18-21)

In response to Moses’ request, God instructed him to take Joshua in whom is the spirit. The word $\text{X} : \bar{W}\text{r}\hat{u}aH$ stands for breath, spirit, or wind. This is the life-giving spirit possessed by every living being from creation, it is the emanation of life-force. “ $\text{X} : \bar{W}\text{r}$ ” is also used interchangeably to mean “Holy Spirit” which disperses God’s energy, mind or intention. This alternative usage is the one that is said to be possessed by Joshua. Clarke (2017) echoes that this “ $\text{X} : \bar{W}\text{r}$ ” must certainly mean the Spirit of God; Calvin (1857) posits that when God declares that the spirit is in him, He does not merely intimate that he has a soul, but that he excels in the necessary gifts, such as intelligence, judgement, magnanimity, and skill in war. Gill (1999) re-affirms that this Spirit Joshua possesses is not the spirit or soul which is in every man but the Spirit of God which gives to him more than the ordinary gift of the Spirit, as courage, conduct, wisdom, prudence, and greatness of mind,

thereby qualifying him for government. It is the Spirit of government, fear of the Lord and wisdom which Joshua already possesses that qualify his selection.

wyl' ([' ^βd>y"-ta, T' îk.m;s'w. “And lay your hand upon him”. According to Jamieson et al (1871) the imposition of hand was an ancient ceremony (Gen. 48:18, Leviticus 1:4, Num. 8:10). It was in use before the giving of the law, through that means the patriarchs blessed their sons. According to Whedon (1909) the imposition of hand is a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and nations. It is an act of a superior in age or office towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some good gifts, or to manifest a desire for its bestowal, (Gen. 48:14). By this ceremony again, Moses is to confer his powers upon his successor and by his prayers, which always accompany this rite, he is to obtain from God all the spiritual gifts and grace necessary for Joshua's future task. Coke (1803) notes that the ceremony of laying on of hands denotes Moses' transferring the public trust delegated to him from God, upon Joshua from himself. Moses on doing this, is thereby transferring the government to him, pointing him out to the people as his successor, to show to the children of Israel that he is to take his place.

He is to commission him in their sight. The verb “ht' îyWICi>” *vwücwîitâh*, *apiel*, vav consecutive perfect, 2nd person masculine singular, from the root *hWC* can be rendered, to commission, give charge, or give responsibility as used in Nehemiah 7:2, 2 Samuel 6:2, Deuteronomy 31:23. It also means “to command” as used in Gen.3:11, 2:16. In this context, ht' îyWICi can be interpreted as “to command”. Here, God asked Moses to command Joshua in his name to undertake the government of the people of Israel, which otherwise he will be afraid and unwilling to do. Whedon (1909)

asserts that “ $\text{h} \text{t} ' \hat{\text{i}} \text{y} \text{W} \text{I} \text{C} \text{i} \text{w} >$ ” as used here, literally means command or instruct him in regard to this high office in the sight of the congregation. Wesley (1765) also added that Moses is to give him counsels and instructions for the right management of that great task.

“You shall give him some of your authority so that the congregation of the Israelites may obey” (v. 20). Moses is also to delegate some of his authority to him so that the Israelites will be obedient to him (Num.27:18-20). $\hat{\text{a}} \beta \text{d} > \text{A} \text{h}) \text{m} \in \text{m} \hat{\text{e}} \text{h} \hat{\text{o}} | \text{d} \text{k} \ddot{\text{a}} \text{i}$ s literally translated as “some of your authority”. $\text{d} \text{A} \text{h} " " " " ") \quad \text{h} \hat{\text{o}} | \text{d}$ which means “authority” can also be alternatively rendered majesty, power, charisma, ray of glory. Milgrom (1990 p.236) argued that if $\text{h} \hat{\text{o}} | \text{d}$ refers to Moses’ spiritual powers, then only God who has endowed them can transfer them as He did when he allowed the elders to share Moses’ prophetic gifts (Num.11:17-25). In addition, Gill (1999) notes that this $\text{h} \hat{\text{o}} | \text{d}$ is not the spirit of God on Moses for this gift is God’s prerogative but of the honour of civil government, suggesting that he should give him a share in it, and use him not as a servant, as he had been, but as his colleague and partner. Joshua is to have some ensigns of power and authority, and some exercise of it, so that he can be respectable among the people.

The Commissioning of Joshua (vv.22-23)

$\text{A} \text{t} = \text{a} \quad \text{o} \text{h} \text{w} " \beta \text{h} \text{y} > \text{h} \text{W} " \text{i} \text{c} \text{i} \text{r} \text{v} < \text{t} \text{a}] \text{K}; \quad \text{h} \text{v}, \hat{\text{e}} \text{m} \text{o}$
 $\text{f} [; \text{Y} : \hat{\text{a}} \text{w} :$ “And Moses did as the Lord had commanded him”. The verb
 $\text{f} [; \text{Y} : \hat{\text{a}} \text{w} :$ $\text{w} \text{a} \text{y} \text{y} \text{a} ^ \circ \text{a} \text{S} \text{i}$ s aqal, vav consecutive imperfect, 3rd person masculine singular, is from the root $\text{h} \text{f} [$ which means “to do”. This means a total and complete obedience to all that God asked him to do in respect to the commissioning of Joshua. It is observed that Moses did even more than he was commanded. For the instruction in v. 18 says

wyl' ([' ^βd>y"-ta, T' îk.m; s' w> “and lay your hand upon him”. ^βd>y" is a noun, common feminine singular construct suffix, 2nd person masculine singular translated as “your hand”. But v. 23 says, wyl' p [' wyd" 2 y"-ta, %moõs.YIw: “and he laid both hands upon him”. . . . wyd" 2 y" is a noun, common feminine dual construct suffix, 3rd person masculine singular meaning “both hands” or “two hands” . According to Matthew (1991), although Moses’ commissioning of Joshua was humiliating to him, and amounted to almost a resignation of Government, he cheerfully commissioned him. This cheerfulness could be seen in his using his two hands to commission him. It shows his willingness to transfer his leadership to Joshua as instructed by God. This is also a clear proof that Moses doesn’t impose things on others and also not a self-seeking leader, since he sought not to aggrandize his family or serve the interest of others; nor did he in the least, repine or murmur that the priesthood was given to his brother Aaron and later to his son Eleazar, and now the civil government to his servant of the tribe of Ephraim; and as for his sons, they were only common Levites that waited upon the Priests.

CHAPTER FOUR

MOSES TRANSFER OF LEADERSHIP IN THE NIGERIAN POLITICAL CONTEXT

Application of the Lessons from Moses to Nigerian Situation

Succession is a well-known concept in leadership. Orderliness and due process are required at every succession of leadership, because they determine the level of a nation's maturity and the quality of leaders such nation possesses. Below are the models discovered in Moses to Joshua leadership succession which, if properly absorbed into Nigerian democratic leadership succession, would pave way for orderliness, growth and sustainable development.

4.1 Orderly Transition of power for Continuity: Immediately the end of Moses' leadership was made known to him by God, he at once requested from God a successor that will take over from him. This of course as has been stated reveals his willingness to transfer leadership to someone else. He refused to be intoxicated with the authority and leadership he has exercised among the Israelites. When the time came for him to leave the stage, he pleaded for another leader who would continue from where he stopped and guide the Israelites into the fulfillment of the promise made to them by God.

Most often than not, Nigerian political leaders demonstrate their unwillingness to leave their political offices at the expiration of their leadership. One imagines a situation where politicians that occupied public offices, during the military era and second Republics are still interested in remaining in power up till today. Unfortunately, the danger in continuing to have the same leaders in the nation is that some of them grow too old and senile, thus becoming a liability to the country. Not only do they lack fresh ideas, some of them who actually started well later lost their way. One of the key facts to note here is that Moses initiated the idea of a successor by himself. He did not wait for God to remind him of the necessary thing to do as a leader who is about to leave the stage. He initiated the idea and followed the due process as instructed to him by God.

Also, Moses as an outgoing leader, understood the importance of transparency in order to achieve an orderly transition of power. This he did by making God's choice of his successor known to the people by laying hands on him before the people, anointing and dedicating him to serve, and presenting him before Eleazar, God's spiritual representative among the people. Moses made God's decision crystal clear to the people. Moses commissioned Joshua before the whole assembly and everyone saw whom God and Moses have appointed.

4.2 Neutrality on the Choice of a Successor: It was discovered from the text of Numbers 27:15 that Moses at the expiration of his leadership did not suggest or force another leader of his choice on the Israelites. He did not even suggest to God on whom he thinks should be appointed. Rather he acknowledged that it was God's prerogative to choose a leader that He desires for His people –the Israelites. This action of Moses opposes godfatherism commonly practiced among some Nigerian political leaders. Powerful politicians sometimes constitute themselves into gods or godfathers who forcefully plant puppets as successors to indirectly perpetuate their expired tenure.

Godfatherism is one of the reasons power in Nigeria is difficult to transfer in a prescribed and orderly manner. Because the so-called godfathers will try everything humanly possible to make sure their candidates win, even if it results to the destruction of life and altering the electoral process. Moses' neutrality on the next leader to be appointed for the Israelites is one of the models that Nigerian political leaders need to absorb to enhance smooth succession of leadership for sustainable development. Every attempt to project leaders or successors who would only serve their personal egoistic interest to the detriment of the citizens and country at large has to be avoided.

Also, Moses did not project any member of his family to replace him at the end of his leadership. Moses at this time, already had two sons Gershom and Eliezer who were part of the tribe of Levi (1 Chron. 23:15). But he did not allow his human inclination to cloud his selfless disposition and foist any of his sons on the Israelites as his successor. He pleaded to

God, knowing fully well that God has the interest of the Israelites at heart. And in response, God chose Joshua who has been a good aide or assistant of Moses throughout the period of his leadership.

The appointment of family members or relations into various positions of power is another practice that has been absorbed into Nigerian political leadership overtime. Politics is not always seen by Nigerian political leaders as a call to service but a clearing house for jobs, contract, public fund embezzlement and official plunder. Some Nigerian political leaders see their political position as an opportunity to perpetuate their family line into political leadership. Sometimes, because political leaders have key to society's economic and social resources, to win an election means that them, their village, tribe or region obtains all the top posts. A good example can be seen from Governor Rochas Okorocha of Imo State and the appointment of his sister Ogechi Ololo as the commissioner for happiness which was just an avenue for her to also benefit from the commonwealth of the people. The same Governor Okorocha presented his son-in-law, Uche Nwosu, to succeed him as governor in 2019.

Moses' interest was not for a **family member** or anyone from his family line to replace him in leadership but that a shepherd; a man who has a great concern for the flock of God- the Israelites to take his place. Nigerian leaders have to in this same way, base their interest on men of good repute and outstanding quality from any part of the country and not to appoint those who may have a questionable character to take up political positions just because they come from the same family, tribe, or region, or local government. And together they continue to siphon or loot public treasury to enrich themselves.

Moses' major interest and concern was for a leader who would look out for the people and protect their interest to be appointed for the Israelites which are the true qualities of a shepherd. He was not interested to projecting his tribal man. Following this request, God appointed Joshua whom from all indications proved to be the best choice for the Israelites, by leading them into the possession of Canaan and rightly dividing the land among the tribes,

including other notable achievements. Joshua led the Israelites into the Promised Land, and captured Jericho. Also, he led the Israelites into the conquest of Canaan and divided the territory among the twelve tribes of Israel. Nigerians and leaders are hereby implored to focus their attention on electing a leader who is transparent and credible enough with a realizable positive vision to set the country on its path to sustainable development, the tribe or ethnicity notwithstanding.

4.3 Executive and Complementary Support for a Successor: In Moses, another great model for leadership succession was unearthed. It is the executive support for a successor. Moses was commanded by God to instruct or give charge to Joshua concerning the task at hand before the people of Israel. He was to prepare Joshua to lead the people of Israel into the Promised Land. Three descriptive words were used to instruct Moses towards that preparation: charge, encourage and strengthen. This preparation is very necessary because in charging him, Moses is to inform him of all the duties and responsibilities that he is to carry out as a leader of the people. He is to make him understand the task ahead of him, as clear as possible. Moses is to guide him properly and equip him for effective service to the people. Then in strengthening him, Moses is to encourage him to be courageous and, focus at the task at hand. He is to help him improve his God-given abilities with a sense of resolve, and help him step out in courageous faith with an unwavering focus.

This adequate preparation of the next leader by the outgoing leader as exemplified by Moses serves as a good paradigm for enhancing smooth succession of leadership in Nigerian democratic leadership. There is need for an incoming leader to be adequately prepared and informed by the outgoing leader. This will enable the succeeding leader to focus on his actual duties and responsibilities without wavering. It builds a sense of commitment and responsibility on the next leader, enables him to continue with the good legacy of the outgoing leader towards nation building.

4.4 Power as transient, Succession as Permanent: one of the principles of leadership that Moses understood and consequently played out in his transfer of leadership is the fact that

power is temporary. Moses did not urge on the Lord to extend his leadership so as to achieve his long term vision for the Israelites. He wasn't jealous that someone would take over from him and take the Israelites into Canaan on his stead. Instead, he requested from God a successor so that the Israelites would not be like sheep without shepherd.

This stands as a big example to Nigerian political leaders. There is no class of persons born as politicians; Nigerian political leaders need to learn to accept when it is time to leave the stage, for another leader to take over. Success in leadership without succession is a failure; Nigerian political leaders are not monarchs who are born to rule till death. Every attempt to remain in or come back to power after one's tenure has previously expired has to be discontinued because it obviously serves as a means to pursue selfish interest or for personal aggrandizement. Also, the ugly manner, in which old leaders desire to come again to leadership in Nigeria, is currently discouraging those that would excel in public offices if granted the opportunity to serve. It also discourages educated citizens from venturing into politics as a career.

4.5 Predecessor and Successor as Shepherds in Leadership Succession: Moses was instructed by God to give some of his authorities to Joshua. He is not to give him all of his authorities. This implies that even though Moses has come to an end of his leadership, he still has some specific tasks to perform as a predecessor. He is not expected to withdraw behind the stage and watch his successor struggle to meet up with his tasks. Joshua cannot work alone, he needs the advice, counsel and help of his predecessor to be able to actualize the vision ahead of him which is to help the Israelites conquer and take possession of Canaan.

Most leaders who emerge successful often have the support of their predecessors. The practise of predecessor-successor relationship helps leaders to pursue a given aim which would lead to the general good of the society. It helps to curb the pursuance of one's selfish aim or interest among leaders. Most often, Nigerian democratic dispensation experiences an acrimony and misunderstanding between a predecessor and successor. They often disagree on some certain things and as such fight each other endlessly. If this practise of predecessor

successor relationship modelled by Moses leadership succession is absorbed in Nigerian democratic political leadership, there is no doubt that the country will rise from its sorry state and experience a remarkable progression.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

Generally, this work analyzed the rare leadership quality demonstrated by Moses in Numbers 27:12-23 who earnestly desired a successor to lead the people of Israel into their land of promise and obediently carried out all the instructions concerning his commissioning. It also examined the factors that are giving rise to the succession problems facing the Nigerian political leadership, and proffered possible solutions to them by using Moses as a lesson.

In chapter one, the work was introduced in the areas of background of the Study, Statement of the Problem, Aim of the Study, Scope of the Study, Significance of the Study, Research Methodology, and Definition of terms.

Chapter two was devoted to reviewing the literatures containing the numerous views of different scholars on the sub-titles: Leadership succession in Nigerian democratic political leadership, leadership succession in Religion, Leadership succession in the Old Testament and the Summary of Literature Review.

In chapter three, an exegetical study of the text or pericope was carried out. This was done by translating the pericope from its original Hebrew text to the researcher's choice of English translation-The New Revised Standard Version, after that, the research looked at the historical and Literary context of the book of Numbers, Structure or plot arrangement of the pericope, the structure or plot, the theme, characterization and time, and finally the close reading of the text.

Chapter four applied the lessons from Moses leadership succession as revealed by the text of study Numbers 27:12-23 to the succession problem in Nigerian democratic political leadership as a panacea.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

At the course of the study, there were limitations and impediments that hindered the research from meeting up its desired target and complete aim. These limitations include:

1. Lack of adequate scholarly works on Moses to Joshua succession of leadership from the text of Num. 27:12-23
2. Insufficient literatures on the solution to succession problems in Nigerian political leadership
3. The study failed to examine leadership succession conflicts in the organizational, business and educational sectors

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

This research did not delve into all areas related to its study for the sake of specification and peculiarity. There is need for more research to be carried out in the following areas:

1. Moses model of leadership transfer as a panacea to the leadership succession conflicts in Nigerian churches.
2. Studying leadership succession in the Old testament as a paradigm for peaceful succession of leadership in the Organizational sector.
3. Studying leadership succession in the Old testament and in the Nigerian democratic dispensation: A comparative approach
4. Mosaic model of leadership succession and its implication to the educational sector.

5.4 Contributions to Knowledge

A study of this nature is significant in many ways, it will be of great importance as a literature base for students who intend to carry out research on a related subject matter. The research will enable Nigerian political leaders understand the need to be neutral in the choice

of their successors while having the interest of the masses at heart. The research will make Nigerian outgoing political leaders understand the need to direct, encourage and strengthen their successors to achieve the nation's goal. Also, the work will add to the numerous already existing Literatures on the problems of political leadership in Nigeria, hence will be useful for future research works related to this topic.

5.5 Recommendations

1. Moses was instructed to give some of his authority to Joshua and not all to enable him stand by his side and support him as his predecessor. Nigerian outgoing political leaders are expected to stand by their successors and work with them to achieve their mandate
2. Moses did not force his choice of a successor on the Israelites but requested from God to appoint someone who will be a shepherd to the people of Israel. Nigerian political leaders are not to force a successor on the masses but allow the people to choose their leader who would project their interest
3. Moses was instructed to encourage and charge Joshua before all the Israelites. Nigerian political leaders are expected to direct, strengthen and encourage their successors who are new in leadership
4. Moses understood that power is temporary and succession in leadership is inevitable. This understanding enabled him to carry out an orderly transition of power. Nigerian political leaders need to have this attitude towards power and leadership to enhance smooth and orderly leadership transfer.

5.6 Conclusion

In the text studied, Numbers 27:12-23, Moses expressed his lack of hunger for power by not hesitating to ask for a successor immediately the end of his leadership was announced, he made the choice of not manipulating or influencing the decision of whom to take over

after him but left it in the hands of God because it was in His power to do so, he also was careful enough not to allow family or ethnic interest come in when he demanded for a successor. Democratic system of government gives the citizens the right and power to choose their own leaders, Nigerian political leaders should need to allow the citizens to exercise this right by not forcing any candidate on them or manipulating the election process in their favour. Nigeria as a country does not lack citizens who are honest, trustworthy, transparent, compassionate, with positive intentions, and sensitive to the plights of fellow citizens, people who have great leadership qualities. But when the political terrain is made to appear like a war zone, where there is no peaceful and lack of violent change of its leadership, where men of corrupt and low moral standard struggle to remain in power, it will continue to be devoid of efficient and credible leaders.

References

- Adetunji, G. O. (2010). *Leadership in action*. Ibadan: Baptist Press Ltd.
- Adeyemo, A. (2009). Gains of a decade of democracy. *This Day Newspaper*. Lagos, May 29, 2009. Retrieved from "<https://www.allafrica.com/stories/200905290416.html>" on 27th October 2018.
- Agbo, P.O. (2012). *Saul's leadership prowess: Paradigm for Nigerian leaders*. An unpublished Thesis.
- Akinbade, J. A. (2008). *Government explained*. Lagos, Nigeria: Macab Books.
- Akinyemi B. (2015). Indicator shows there may be post-election violence in 2015. *VanguardOnline*, Lagos. January 8th 2015. Retrieved from "<https://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/01/February-polls>" on 29th November 2018.
- Albright, W.F. (1963). The divine name. *Journal of biblical literature*, 83 (1), 370-378.
- Alemika, E.O. (2007). Nigerian security agencies and the 2003 elections: Lessons for the 2007 elections, In Isaac O. A.etal (eds) *Perpsectvies on the 2003 elections in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Stirling-HordenPublishers Ltd.
- Alokan, P. (2013). Critical analyses of church politics and crises within the indigenous christianity in Nigeria. *American Journal of Social Management Sciences*, 2(3), 367-381.
- Awojobi, P. (2011). *Church Management*. Ilorin: Kingdom Power Communications.
- Bamgbose, J. A. (2012). Electoral violence and Nigeria's 2011 general elections. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 211-220.
- Bassey, O. C. (2008). "Legislature-executive relations and the future of democracy in Nigeria" in Ojo, E.O. (ed.) *Challenges of sustainable democracy in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Nigeria: John Archers Publishers Ltd.
- Bill, T. A. (2005). *Dictionary of the old testament: Historical books*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 201.
- Binnie (2010). *The pulpit commentary*. Electronic database. Biblesoft, Inc. Retrieved from <https://www.biblehub.com/commentaries/homiletics/numbers/27.htm> on 29th November 2018.
- Boeker, W. (1997). Strategic change: The influence of managerial characteristics and organizational growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 113-201.
- Budd, P.J. (1984). *Numbers. Westminster biblical commentary 2*. Waco Tex, Texas, USA: Word Books Publishers.
- Butler, T. C. (2009). *Word biblical commentary 8*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers
- Calvin, J. (1857). *Calvin's biblical commentary*. New York: Ivison & Phiney Publishers
- Charles, W. (1872). *Holy bible in the authorized version*. England: Rivingtons, Waterloo Press

- Chris, I. and Otu, D. (2012). Nigeria and the challenges of leadership in the 21st Century: A critique. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2 (13), 230-237.
- Clarke, A. (2017). *Clarke's commentary on the bible*. California: G. Lane & P.P. Stanford Publishers.
- Coffman, J. (1999). *Coffman Commentary on the Old and New Testament*. Texas, USA: Abilene Christian University Press.
- Coke, T. (1803). Commentary on numbers. *Thomas Coke commentary on the holy bible*. Retrieved from <https://www.studydrive.org/commentaries/tcc/numbers-27.html> on 29th November 2018.
- Cole, D. (2008). *The new American commentary, an exegetical and theological exposition of the holy scriptures*. Nashville, United States: B&H Publishing Groups.
- Diminas, E. (2017). Nigeria: the need to avoid succession crises. *Premium Times*. February 8th 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.opinion.premiumtimesng.com/2017/02/08/nigeria-the-need-to-avoid-a-succession-crises.html> on 22nd August, 2018).
- Elicott, C.J. (1905). *Elicott commentary for english readers*. London, England: Cassel and Company Ltd.
- Eric, (2018). Recycling the recycled. *Daily Trust News Nigeria*, Lagos. Retrieved 28th August 2018.
- Erwin, F. (2003). *The encyclopaedia of christianity: J-O*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Friedman, R.C. (2001). *Commentary on the torah*. San Francisco, California: HarperOne Publishers.
- George, H.L. (2017). Commentary on numbers. *George Haydock's catholic bible commentary*. Retrieved from <https://www.studydrive.org/commentaries> on 22nd August 2018
- Gill, J. (1999). Commentary on numbers. *The new John Gill exposition of the entire bible*. Retrieved from <https://www.numbers-27.html> on 13th November 2018.
- Gill, J., (1851). *Exposition of the old testament*. London: William H. Collingridge City Press.
- Gorman, M. (2008). *Elements of biblical exegesis*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendricksen Publishers
- Greg, G. (2013). Joshua and kingship, *Bulletin For Biblical Research*, 23(1), 37-48.
- Halley, H. (1965). *Halley's bible handbook*. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Hameso, S. (2002). Issues and dilemmas of multi-party democracy in Africa, *West Africa Review*, 6(1), 57-63.
- Harshey, H. Friedman, L. (2007). Biblical leadership: Insights for today's managers. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organisation of Studies*, 21(2), 35-44.
- Herinrich, V. (1978). *Aaron*. Gottingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht..

- Howard M.I., Packer, J., Wiseman, D.J. and Millard, A.R. , (1996). *New bible dictionary*, 3rd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Hubbarb, R.L. (2009). *The NIV application commentary: Joshua*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishers
- Hutzschenreuter, T., Kleindienst, I., & Greger, C. (2012). How new leaders affect strategic change following a succession event: A critical review of the literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23 (5), 729-755.
- Jack, R. L. (2013). *Deuteronomy: A commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Jacob, M. (1989). *The JPS torah commentary: Numbers*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Jacob, R & Jacques, E. (1990). Military executive leadership. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (eds) *Measures of leadership: Leadership library of America*. Watchung Avenue, West Orange: Leadership Library of America, Inc.
- Jamieson, Robert, D. Fausset, A. & Brown, D. (1871). *Commentary, critical and explanatory on the whole bible*. Retrieved from <https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/numbers-27.html> on 30th October 2018.
- John, A.B. (2003). Why did Moses strike out? The narrative-geographical shaping of Moses' disqualification in numbers 20:1-13. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 65 (4), 131-149.
- Kabir (2010). "Constitutional reform and political succession in Nigeria". *Daily Trust News, Nigeria*, Lagos. May 7th 2010. Retrieved 30th November, 2018. <https://www./political/succession/05/16/nigeria/>.
- Kay, A. F. (2004). An investigation into successful leadership transitions in the old testament. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, 7 (2), 198-201
- Keil, C.F. & Delitzsch, F. (1985). *The pentateuch commentary on the old testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Konkel, A.H. (2006). *The NIV application commentary: 1 & 2 Kings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan
- Levine, B. (1993). *Numbers: A new translation with introduction and commentary*. New York: Doubleday.
- Lewis, P. M. (2003). Nigeria: elections in a fragile regime. *Journal of Democracy*, 14(3), 131-144
- Marvin A S. (2013). *I & II Kings: A commentary*, The old testament library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Mathew, H. (1991). *Mathew Henry's Commentary on the whole bible*. Peabody Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

- Matser, I., & Lievens, J. (2011). The succession scorecard, a tool to assist family business's trans-generational continuity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 3(2), 66-75.
- Mbamara, C.I. (2004). "Anxiety and psychological factors in godfatherism" in Duker, M. (ed) *Godfatherism in Nigeria's Politics*. Lagos, Nigeria: Essence Library.
- McDermott, J.J. (2002). *Reading the pentateuch: A historical introduction*. New York: Pauline Press.
- McKenzie, S.L. (2000). *King David: A biography*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Merrill, C. (2009). *The Zondervan dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Metumara, D. (2010). Democracy and the challenge of ethno-nationalism in Nigeria's fourth republic: Interrogating Institutional Mechanics. *Journal of peace, conflict and development*, 93(15), 97-112.
- Milgrom, J. (1983). *Magic, monotheism and the sin of Moses, in the quest for the kingdom of God*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Milgrom, J. (1990). *Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Miller, D. (1991). Some organizational consequences of CEO succession. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 99-115.
- Mumford, A. (2000). A learning approach to strategy. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(2), 234-244.
- Murtala, M. (2014). Nigeria's tortuous transition after independence: The collapse of the first republic in Ahmed, B. et al (eds) *Issues on Nigerian peoples and culture*. Zaria, Nigeria: Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited.
- Nnonyelu, A. U. (2015). The challenges of conducting peaceful elections in large multi-cultural democracies: The Indian and South African Experience". Being a paper presented at a stakeholders workshop organized by federal government and United Nations development Programme (UNDP) on Tuesday 20th Jan. 2015 at Zodiac Hotels, Enugu.
- Nwolise, O. B. C. (2007). Electoral violence and Nigeria's 2007 elections. *Journal of African Elections*, 6(2), 35-44.
- Obakhedo, N. O. (2011). Curbing electoral violence in Nigeria: The imperative of political education. *African Research Review, International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia* 5(5), 99-110.
- Ocheroeme, N. (2014). Praying for Atiku Abubakar. *Vanguard News*. Lagos. December 11th 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/11/atiku-firms-support-deal-with-s-east-leaders> on 29th November, 2018.
- Ogbonmwan, S. (2005). The Nigerian political godfathers: Edo State as a case Study". A paper presented at the 3rd annual Edo conference, Budapest, Hungary. 14th -16th October 2005.

- Oladimeji, M & Oladimeji A (2011). Corruption in Nigeria, causes, consequences and cure, in Sunday, A.B. (ed) *Corruption, democracy & good governance In Nigeria*. Saki, Ibadan: Real Success Consult.
- Olaniyi, L.K., & Umar, M.B. (2014). Democracy and succession problems in Nigeria: The fourth republic experience. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(3), 105-117.
- Olson, D.J. (1996). *Numbers*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Omolayo, B. (2005). Leadership and citizenship development in Nigeria in A. Agagu.&F. Omotoso (eds) *Citizenship education and governmental process*. University of Ado-Ekiti: General Studies unit.
- Omoruyi, O (2007). Political education for the political class, in Hassan Saliu, EbeleAmali and Raphael Olawepo (eds), *Nigeria's Reform Programme: Issues and Challenges*. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers Ltd.
- Onwuka, A. (2019). 2019 Elections: watered by blood of Nigerians. *Punch Newspaper*. February 25th 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.punchng.com/2019-elections-watered-by-blood-of-nigerians> on February 27th 2019.
- Palmer, T. (2013). *Biblical exegesis handbook*, Bukuru, Jos: African Christian Textbooks.
- Peter, C. C. (1976). *The book of deuteronomy*, the new international commentary on the old testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Richard, D. N. (2013). *The Historical Books: Interpreting Biblical Texts*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Robert, G. C. (2002). *The story of the church*. England: Moody Press.
- Robert, L. H. (2009). *The NIV Application Commentary: Joshua* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan
- Roger, G. (2012). *Theory and Practice of Leadership*. London: Sage Publishers.
- Sweeney, M.A (2007). *1&11 Kings: A commentary, the Old Testament library*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- The Human Rights Watch (2011). Nigeria: post election violence killed 800 people. New York. May, 16th 2011. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2011/05/16/nigeria-post-election-violence-killed-800.html> on August 20th, 2018.
- Umar A.A. (2011). Ethnic aggrandizement and religious fanaticism: The bane of credible elections and viable democracy in Nigeria at fifty. *Issues, Challenges and Agenda*, 2 (5), 311-327.
- Volkmar, F. (2003). *1 & 2 Kings: A continental commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press Publishers.
- Wenham, G.J. (1981). *Numbers in Tyndale old testament commentaries*. Downers Grove, Illinois, Chicago: Intervarsity Press.

Whedon, D. (1909). Commentary on Numbers. *Whedon's commentary on the bible*. Retrieved from <https://www.commentaries/whe/numbers-27.html> on 20th November