

ISSN 2181-9505
Doi Journal 10.26739/181-9505

Philosophy and Life

FALSAFA VA HAYOT • ФИЛОСОФИЯ И ЖИЗНЬ

2026 №1 (32)



ISSN 2181-9505

Doi Journal 10.26739/2181-9505

Mirzo Ulug'bek nomidagi O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi

Imom Buxoriy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi

O'zbekiston falsafa jamiyati

Национальный университет Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека

Международный научно-исследовательский центр Имам Бухари

при Кабинете Министров Республики Узбекистан

Философское общество Узбекистана

The National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Imam Bukhari International Research Center under the Cabinet of Ministers
of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Philosophical Society of Uzbekistan

FALSAFA VA HAYOT

XALQARO JURNAL

ФИЛОСОФИЯ И ЖИЗНЬ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ

PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

2026 №1 (32)

Jurnal bir yilda 4 marta nashr qilinadi.

Журнал выходит 4 раза в год.

The journal is published 4 times in a year.



Toshkent

“Falsafa va hayot” xalqaro jurnal
“Философия и жизнь” международный журнал
“Philosophy and Life” international journal

Tahrir kengashi Abdildina, R.J. – Qozog‘iston FA akademigi, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor Mamedzade, I.R. – Azarbayjon FA Falsafa va sotsiologiya instituti direktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor Skarantino, L.M. – DSc, professor, (Italiya) Smirnov, A.V. – Rossiya FA akademigi, Rossiya falsafa jamiyati, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor (Rossiya) Seytaxmedova N.L. – Qozog‘iston FA akademigi, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor Tsuy Veyxan – Xitoy ijtimoiy fanlar Akademiyasi vitse-prezidenti, DSc, professor, (Xitoy) Chumakov, A.N. – Rossiya FA Falsafa instituti professori, falsafa fanlari doktori (Rossiya) Muassislar: Mirzo Ulug‘bek nomidagi O‘zbekiston Milliy universiteti O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Imom Buxoriy xalqaro ilmiy - tadqiqot markazi O‘zbekiston falsafa jamiyati Expert lawyers MCHJ Elc.uz Ro‘yxatga olinganligi haqidagi 1175 sonli guvohnoma O‘zbekiston matbuot va axborot agentligi tomonidan 20.02.2018 yilda berilgan.	Bosh muharrir: Shermuhamedova, N.A. – f.f.d., professor (O‘zbekiston) Bosh muharrir o‘rinbosari: Aslanova, R. – f.f.d., professor (Azarbayjon) Mas’ul muharrir: Muhamedova, Z.M. – f.f.d., professor (O‘zbekiston) Tahrir hay’ati: Allahyarova, T., – f.f.d., professor (Azarbayjon) Andirjanova, G.A., – s.f.d., professor (Qozog‘iston) Abasov, A.S., –f.f.d., professor (Azarbayjon) Axamer, G – f.f.d., professor (Avstriya) Buzarinejad, Y. – f.f.d., professor (Eron) Bilalov, M.I., – f.f.d., professor (Rossiya) Gabitov, T.X., – f.f.d., professor (Qozog‘iston) Gezalov, A.A., – f.f.n., professor (Rossiya) Kerimov, E. – f.f.d., professor (Azarbayjon) Kurmangalieva, G. K., – f.f.d., professor (Qozog‘iston) Kurbonova, L.A. – f.f.d.DSc, dotsent (O‘zbekiston) Lazarevich, A.A. – f.f.d., professor (Belorus) Olatunji, Feliks – PhD, dotsent (Nigeriya) Paxruddinov, Sh.I. – s.f.d., professor (O‘zbekiston) Pardayev, S. – falsafa doktori (PhD), (O‘zbekiston) Sergeev, M.Y., – professor (AQSh) Sagikizi, A. – f.f.d., professor (Qozog‘iston) Tulenova, G. J – f.f.d., professor (O‘zbekiston) Tesdelen, Vefa, – f.f.d., professor (Turkiya) Tyukmaeva A.M. – falsafa doktori PhD (O‘zbekiston) Hakimov N. H. – f.f.d., professor (O‘zbekiston) Xudoydodzoda, F.B., – f.f.d., professor (Tojikiston) Xudoyberganov, R. – f.f.d.DSc, (O‘zbekiston) Mahmadizoda, N. – f.f.d., professor (Tojikiston) Naushabaeva, A. H – falsafa doktori (PhD), professor (Turkiya) Urmanbetova, J.K., – f.f.d., professor (Qirg‘iziston) Chjan Baychun, – f.f.d., professor (Xitoy) Sharipova E.K. – f.f.d., professor (Qirg‘iziston) Ilmiy kotib: Xidirov, M.T. – falsafa fanlari doktori (DSc), dotsent (O‘zbekiston) Musahhihlar: Qodirov J. – (O‘zbekiston) Po‘latov A. – (O‘zbekiston)
--	---

CONTENTS

PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICS AND SOCIETY

Abdurakhmanov Mukhiddin Shamsievich	HISTORICAL EVOLUTION AND SOCIO- PHILOSOPHICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF UZBEKISTAN'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE ORGANIZATION OF TURKIC STATES	9-19
Andirzhanova Gulnar Abylkhairvna, Ivashov Arslan Amanbaevich	PRESERVING THE IDENTITY OF KAZAKH SOCIETY AS A RESPONSE TO GLOBAL THREATS TO OUR WORLD	20-32
Usmanov Saidikromkhoja Saidalievich	CYBERSECURITY AS A FACTOR IN ENSURING NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY IN THE ERA OF GLOBALIZATION	33-47

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Aminjonov Kurban Khabibullaevich	INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON IN THE FORMATION OF YOUTH'S WORLDVIEW	48-60
Berdikulova Gulsarvinoz Aslamovna	COMMUNICATIVE MECHANISMS OF DISCOURSE AND MEANING TRANSFORMATION IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	61-71
Kodirov Javlonbek Abdusattor oqli	ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUSNESS AND LANGUAGE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HERMENEUTIC AND ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY	72-81

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Pulatov Anvar Akmalovich	INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF BEING IN THE PARADIGM OF POSTMODERNISM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE	82-91
Khaydarova Zebiniso	EVOLUTION OF THE CATEGORY OF TRUTH IN CLASSICAL, MODERN, AND POSTMODERN PHILOSOPHY AND TRENDS OF RELATIVITY IN GLOBAL CONSCIOUSNESS	92-102

WORLD CULTURE AND RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS

Dr. Yetunde Abolaji AKINNAWO, Dr. Amos Ayodele OKEOWO	IK'YHE AS A SYMBOL OF POWER IN CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY	103-115
Shakenov Dias Pavlovich	TRANSFORMATION OF ECOLOGICAL CULTURE AND THE SYSTEM OF ECOLOGICAL VALUES IN A POST- NORMAL SOCIETY	116-126

**DUNYO MADANIYATI VA DINIY AN'ANALAR /
МИРОВАЯ КУЛЬТУРА И РЕЛИГИОЗНЫЕ ТРАДИЦИИ /
WORLD CULTURE AND RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS**

UDK: 27-42:316.74



10.5281/zenodo.20181950

Dr. Yetunde Abolaji AKINNAWO

Department of Religions

Osun State University, Ikire Campus, Nigeria

e-mail: akinnawoabolaji@gmail.com

Dr. Amos Ayodele OKEOWO

Department of Religions

Osun State University, Ikire Campus, Nigeria

e-mail: ayo5929.ao@gmail.com

**IK'YHE AS SYMBOL OF POWER FOR CONTEMPORARY
CHRISTIANITY**

Abstract. Historically, the integral mingling of politics and religion did not start with ancient Israel. Incidentally, ancient Israelite religion, culture, and politics were adaptations of Ancient Near Eastern influences, where kings were regarded as the representatives of gods. Although pragmatic analysis reveals that power is the common goal of politics and religion but power in religion has been passively perceived as a result of comfort in religion. Hence, the inviolable concord between religion and politics in the early monarchical Israelite is a unique reference for establishing a discussion on politics and religion as an entity. In Ancient Israel, the Hebrew term **הֵיכָל** (Heykal), Ik'yhe translated as sanctuary, is designated for both the Temple of YHWH and the king's Palace. This implies religion as a political entity and vice versa among the Ancient Israelites. This paper attempts a compendium of these interplays to instil the paradigm of religion as a paragon of power which controls even the activities of our contemporary society. The paper also gives modern Christian churches useful advice on how to deal with political power structures.

Keywords: Politics, Religion, Power, Heykal and Society, pragmatic phenomenon, Michel Foucault.

INTRODUCTION

The sociological control and influence of religion on any society cannot be overemphasised. The show of respect, ore and fear that religion has been earning from humanity transcends historical record. It is a pragmatic phenomenon that lacks a logical explanation. Its imperceptible influence permeates humanity, yet without assertion to any scientific source of its power. A credence to an

undefinable and heterogeneously perceived divine being maintains a constant for its source of power. Conventionally, politics is equated to power, whereas religion, on which political elites mostly depend for the establishment of their power, is passively perceived as being powerful. It is pertinent to quickly mention that divine and ritual power, being one of the mechanisms of power for religion, is a generic source of power [Wuthnow, 2023]. From Emile Durkheim's functional theory to Max Weber's social change theory and Karl Max's conflict theory of religion [Cliffs Notes 2024], the religious domination of society is affirmed, ranging from economic, culture and even politics, because religion's power is expressed in what people do or say, hence the idea of religion being synonymous with power. In the quest to paradigmatically nip the synonymousness of religion to power, this paper adopts הֵיכָל Heykal, being the designated name for the Ancient Israelite's temple and the palace of their king. Thus, the instinct that the temple of Yahweh and the king's palace are bureaucratically synonymous. If the Temple is הֵיכָל Heykal and הֵיכָל Heykal is Palace, where palace is a political symbol and power is equal to politics, religion can be proofed to be a symbol of power. This paper will attempt different dimensions of power, run exegesis on the Hebrew word הֵיכָל to establish its historical usage in Ancient Near East and Israel, trace the religio-political interplay in ANE, ancient Israelites from the tribal league to the post exilic period. Finally, the consciousness of religion as an emblem of power shall be drawn as an implication for contemporary society.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The theoretical foundation of this paper is significantly based on the concept of political theology, especially as articulated by Carl Schmitt, who famously stated that "all significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularised theological concepts [Schmitt, 1985] Schmitt's framework asserts that political structures historically obtain their legitimacy and conceptual categories from theological models. This is especially important for understanding Heykal, where the same word refers to both the Temple of Yahweh and the king's palace. This shows that in Ancient Israel, political power was seen as an extension of divine authority. Johann Baptist Metz's political theology enhances this framework by arguing that theology must engage with societal structures and that the church's message carries unavoidable political ramifications¹ [Metz, Baptist, 1969]. In Metz's view, "the authority of the church is not a domination authority but a service authority"; however, this service inherently situates the church within a political discourse [Metz, 1980]². This theoretical perspective elucidates the dual role of the prophets in ancient Israel as both religious representatives and political critics, they operated within a theological framework that inherently included political reality.

¹ [Metz, Baptist, 1969, *Theology of the World*. Translated by William Glen-Doepel. New York: Herder and Herder, 107-124]

² [, *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*, trans. David Smith, New York: Seabury Press, 52].

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Power as an expression of freedom represents one's ability to get things done through other people. While freedom remains the ultimate goal of every man, power remains the necessary tool to gain freedom. Thus, the more power you have, the more freedom to do the things we desire. Freedom is tantamount to responsibility therefore, usurping great power comes with great responsibility. Since all human relationships are based on power, there is nothing morally wrong with a craving to have more. Michel Foucault remarked on the importance of power in human activity in this manner: "Power is everywhere...because it comes from everywhere" [Aldrich, Robert and Wotherspoon, Gary (Eds.), 2001]. Power is all about domination. It comes in different dimensions. The ability to change another person's circumstances or mental state, either through giving or taking away resources (tangible and/or intangible) or by enforcing penalties, is dimensional. However, to Lukes, the most effective of any dimension is the least observable one [Lukes, 2005]. Working by Steven Luke's framework on power, the scope of power is broadly limited to three dimensions: the active, the passive and influence. Luke's three dimensions are preferred to the latter scholars' four dimensions because he further groups the three dimensions into two: confrontational and influence [Lukes, 2005]. The first dimension of power is referred to as active because it is direct and insensitive to the imminent conflict when the interests of various parties are at odds in ensuring the acquiescence of another. Power's second dimension is passive because of the ability of those in positions of authority to stifle disagreement out of conflict. Thirdly, the capacity to avoid confrontation is taken into account in the third dimension of power. People's impressions of their circumstances and how they think and perceive the world can be shaped by those in positions of power. Through such methods, persons in positions of authority can influence others' choices to the point where they obey because they are unable to envision another outcome. They consider conformity to be normal. The first and second dimensions are closely related because it involves compulsion; not minding the approach of attainment, while the third dimension is influential. Basically, the three dimensions can be broadly divided into two forms.

The two major forms of power are hard power (compulsion) and soft power (influence) [Kotter, 1985]. While the former is the use of force on someone to do what you command, the latter is the ability to encourage someone to do what you suggest. Since religion does not use force to gain control, we shall resolve to consider the five bases for soft power. John R. P. French and Bertram Raven's work on sources of power identifies five bases of power as legitimate, coercive, expert, referent and reward [Raven, 2004]. However, their position on influence as distinct from power is opposed. The relativity of power through influence does not jeopardise its controlling efficacy. This is where Luke's choice of power dimension is valid. Influence, based on understanding, is the least observable form of power, hence the most potent of the forms. However, the suggestion of legitimate, coercive, referent, expert and reward as five bases for attaining control without considering the approach is reference. It is superfluous in this paper,

considering further bases as adduced by other scholars [Morgan 1986]. Legitimate power - the power of position and duties within an organisation. It is a formal authority through delegation to the holder of the position. This is the most obvious kind of power operating through social recognition of hierarchical structures. Coercive power - the application of negative influences. It includes the ability to demote or withhold other rewards. The desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the most obvious but least effective form of power, as it often builds resentment and resistance among those who experience it.

Expert power - A personal power derived from the skills or expertise of the person and the organisation's needs for those skills and expertise. Unlike the others, this type of power is usually highly specific and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified. Referent power - The ability of individuals to attract others and build loyalty. It's based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. This is power through desires to identify the personal qualities of the power holder to gain satisfaction from being an accepted follower [Nesler, Mitchell, Aguinis, Herman, Quigley, Brian, Tedeschi, James, 1993].

Reward power - This power depends on the ability of the power wielder to confer valued material rewards; it refers to the degree to which the individual can give others a reward of some kind, such as benefits, time off, desired gifts, promotions or increases in pay or responsibility. This power is obvious but also ineffective if abused. People who abuse reward power can become pushy or become reprimanded for being too forthcoming or 'moving things too quickly.

Religion follows the path of soft power to advance dominion by adopting secondary apparatus, including politics, to gain control, although soft power is the preferred form for both religion and politics. Neither religion nor politics is expected to exercise hard form of power, but where coercion is legitimately necessitated, politics can adopt it. Viewing power as asymmetric resources and capacity, politics often results in underhanded schemes, called intrigue, to gain control in the absence of moral authority. For the region, Robert Wuthnow [Wuthnow, 2023] offers the following methods of how religious power works to gain social control: Ritual Power is not merely comprehensively symbolised in ritual, as is frequently claimed. Instead, it is communication-based, and as a result, it takes place in the social connections of individuals involved, particularly with respect to the object of adoration [Wuthnow, 2023, 16].

Discursive Power is the kind of influential power expressed in Karl Marx's conflict theory of religion. Those in power in a religion are often able to dictate practices, rituals, and beliefs through their interpretations [Wuthnow, 2023, 48]. Having viewed religion as the "opium of the people", teaching people to accept their current lot in life, no matter how bad, while postponing rewards and happiness to some afterlife, is a massive in controlling the economic status of its society. This is the core of religion's power mechanism. Institutional Power - is a power that a group naturally wields through the control of physical space, the

certification of knowledge that is both practical and codified, and the distribution of symbolic incentives in ways that bestow status [Wuthnow, 2023].

Identity power - when it validates or challenges group identities based on gender, sexual orientation, race, and ethnicity, as well as national origin, religion, and exercises identity power. Organised conservative Christians from various denominations use political means to oppose same-sex marriage, seeking to amend both state and federal laws. Political Power – It is surprising that one of the religion's power apparatuses is politics, yet religion's capacity to control is passively considered. “Out of the eater came something to eat” (Judges 14:14). Here lies the coercive force of religion. Thus, religion lays claim to divine authority by its capacity to bring comfort to control politics. Therefore, it can be said that religion frequently wields some sort of "soft power" in politics. Wuthnow investigates four ways that power is manifested: signalling, storytelling, political involvement, and protest [Wuthnow, 2023, 186.].

Exegetically, the word הֵיכָל (heykal), a noun common masculine singular construct in Ancient Israel, is used to designate a large public building such as a palace or temple, including the palace of the king of Babylon (2Kgs 20:18) [Strong. 2001]. Its first usage pertains to the tabernacle at Shiloh [1Sam.1:9]. וְעָלִי הָעֵלִי יָשָׁב עַל־הַכִּסֵּא עַל־מְזוֹזַת הַיָּכָל יְהוָה: “Now Eli the priest was sitting on the seat by the doorpost of the tabernacle.

הֵיכָל (Heykal) of the LORD.

It is suggested to have originated from a root word lk)y (yakol); a primitive root meaning to be able, literally (can, could) or morally (may, might) [Strong, 2001]. It is a pagan word akkadian (the Sumerian to be precise) which became e-kal or “big house, palace” In the Bible, it is interpreted as be able, any at all (ways), attain, can (away with), could, endure, might, overcome, have power, prevail [KJV version]. It first occurs in Gen.13:6 to designate incapacitation. . . . וְלֹא־נָשָׂא אֹתָם הָאָרֶץ לְשִׁבְתָּ יַחְדָּו כִּי־הָיָה רִכּוּשָׁם רָב וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְשִׁבְתָּ יַחְדָּו: that they could not dwell together. It is amazing how a word that signifies “holy of holies of the temple or tabernacle” is actually a loan word from a “pagan” language: the Sumerian word akkadian, which became e-kal or “big house, palace” [Sabar, 2015]. It is not surprising that it easily fits into being used to designate the king of Babylon's temple. It is obvious that the word הֵיכָל is a generic name in the Ancient Near East – ANE, which simply symbolises capacity/power/authority. The architectural structure represented not merely a building but the institutional authority contained within it. Ancient Israel is a theocratic state, hence it is impossible to understand politics without understanding their religion. Norman Gottwald expresses his challenge in understanding the politics of ancient Israel outside the court of religion. He observed that all of the political personalities listed in the Hebrew Bible were concurrently viewed as religious figures and religious organisations, and vice versa [Gottwald, 1979]. Furthermore, it was challenging to understand the essentially political nature of ancient Israelite life because the biblical descriptions and appraisals of politics were nearly entirely written from a religious perspective. Every political regime's success or failure

seemed to depend on whether or not religious principles and practices were upheld or disregarded while it was in power. This substantiates the identical designation of the temple of Yahweh and the king's palace with the word Heykal. The palace of the king is an extension of Yahweh's temple, while the temple was the center of the nation both politically and cosmically [Levenson, 1985]. This practice is not unique to the Ancient Israel. Reiteratively, Israelite's culture, politics and religion are appropriations of the usual practice in the Ancient Near East [Ojo & Ojebode, 2010,]. Sumerians had much resemblance with the Babylonians as theocratic states.

The term Pharaoh derives from the Egyptian per-aa, meaning "great house," which referred to the royal palace and, by extension, the king himself [Silverman, 1997]. The Pharaoh was not merely a political leader but also held divine status, regarded as the living embodiment of the god Horus and the son of Ra, the sun god. This theological role was central to Egyptian civilisation, as the Pharaoh was believed to maintain ma'at cosmic order, justice, and truth [Wilkinson, 2008,]. As a divine ruler, the Pharaoh was the preserver of the god-given order, ma'at. His duties included building temples, leading military campaigns, and performing rituals to ensure the Nile's annual flood and the nation's prosperity. Starting around 1400 BCE, this phrase was more frequently employed to designate the reigning monarch. This is synonymous with the Ancient Israelites' designation of Heykal large public building. According to Scheffler, anyone who is relevant in history must be connected with politics and power [Scheffler, 2001]. The power of Pharaoh as a political figure is vested in religious authority since his legitimacy was derived from divine appointment and his role as intermediary between the gods and the people. The Neolithic Babylonian Empire, the city and its land were the god's estate. The earthly ruler, whether king or priest, is a representative of the gods. Like the 3,500 B.C.E Egyptian Pharaoh, the law of the kings was the law of the gods. King Hammurabi (1728–1686 BCE) dominated Mesopotamia and ruled with the code of the gods called the Code of Hammurabi. Even the meaning of the city's name depicts the control and power of its religion. The spelling Babylon is the Latin representation of Greek Babylōn (Βαβυλών), derived from the native (Babylonian) Bābilim, meaning "gate of the god(s)" [Budge, 1880]. The city itself was conceived as the point of intersection between divine and human realms, with the temple as the earthly dwelling of the deity and the king as the deity's earthly representative. Whatever is relevant in history is political and whatever is political is powerful, Scheffler [Scheffler, 2001] posits that any history is a political history because it brings to record the few who had impact (power) in their time. Dada made an apt observation on the relevance of the Ancient Israelite's prophets as agents of socio-political control from religion's wing [Dada, 2018]. These prophets served as both religious representatives and political critics, demanding accountability from kings to divine standards, thus exerting considerable political influence, without occupying formal political positions. The Temple was not only a place of worship; it was also the economic center, the judicial authority, and the symbolic heart of the country. The relevance of the Temple in Ancient Israel was

positioned at the vantage position of power and inevitable social influence. Invariably, religion is power - a form of metaphysical tower [Satlow, 2014,].

During the tribal confederacy period of the Israelites, 1250 1050 BCE, the religious structure was the center of unity for the twelve tribes, even though the tabernacle was a mobile sanctuary. The Ark of the Covenant, housed in the tabernacle, symbolises God's presence and a rallying point for the military confederation. The religious structure experienced a transformation from a mobile tent to a permanent temple when there was the establishment of the monarchy was established under Saul, David, and Solomon [Gottwald, 1979].

David's aspiration to build a "house" for Yahweh (2 Samuel 7) indicated how religious and political power were integrated. The Davidic dynasty covenant showcased an eternal dynasty which reflected the link of the fate of the survival of the monarchy inextricably with the worship of Yahweh. When Solomon built the Temple in Jerusalem, he put it adjacent to his royal palace. This created a sacred zone where both divine and human rule could be found. The Temple was more than just a place to worship; but also the royal chapel, the national shrine, and the symbol that Yahweh had chosen David and his descendants [Brueggemann, 2002].

The Temple in Jerusalem served as the religious, political, economic, and social center of the nation during the First Temple period [ca. 960 586 BCE]. The king's palace and Yahweh's temple shared the same designation *הֵיכָל* because they both have a significant function of seats of authority. The king ruled over Yahweh's people in Yahweh's land from Yahweh's city, with Yahweh's temple as the cosmic center from which divine order was emanated [Matthews, 2002]. The reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah explain how religious and political were integrated. These kings used their political power to authorise religious reforms, such as centralising worship in Jerusalem and eliminating rival religious sites of worship. At the same time that their religious reforms served political purposes, centralising worship fortified royal authority by weakening and destroying local power centers [Cogan, 2003]. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, and Hosea were all prophets who operated at the intersection of religion and politics in Israel. They addressed the king directly by pronouncing God's decisions on political issues. Their authorities to prophecy were not derived from political office but from their claim to speak for Yahweh, yet their messages carried profound political consequences. For instance, when Jeremiah stood in the Temple gate and pronounced judgment on the Temple in Jeremiah 7, he challenged both religious and political establishments simultaneously [Heschel, 1962].³ The destruction of the First Temple in 586 BCE caused a devastation of religio-political integration. It was difficult for the Israelite to understand its unique relationship with Yahweh as a nation without the temple, king, or land. During the time of exile, synagogue worship evolved and the Torah was rated as center of religious identity. Even while in exile, religion and politics were still integrated Daniel and his companions served pagan kings in the Babylonian and Persian courts, and still maintain their religious identity of Yahweism - Daniel 1-6.[Ackroyd, 1968]. Under Persian rule,

³ [Heschel, 1962, *The Prophets*, New York: Harper & Row, 3-26.]

after the return from exile in 539 BCE and later years, the Temple was rebuilt under the leadership of Zerubbabel and Joshua the High Priests. Prophets Haggai and Zechariah, supported and encouraged the rebuilding, they connected the restored Temple to messianic hopes for a restored Davidic monarchy. The Second Temple period (516 BCE–70 CE) presented a different configuration of religio-political authority in which the high priest assumed greater political authority in the absence of a native king, while foreign powers (Persian, Greek, Hasmonean, Roman) exerted ultimate political control [Grabbe, 2004-2008].

The Temple in Jerusalem remained the center of Jewish religious life by the New Testament period, even though the political authority was shared between Roman Governors and client kings like Herod. Herod the Great rebuilt and expanded the Temple, using it to gain political legitimacy while also building temples to Roman gods in other cities. The priestly aristocracy cooperated with Roman authorities to maintain peace and order, thus demonstrating the continued integration of religious and political power [Sanders, 1992]. Furthermore, Jesus' ministry involved substantial confrontations with Temple authorities. His cleansing of the Temple (Mark 11:15–19; John 2:13–22) challenged the commercial and political arrangements that sustained the priestly aristocracy in power while his prophecy of the Temple's destruction (Mark 13:1–2) threatened the entire religio-political framework. The political charges against him in front of Pilate were that he professed himself to be the Christ, and a king, and that he forbade people to pay tribute to Caesar-Luke 23:2 [Sanders, 1985]. However, the early Church gradually broke away from the Temple, because of persecution (Acts 6–8) and destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Nevertheless, the Church built its own structure of authority similar to both religious and political models. Bishops emerged as leaders of Christian communities and exercised authorities that were both spiritual and administrative [Brown, 2003]. It is not accidental neither is it a necessity borne out of the Ancient Israelites' political system – theocracy – that their major religious symbol shared the same nomenclature with their kings' palace. First, it has been proven that theocratic rule is a norm in the ANE, where the Israelites got their culture, politics and religion appropriated. They consciously brought the domination of religion over politics to play while maintaining the inviolable relationship of the physical political head to Yahweh through the Temple. Significantly, Heykal in Ancient Israel is a representation of religious domination and the reason for political relevance (power). Therefore, religion's well-being should be the concern of the state. It must never be suppressed by the power of politics when it maintains its focus and relevance [Casanova, 1994].

Politics is power because it holds religion at an arm's length. In essence, the religion constitutes the power that feeds politics. The presence of religion in the political sphere is a sustaining backup for the political relevance, but not in immoral collaboration. Rather, religion offers moral vision, communal identity, and transcendent legitimation that political institutions cannot generate from within themselves [Apter, 1965].

The current separation of church and state in numerous societies should not obscure the persistent reality of religio-political integration. Even in societies that are not religious, religious groups still have a lot of power through voting blocs, advocacy groups, and moral persuasion. The name may have changed, but the reality of Heykal the merging of religious and political power remains in new forms [Taylor, 2007]. Modern political movements that openly oppose religious influence frequently appropriate religious language and symbolism. Revolutionary movements use messianic themes, nationalist movements claim sacredness for the nation, and political leaders present themselves as saviours. These applications of religious categories of symbols and languages demonstrate the continued power of religion even in situations that seem to be secular. Religion constitutes the fundamental framework of meaning within which political power functions [Voegelin, 1952]. Politics honours the power of religion as it is observed that politicians do consult either openly or secretly men of God to pray for them for protection, guidance, victory and organise and attend religious places of worship for thanksgiving services. On the other hand, a good number of men of God still take it as a responsibility to intercede for politicians and in addition, are not afraid to bear the mind of God to them either openly or secretly on any matter. This reflects the connection of the Heykal in the political realm, even in contemporary times.

Like the prophets of ancient Israel, the church must speak truth to political power and hold rulers accountable to divine standards of justice and righteousness. This requires both proximity to power in order to speak relevantly and at the same time distance from power to speak prophetically. The church that becomes indistinguishable from political institutions loses its critical capacity, while the church that retreats entirely from political engagement abandons its prophetic responsibilities. The church is expected to form citizens whose character, integrity and commitments influence their political participation. Through worship, catechesis, and communal practice, the church cultivates virtues and convictions that inform how believers engage in political life. This formative role constitutes a form of power more profound than direct political action as it shapes the very desires and dispositions that underlie political choices. Christians should be conscious of the fact that the Church itself constitutes a political community, a polis with its own constitution (Scripture), its own laws (the commandments of Christ), its own citizenship (baptism), and its own practices (worship, Eucharist, discipline). This alternative polity does not replace earthly political communities but relativises their claims and provides a model of human community ordered toward genuine flourishing. Churches should equip members for faithful political engagement in their various callings by helping believers discern whether they are called to political office, government service, advocacy, or other forms of political engagement. This is because political vocation is a legitimate Christian calling requiring specific gifts and formation. When the church seeks power for its own sake, it risks making an idol of political influence. The church's ultimate loyalty belongs to God alone. Therefore, political power must serve, not supplant, that

loyalty. The church that sacrifices its witness for political access will lose its essence of existence. Having established the power of religion, the church organisation should make it a point of duty that handlers of religious doctrine should be well-grounded not only in theological knowledge but also in Religio-cultural knowledge, such that they will be able to dish out the right knowledge. By and large, churches must prioritise training in the exercise of prophetic ministry that speaks truth to power while maintaining appropriate humility and respect for institutional authority. The Prophetic ministry requires both courage and wisdom, speaking in clear terms, while listening carefully.

CONCLUSION

Whatever influences society is vested with power because power is the source of context manipulation of objective facts and social influence. Power is the essence of our conscious manipulations, which have been brought forth to pursue desires. The Hebrew word **הֵיכָל** has revealed the deep integration of religious and political power in human society. This integration is not merely a historical curiosity but an enduring reality. Contemporary churches inherit the symbolic identity and legacy of Heykal, which is the temple of the living God where His divine presence dwells and from which divine authority radiates. Therefore, Christians must navigate their relationship to political power with wisdom, courage, and faithfulness. Politics also should not look down on or take with levity the contemporary Heykal. The recommendations and implications offered in this paper aim to help churches maintain faithful witness in the political sphere and also help sanitise the political realm while avoiding the temptations that accompany power.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackroyd, (1968) *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
2. Aldrich, Robert, and Wotherspoon, eds. (2001), *Who's Who in Contemporary Gay and Lesbian History: From World War II to the Present Day*. London: Routledge.
3. Apter, David (1965) *The Politics of Modernization* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
4. Brown, (2003), *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
5. Brueggemann, (2002) *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination and Memory*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
6. Budge, (1880) *The History of Esarhaddon (Son of Sennacherib) King of Assyria, B.C. 681-668*. London: Trübner & Co.
7. Casanova, (1994) *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

8. Cliffs Notes, (2024) "Sociological Theories of Religion." 2024. Accessed May 4, 2025. <https://www.cliffsnotes.com/study-guides/sociology/religion/sociological-theories-of-religion>.
9. Cogan, (2003) "The Chronicler's Use of Chronology as Illuminated by Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions." In *Empires and Empires: Studies in Biblical Historiography*, Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press.
10. Dada, (2018), "Predictive Prophecy as a Medium of Social Control in Ancient Israel and the Nigerian Context." In *Prophecy, Politics and Power in Ancient Israel and the Nigerian Context*, edited by Dada, Ayantayo, Akinbamijo, Adekoya, Familusi, and Olaleye, 179–195. Ibadan: Zenith Book House Ltd.
11. Drower, and Peter, (2026) "Pharaoh: Egypt King." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Accessed [date]. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/pharaoh>.
12. Gottwald, (1979), *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250–1050 B.C.E.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
13. Grabbe, (2008) *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. 2 vols. London: T&T Clark International.
14. Handy, (1976), *Understanding Organizations*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976.
15. Heschel, (1962) *The Prophets*. New York: Harper & Row.
16. Kotter, (1985) *Power and Influence*. New York: Free Press.
17. Levenson, (1985), *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston Press.
18. Lukes, (2005) *Power: A Radical View*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
19. Matthews, (2002) *A Brief History of Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press,
20. Metz, (1980) *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology* Translated by David Smith. New York: Seabury Pres.
21. Metz, (1969) *Theology of the World*. Translated by William Glen-Doepel. New York: Herder and Herder.
22. Morgan, (1968) *Images of Organization*, Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
23. Nesler, Brian, and James (1993) "The Effect of Credibility on Perceived Power." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 23, no. 17.
24. Ojo and Ojebode, (2010) *History and Religion of Israel from the Formative Period to the Fall of Judah*. Lagos: Nathy Publishers.
25. Raven, (2004) "Six Bases of Power." In *Encyclopedia of Leadership*, 1242–1249. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2004.
26. Sabar, (2015) A Word or Two on 'Heichal. *Jewish Journal*, July 29. <https://jewishjournal.com/culture>.
27. Sanders, (1985) *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
28. Sanders, (1992) *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM Press.

29. Satlow, (2014) How the Bible Became Holy. New Haven: Yale University Press.
30. Scheffler, (2001) Politics in Ancient Israel. Pretoria: Biblia Publishers.
31. Schmitt, (1985) Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty. Translated by George Schwab. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
32. Strong, (1964) The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible: Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary, Original Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
33. Taylor, (2007) A Secular Age. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
34. Voegelin, (1952) The New Science of Politics: An Introduction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
35. Wuthnow, (2003) Religion's Power: What Makes It Work, -New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. Online edition, Oxford Academic, Accessed May 4, 2023. <https://academic.oup.com/book>.

Йетунде Аболáджи Акиннавo

доктор философии PhD

кафедра религиоведения

Государственный университет Осун, кампус Икире,

(Нигерия)

E-mail: akinnowoabolaji@gmail.com

Амос Аёдэле Океовo

доктор философии PhD

кафедра религиоведения

Государственный университет Осун, кампус Икире,

(Нигерия)

E-mail: akinnowoabolaji@gmail.com; ayo5929.ao@gmail.com

ИКЪЕ КАК СИМВОЛ ВЛАСТИ ДЛЯ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ХРИСТИАНСТВА

Аннотация. Исторически неразрывное переплетение политики и религии не началось с древнего Израиля. Древнеизраильская религия, культура и политика, по сути, являлись адаптацией древневосточных влияний, где цари рассматривались как представители богов. Хотя прагматический анализ показывает, что власть является общей целью как политики, так и религии, в религиозном контексте власть часто воспринимается пассивно как результат духовного комфорта. Таким образом, неразрывное единство религии и политики в ранней монархической системе древнего Израиля служит важным основанием для анализа их взаимосвязи. В древнем Израиле еврейский термин **הֵיכָל** (Heykal), переведённый как святилище, обозначал как храм Яхве, так и дворец царя. Это указывает на то, что религия и политика функционировали как взаимосвязанные элементы социальной системы. Данная статья рассматривает эти взаимосвязи с целью

показать религию как форму власти, влияющую на современное общество. Также предлагаются рекомендации для современных христианских церквей относительно взаимодействия с политическими структурами власти.

Ключевые слова: политика, религия, власть, Хейкал, общество.

Yetunde Abolaji Akinawo

falsafa doktori

dinshunoslik kafedrası

Osun davlat universiteti, Ikire kampusi,

(Nigeriya)

E-mail: akinnawoabolaji@gmail.com

Amos Ayodele Okeowo

falsafa doktori

dinshunoslik kafedrası

Osun davlat universiteti, Ikire kampusi,

(Nigeriya)

Eayo5929.ao@gmail.com

IK'YHE ZAMONAVIY XRISTIANLIKDA QUDRAT TIMSOLI SIFATIDA

Annotatsiya. Tarixiy jihatdan siyosat va dinning uzviy qorishuvi qadimgi Isroildan boshlanmagan. Qadimgi Isroil dini, madaniyati va siyosati aslida qadimiy Sharq sivilizatsiyalarining ta'siri natijasida shakllangan bo'lib, u yerda podshohlar xudolarning vakillari sifatida qaralgan. Amaliy tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, siyosat va din uchun umumiy maqsad — bu hokimiyatdir, biroq diniy hokimiyat ko'p hollarda ruhiy qoniqish orqali passiv tarzda qabul qilinadi. Shu sababli, qadimgi Isroilning ilk monarxik davrida din va siyosat o'rtasidagi uzviy bog'liqlik ushbu munosabatni tahlil qilish uchun muhim asos bo'lib xizmat qiladi. Qadimgi Isroilda ibroniycha heykal atamasi «muqaddas joy» deb tarjima qilinadi va u ham Yahve ibodatxonasini, ham podshoh saroyini anglatgan. Bu esa din va siyosatning o'zaro bog'liq ijtimoiy tizim sifatida faoliyat yuritganini ko'rsatadi. Mazkur maqolada ushbu o'zaro aloqalar tahlil qilinib, din hokimiyatning shakli sifatida zamonaviy jamiyatga ta'sir ko'rsatishi ochib beriladi. Shuningdek, zamonaviy xristian cherkovlariga siyosiy hokimiyat tuzilmalari bilan munosabatda bo'lish bo'yicha tavsiyalar beriladi.

Kalit so'zlar: siyosat, din, hokimiyat, Heykal, jamiyat, siyosiy hokimiyat.

