

CONCEPTION
OF
WAR AND PEACE
IN THE
B I B L E.

Sidney E. Goldstein.

1905.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

.....

The Bible.

Jewish Encyclopedia.

Encyclopedia Biblica.

Hasting's Encyclopedia of the Bible.

Newack, Wilhelm: Lehrbuch der Hebraischen Archæologie.
Leipzig, 1894.

Benzinger, J.: Hebraische Archæologie.
Leipzig, 1894.

Schwally, Friedrich: Semitische Kriegsaltertümer.
Leipzig, 1901.

Smend, Rudolf: Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte.
Leipzig, 1899.

Marti, Karl: Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion.
Strassburg, 1903.

Smith, W. Robertson: Religion of the Semites.
London, 1894.

Barton, George Aaron: Sketch of Semitic Origins.
New York, 1902.

Smith, George Adam: Historical Geography of the Holy Land.
New York, 1895.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. (continued).

Budde, Karl: Religion of Israel to the Exile.

Cornill, Carl Heinrich: The Prophets of Israel.

Graetz, H.: History of the Jews.

Todd, J.C.: Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel.

Driver, S.R.: Commentary on Deuteronomy.

Gray, George Buchanan: Commentary on Numbers.

Steuernagel, Carl: Deuteronomium und Jesua.

ABBREVIATIONS.

.....

Aren.	Hebraische Archæologie.
GIR	Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion.
HGHL	Historical Geography of the Holy Land.
LAR	Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte.
P&R in AI	Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel.
RS	Religion of the Semites.
SK	Semitische Kriegsaltertümer.
SKO	A Sketch of Semitic Origins.

INTRODUCTION.

A nation's conception of life is conditioned and shaped by its historical experience; this historical experience is determined in part by the geographical position of the nation and the character of its country. If a nation is outside the line of communication that runs from one point of civilization to another, this nation's experience will be practically simple, peaceful and indigenous, as is the experience of an isolated village or of an individual who secludes himself from society; on the other hand, if a nation lies directly across the path which other peoples must traverse in their conduct of trade or war, this nation's experience will be complex, agitated and mingled with alien elements, as is the experience of a city which is the meeting place of many roads of commerce or of a man who lives within the circles of activity and who feels the rush and sweep of social currents.

This general truth, operative at all times, was particularly applicative in ancient days. In the twentieth century the telegraph and the press carry the news of the world into every corner of the earth and so make us all participants in the whole of contemporaneous history; in the age of Egypt, Assyria and Israel the only avenues of communication were the great trade routes and the only instruments were the incidental travelers, caravans and armies. It is necessary, therefore, in studying the con-

tion of war and peace in the Bible to consider first the geographical position of the ancient Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

Palestine is situated midway between the two continents of Asia and Africa; on the north are the Lebanon Mountains, on the south and east are the deserts of Arabia, on the west is the Mediterranean Sea, and along this western coast is the one great trade route that leads from the Nile to the Euphrates. The significance of this position can be fully appreciated when we recall that on the banks of the Euphrates rested the vast Assyrian Empire and that Egypt extended along the Nile. Egypt and Assyria were the two great world powers of Antiquity, for centuries they struggled with each other in a gigantic conflict, and in order to reach each other they were forced to pass through Palestine and to march over the route that stretched north from the land of Egypt to the broad Plain of Esdraelon, thence north east to Damascus and thence east to Assyria. George Adam Smith (HGHLpp.147-156) draws for us a vivid picture of these mighty armies tramping back and forth, meeting and clashing in the heart of Syria and within sight and hearing of Israel and Judah; and it requires but little reasoning to prove the consequent influence that these two small kingdoms must have suffered, bordering as they did upon this "highroad of civilization and the battle-field of empires" (ibid p.6). Placed between these two powerful poles the Israelites and the Judeans were constantly fearful of their fate; they inclined now to one and now to the other, playing for the favor and the support of each, and hence, an enemy to both. This political struggle in all its vacillation and weakness is most painfully

reflected in our best source-books of the period, the Books of the First Isaiah and of Jeremiah. Each of these Prophets insisted that Judah's salvation lay in neutrality, as we shall see later, and both fought unceasingly against the waves of Egyptian and Assyrian Culture.

Palestine itself is divided into four natural sections, running north and south (G.A.Smith:HGHLpp.45-59). Beginning at the Mediterranean Sea, there is first the Maritime Plain, then a central range of mountains, next the Jordan Valley, and finally another range of mountains which slope off into the desert. The central range south of the Plain of Esdraelon shapes itself gradually into a table-land with an average height of 2400 feet, and it was upon this table-land that Judah was situated. This home among the hills gave the people a decide advantage in both war and peace; it afforded them an opportunity to defend themselves in the mountains and the passes as they often did from their entrance into Canaan even down to Maccabean times and the Bar Cochba Rebellion; and during the breathing-spells that Egypt and Assyria were compelled to take it permitted them to develop in comparative security. These facts concerning the position and the character of Palestine will disclose their importance in even a preliminary study of the kind of war the Israelites and the Judeans waged, the ritual and laws accompanying it, the purpose of their war and the relation of Jahwe to the battles of his people.

CHARACTER OF WAR.

In the Bible the word "war", ~~which~~, covers a wide range of facts and events with only this in common, they all involve combat and struggle. J.C. Todd (P.&R.inA.I. p.50) says: "When a neighboring tribe tries stealthily to drive off the cattle, and the clansmen turn out to chase the marauders away, that is 'war'. When Assyria pours like a flood over a happy country and ruins it forever, that, too, is 'war'." On the way to Palestine the Israelites fought a number of wars; they almost had to fight their way to the Promised Land. The accounts of these wars are contained in the Pentateuch (Ex.17:8-13, Num.21:1-3, 21-35, 31:1-54), but the stories are so worked over that it is difficult to do more than infer the character of these early struggles with Amalek, the Kings of Arad, the Emorites, Bashan and the Midianites. There seems to be little doubt that the Israelites wandering in the Wilderness were only nomads in culture and thought. As such, their method of warfare must have been extremely simple. Nomads combine clans and go out to battle principally for plunder or new possessions, or in order to protect themselves from those who wish to ravage or dispossess them. This no doubt, was what the Israelitish tribes did; on the approach of an enemy they mustered out all who were able to bear arms, and, it seems, conducted their attack in accordance with no devised plan; or when they wished to change their abode they simply sent spies to search out the district coveted (Num.13:1-33) and raided the region with what skill they

could.(Barton:S.K.O. p.38,Benziger:Arch. p.356).

When the Israelites entered Canaan they found conditions that were very different from those of the desert, and consequently they were compelled to change their tactics of warfare. The inhabitants of Canaan had developed an advanced civilization and lived in cities walled high and strongly fortified(Num:13:28,Deut.1:28,Josh.14:12). It was impossible for the Israelites to capture these cities at once with their primitive nomadic methods, so they encamped and settled in the open country, where, indeed, they were not always safe(ISam.13:6) Again and again they were overcome and enslaved and driven into caves and forests and hills. Each time, however, a deliverer arose in the person of the so-called Judges. These men, filled with a warlike inspiration which it is difficult for us to appreciate, won the confidence and co-operation of the scattered tribes and led them on to victory(Smend:LA Rp.60). The strangest of these men initiated a tactical movement which proved successful and which was repeated by later leaders. Gideon in his attack on the Midianites divided his men into three bands and fell upon the enemy at night from three different sides at the same time.(Jud.7:16-21) This was a great improvement on the early method of frontal rush onslaught, and Saul tried the plan with equal success in his morning attack upon the Ammonites.(ISam.11:11)

The method of taking a city without siege engines is described in Jud.20:30-44. Here the Israelites lay an ambush around the city and then draw the defenders off by feigning a retreat, but while the men are pursuing the retreating host the ambush rises and seizes the place. The same

ruse was practiced by Joshua in his attack on Ai (Josh. 8:10-24). But so far there is no mention of a planned campaign and a deliberate siege. The tribes were still in a tribal state and were not so closely bound together that they could make a joint expedition against their enemies. Even in these first attempts at self-protection and possession all the tribes did not unite (Jud. 5:16-17, 8:1) (Benziger: Arch. p. 360, Newack: Arch. p. 368).

At the inauguration of the kingdom the new and permanent army of the Israelites came into being. Saul was no sooner proclaimed king than he began to fix the military life of his people; he openly chose three thousand men from the hosts that he had led to triumph against the Ammonites (ISam. 13:2) and two thousand of these he kept at Michmash and one thousand at Gibeah in Benjamin. Later (ISam. 17:55) we find that he has a captain in command of his army. David even in the wilderness to which he fled had a small army of six hundred men (ISam. 23:13), but there is no reason for assuming with Benziger (Arch. p. 358) that these six hundred men formed the kernel of the army that he organized later. The army had already taken shape under Saul and what David did was to enlarge and discipline it. And under David's leadership the army did become an efficient instrument of war, for with it he overcame all the ancient enemies of Israel and extended the kingdom to its furthest limits. What this army was in its fullest form we can discover from the descriptions referring to the reign of Solomon. Not only infantry, but cavalry and chariots Solomon possessed in great number. (IKings 5:6, 10:26). Also during his reign, it appears, the Israelites began to strengthen Jerusalem and to build a series of fort-

But among them were the original leaders of his army, see II S. 23
S. M.

resses which were to act as a defence to the country (IKings 9:15).

From this account of the warfare among the Israelites two things are evident; first, that the Israelites progressed in their military methods from the simple nomadic raid and rush to a highly organized system of army discipline and tactics; second, that the Israelites were decidedly a war-like people, and that they engaged in war for both self-protection and conquest, which in ancient times meant dispossessing others of the land they inhabited and called their home. As to the first, Benziger (Arch. p357) claims that the Israelites learned their art of war from the Canaanites, and this claim he supports with verses which seem to prove his position. As to the second, all that can be said is that the Israelites believed that they were acting in accordance with the wishes and decrees of their God. How intensely deep this belief was, we shall see in the discussion of the next subject, namely, the Ritual of War.

RITUAL OF WAR.

In the Bible a number of customs are mentioned in connection with war which help us to understand the conception of war that the Israelites held. In the first place, it is necessary to consider the means by which the members of the army were gathered together. During the scattered tribal state two means are known. When Ehud decides to begin the war against Moab he blows the ~~shofar~~ on Mount Ephraim and this acts as a signal for the men to assemble. (Jud. 3:27). Gideon (Jud. 6:24) does the same in his own city and also sends messengers through the tribes. And Saul, too, adopts the same means (ISam. 13:3), but "blows the Shofar throughout the land". The second means has not yet been explained satisfactorily. In the Book of Judges (19:29) there is the story told of a Levite who cut his outraged concubine into pieces and sent the pieces to the twelve different tribes of Israel. As a result all Israel gathered together for war (ibid 20:1). And when Saul hears of the plight of the men of Jabesh Gilead he also cuts the oxen, with which he had been plowing, into parts and sends the parts to the tribes (ISam. 11:7). W. Robertson Smith (RS p. 102, note 3) conjectures that this form had a sacramental sense originally and Schwally (SK p. 52-54) believes that it was a rite through which the tribes were bound together in a covenant. In the Prophets the blowing of the Shofar is spoken of (Jer. 4:5, 6:1, Ez. 7:14) and in addition there is another custom suggested, namely, the raising of the "ensign" or (Is. 5:26, Jer.

I think that this act should show the horror of the outrage committed and arouse general indignation. Hence the reason is clearly indicated. S. M.

4:6, 51:12).

After the men were assembled, and not infrequently, after the battle was begun, it was the custom to consult some kind of oracle in the case of doubt or distress in war. Before the battle Gideon (Jud. 7:13) bases his hopes upon a dream that a Midianite, one of the enemy told; ^{Saul} Samuel (ISam. 28:7) consults the Witch of Endor and persuades her to conjure up Samuel's spirit; the Israelites after the defeat at Bethel consulted the ark (Jud. 20:27), and Saul made use of the same instrument at Gibeah; David at Ziklag inquired of the Ephod; and Jehoshaphat and the King of Israel seek the advice of a prophet of the Eternal (IKings 22:5-18). In ISamuel 28:6 three oracles are enumerated, dreams, Urim and prophets; perhaps these were the regular instruments through which the Israelites consulted God's will. Schwally (SK p21-25) adds to those mentioned above the staff-magic, the arrow-magic, and the sun-magic. For the first he finds a proof in the story of Moses on the mountain arbitrating the battle by the raising and lowering of his hand in which was the rod, and in the story of Joshua not withdrawing the hand in which he held the spear before Ai (Ex. 17:9, Josh. 8:26); for the second he quotes the incident in which Elisha bids the King of Israel to shoot an arrow out the window and to smite with the arrows upon the ground (IIKings 13:14-19); for the sun-magic he adduces the verses in which Joshua commands the sun to stand still (Josh. 10:12) and the miracle of the sun-dial which Isaiah predicted to Hezekiah (IIKings 20:8). For each of these cases Schwally discovers analogies in a comparative study of ethnology; but his arguments are not convincing, especial-

ly the case of the arrow-magic and of the sun-magic; aside from the weakness of such reasoning by analogy, the text of the Bible does not naturally admit of the interpretation which he would give it; the case of the staff-magic is plausible and the inference that he draws is justified, namely, that the staff Moses used was the same one that he had wielded, in the presence of Pharaoh.

Another custom connected with a war-campaign was the sacrifice or burnt-offering. At Bethel all Israel takes part in the sacrifice (Jud. 20:26); at Mizpah Samuel officiates at the altar (ISam. 7:9); and at Gilgal, in the absence of Samuel, Saul makes the offering (ISam. 13:10). The sacrifice that Gideon offers (Jud. 6:26), and the vow of Jephthah (Jud. 11:31) seem to have the same significance. The object of this sacrifice W. Robertson Smith (RS p. 402, ~~maxxi~~) considers to have been consecrative, it consecrated the warrior for his task. Smend (LAR p. 156) and Marti (GIR p. 71) believe that through this sacrifice the Israelites assured themselves of the help of Jahwe and secured his favor. The context of the passages quoted rather favor the opinion of Smend and Marti; the sacrifice seems to be a surrendering up of something in return for which God is to grant his assistance and victory.

A phrase frequently used to declare war in the Bible is ~~anabewep~~ "to consecrate war". (Is. 13:3, Jer. 6:4, 51:28, Joel 4:9, Micah 3:5). This phrase has been explained by citations from other verses and is taken to mean that the warriors are to consecrate themselves, principally by sexual abstinence. The basis for this interpretation is found in the answer that David makes to the priest Achimelech: Women have been tabooed for us

since yesterday and the day before, (For the translation of טָבַע as "tabee" see W. Robertson Smith: RS p. 456); and in the refusal of Uriah to sleep in his own home while the army is still in the field. (ISam. 21:5-6, IISam. 11:11). It is probable, however, that the phrase קָרַשׁ סִלְחָם had a wider meaning. David (ISam. 21:6) says that the weapons also will be consecrated and Schwally (SK p. 49-52) rightly calls our attention to the customs of anointing the shield (Is. 21:5, IISam. 1:21) and of fasting (ISam. 7:6, Jud. 20:26). He insists too that the burnt-offering (Jud. 6:19, 26, 20:26, ISam. 7:9, 13:9) was a sacrifice of expiation for the warriors. But whatever interpretation we give these passages they all bear witness to the sacred significance which the ancients conceived war to possess (Martí: GIR p. 33 and Smend: LAR p. 146).

A further proof of this sacred significance of war is discovered in the בַּרְחָה or Bann. The original and extreme form of this Bann is contained in the command of Samuel to Saul (ISam. 15:3): Go and smite Amalek and put a bann on all which he has, and show no pity to him. Thou shalt slay both man and woman, babe and suckling, ox and lamb, camel and ass. In this Bann Smend (LAR p. 39) sees a present to God, and Benziger (Arch. p. 363) sees a gift of thanks for Jahwe's help and also the anger of Jahwe toward his enemies. Schwally (SK p. 29-44), on the other hand, believes that the Bann means nothing more than a tabee and that for this reason it is annihilated. In this case his argument is convincing and safe. In all these ancient rites, then, it is clearly evident that the Israelites conceived war to be holy and, therefore, under the protection of Jahwe.

LAWS OF WAR.

The legislation on war in the Bible is contained in Numbers chap.31 and in Deuteronomy chaps.20 and 23:10-15. Numbers chap.31 tells the full story of the battle with Amalek, and from this story it is not difficult to derive the following laws. A thousand men should be mustered from each tribe to form the army; the priest should accompany the army with the sacred instruments and with the trumpets; every male of the enemies should be slain, young and old, and also all females who had held intercourse with men; the cities were to be burnt; the animals were to be preserved; all metal goods should be purified in fire, and what can not stand the fire should be purified in water; the warriors should remain outside the camp for seven days and should purify themselves on the third and seventh days; all spoil taken should be divided between those who went to war and those who remained at home, and from each portion a tribute should be levied for the priests and the Levites.

These laws are very interesting when they are compared with the ritual customs discussed in the last section. The custom of consulting an oracle is paralleled in the law that the priest should accompany the army with the sacred instruments. By the "sacred instruments" no doubt the Urim and Thumim or the Ephod are meant. In extreme cases the Ark itself was carried into the battle (ISam.4:4), and this custom we find mentioned in Numbers 14:44 as if it were a regular arrangement in war; but there is

no reason for assuming that in the "sacred instruments" the ark was also included. Further, it is worth while to notice that the Bann is given here as a law, but in a modified form. In ISam.15:3 "man and woman, babe and suckling, ox and lamb, camel and ass" are to be slaughtered; in this law of Numbers the virgin females are kept as captive and the animals are preserved and the goods taken as spoil are purified and retained. A reason for this difference might be found in Deut.20:14-18 where the extreme form of the Bann is referred to only the cities of Canaan, and the modified form to the cities afar off; but Deut.20:14-18 seems to be an after thought, and in addition to this the hatred against Amalek is so intense throughout the Bible that it is hardly conceivable that any modification would be extended to the Amalekites and to their possessions. A more plausible explanation is that Numbers 31 is later than ISam.15:3 and this explanation is sustained by these other laws which must be later since no hint of their existence is found in the ritual customs. In the first place a thousand men are mustered from each tribe; this could not have been done during the tribal state, for we have seen that the tribes were scattered and responded to the call for war only as they wished. In the second place the warriors are commanded to pass through a service of lustration for seven days as result of their contact with the slain; nothing corresponding to this law is suggested in our sources for the period of the settlement. The law evidently dates from the time when the cult of Levitical uncleanness came into practice. And thirdly, the law that the spoil should be divided between the warriors and those who stay at home

is without doubt based on the custom of David (ISam.30:20-24), as is indeed stated in ISam.30:25. The law that a tribute should be levied for the priests and the Levites certainly comes from the time when the priest-hood had become an established institution. Hence, we can safely say that these laws in Numbers 31 are later than the ritual customs, and that they merely continue some of the rites of war.

The passage in Deut. 23:10-15 plainly ordains the purity of the camp. The camp is to be kept free of all uncleanness. As Marti says (GIRp.33), this law seems to connect itself with the custom called the "consecration of war", and can be well considered with the custom of sexual abstinence. Schwally, however, has a different interpretation; he claims (SK p.67-68) that the law traces itself back to superstition and a belief in demons. "Offenbar galt der heme cacas dämonischen Einflüssen besonders zugänglich". The demons it is supposed made the camp impure and prevented Jews from abiding therein; and further, the custom or law that the excrement should be covered with earth also is very ancient. Some primitive people believe that if an enemy finds the excrement of his opponent he secures a certain power over his opponent by burning the excrement or by dealing with it in some magical way. This interpretation of the passage is certainly suggestive, and it may be, ^{that} beneath the law which has been considered to have only a hygienic significance there lies a very ancient Jewish superstition and demonology. This conclusion, nevertheless, should be accepted with some reserve; we must again bear in mind that Schwally reasons by analogy and that it is dangerous to explain a law by assuming a prior

1) And this is ~~that~~ true meaning S.M.

custom parallel to one found among other primitive people. If a demonology underlies this law it evidently has been forgotten, has been outgrown by a long period of time and has been superseded by another cult, namely, that of holiness. The camp is to be kept holy (v.15) in order that Jahwe, who is holy, may remain within it and give his people aid and victory. In this last point we once more see the intimate relation that the Israelites believed to exist between their deity and their battles.

In Deuteronomy chap.20 another series of laws is given. According to this series the priest should approach the assembled army and exhort ^{the men} _A to have courage and to remember that Jahwe will fight for them; four classes of men should be exempt from service, those who have built a house and have not dedicated it, those who have planted a vineyard and have not used the fruit thereof (lit. not profaned it), those who have betrothed a woman and have not married her, those who are faint-hearted and who would discourage others; the city to be attacked should be made a formal offer of peace, if this offer is refused, the city is to ^{be} taken and the males are to put to death, while the women and cattle and goods are to be kept as spoil, that is, if the city is afar off; if the city is within the land of Canaan, it is to be utterly destroyed, in order that the inhabitants may not teach the Israelites idolatrous customs; and finally, during a siege the fruit-trees of the vicinity should not be cut down.

Driver, in commenting on this chapter (Com. to Deut. p.236-240), heads his discussion with the words: "Three laws designed to secure Self-control and Forbearance in the Conduct of War"; and he quotes (p.236) the following

sentences from Dillman, after Ewald, Antiquities, p. 314: "These laws are peculiar to Dt.: their aim, however, is not to regulate the entire conduct of war, but only to check the barbarity and cruelty with which it was carried on by many ancient nations, especially by the Assyrians, to bring it, as far as possible, under the influence of the higher moral spirit of Israel's religion, and to secure recognition for the claims of humanity and moderation"; and in connection with verses 5-7 he says: "These provisions are a remarkable illustration of the sympathetic regard for the interests and feelings of others, which characterizes the author of Dt.". Schwally (SK p. 99) says: "Ich glaube nun den Nachweis erbracht zu haben, dass Deut. 20, 5-8 nicht von einem überspannten und unpraktischen Philanthropen des Judenthums herrührt, sondern auf uralten Brauch zurückgeht". These two opinions placed side by side show unmistakably the difficulty of interpreting such a passage as this at the present time. If Driver is right, the verses reveal an idealism which would place them very late; if Schwally is correct, the verses betray a superstitious belief which would carry them back to very ancient times.

The basis upon which Schwally works is, as may be suspected, a primitive Jewish belief in demons, either indigenous to the Jahwe cult or derived from the Canaanitish religions. Houses were infested by demons and were cleansed of them and their influence by the service of dedication; vineyards and fields were overrun by demons and were rescued from their power by the service of consecration; brides were besieged by demons and were shielded from their attacks only by the service of marriage. The

man, therefore, who had a house to dedicate, or a vineyard to gather the fruit from, or a bride to marry, was in some way connected with the demons, was made unclean by them, and was for this reason prevented from taking part in the war, which was a holy service. This, evidently, is Schwally's course of argument; but behind this argument rests the thesis of his book, which may be stated as follows: The Jahwe religion was a cult of holiness; war was a form and an expression of this cult; hence any one who was unholy could not take part in war. In order to prove this thesis of course it is necessary to show that every thing connected with war has a holy character and that every one excluded is in some way unholy; this Schwally undertakes to do, and, as we have seen, at all times he is not convincing, and certainly not conclusive. On the contrary, he sometimes opens himself to the charge of mere conjecture, as will be clear from a more careful examination of his treatment of these few verses in Deuteronomy.

It may be true that the groundwork and the motive of these four laws which exclude four classes of men from military service was a Jewish belief in demons. The existence of such a belief would explain the laws, we must admit, but a cause which merely explains an effect is not necessarily the true cause. We may see a house on fire and say that the cause was an over-heated stove, this would explain the fire, whereas the true cause may have been an over-turned lamp or the stepping on a match. In order to prove our cause the true one it is necessary to first prove its existence and then prove its causal connection with the effect we wish to explain. Schwally, therefore, ought to first prove the existence of demon-

alogy among the Israelites and then prove its causal connection with the laws which he wishes to explain by it. This he does not do, instead, he assumes the belief in demons by analogy with other nations and then he uses this assumption as a basis for inference. An extreme illustration is found in his explanation of verse 8 of this chapter we are considering. Why should the faint-hearted be sent away from the army? The Bible says: In order that they may not discourage their comrades. Schwally (SK p.98) considers that it was due to the fact that cowardice, like sickness, melancholy and insanity, was probably attributed to demonical influence. This at once would make the coward unholy, which in turn would prove the holy character of war and its relation to the Jahwe cult. But if this explanation will serve in Deut. 20:8 then it ought to serve equally well in Jud. 7:3. The hint of a connection between demons and cowardice lies in either passage.

In regard to the other laws contained in this section (Deut. 20:1-20) it is well to notice that: the priest is mentioned in company with the army, that he addresses the men, but that no word is said about the sacred instruments or oracles; that distant cities are to be proffered peace, and in case of refusal, only the males are to be slain; that the cities within Canaan are to be utterly destroyed; that the army is warned against wantonly destroying the fruit-trees of the country. When we compare these laws with these in Num. 31 we discover striking differences. In the first place, no mention is made in Deuteronomy of the two main points in Numbers, namely, the law of lustration after contact with the slain, and the law of

istribution of the spoil; and further, the custom of mustering out one thousand men from each tribe spoken of in Numbers has no counterpart in euteronomy. These two points at once suggest that Deut.20 antedates Num.31. On the other hand, the address of the priest to the army, the ^{for}proffer of peace to the city to be attacked, and the warning not to cut down the fruit-trees, all place Deut.20 above Num.31 in breadth of view, in generosity of feeling and in attitude toward war. This, however, would not necessarily change the chronology assigned to the respective passages; nations like individuals have their periods of decline, and it may well be that the author of Num.31 did not maintain the height reached by the author of Deut.20.

When compared now with ancient ritual customs Deut.20 shows remarkable differences again. The priest is no longer an interpreter of auguries, but a counsellor; the campaign is not opened with a sacrifice; no word is said about "consecrating the war"; the bann is modified, and the reason for the extension of the extreme form against the cities of Canaan is in the character of a protest against idolatry. In the presence of these facts it seems just to infer that to the author of the laws of Deut.20 war had outgrown its ancient consecrated character, it was no longer bound up intimately with the Jahwe cult. Later, priestly legislation through its laws of Levitical cleanliness strove to give war religious relation, to bring war under priestly control. The reasons for these changes will perhaps appear in the course of the next two chapters.

ATTITUDE OF THE PROPHETS TOWARD WAR.

The first authentic account of the prophetic movement is contained in chapter 10 of the First Book of Samuel. (Budge:RIE p.95f.) In this chapter it is stated that the prophets travelled about in bands, that they possessed musical instruments, that they were not held in very high esteem. Samuel also tells Saul that the band of prophets will meet him near the outposts of the Philistines, that the spirit of God will descend upon him, that he will prophesy among the men, and that he will be a changed man. Behind this story stand the historical facts that the Israelites were under the Philistine yoke and severely oppressed during the period of Samuel, and that Saul did become the savior and king of his people. From the connection of fact and story it has been inferred that the bands of prophets were companies of men who went from place to place with the avowed purpose of arousing the people against the Philistines, and that the means they adopted were ecstatic dances, frenzied music and raving language. Such a movement has its parallel in the Flagellants of the Middle Ages and in the Mohammedan Dervishes. If this inference is true, and all the facts in the case seem to justify this conclusion, then at the very origin of prophecy we can see that it is related to war, even more than this, we are warranted in saying that war was the impetus and the object of its existence.

The question now is: Do the prophets continue this relation to the

end of their activity? Is it just to claim that the prophets were primarily concerned with war? In order to determine the answer to this question it will be necessary to review the work of the prophets and to recall continually the historical background and the internal political conditions. It is customary to divide the prophets into two distinct classes, the earlier and the later. To the second class belong those men from Amos to Malachi who have left us written testimony of their preaching; to the first class belong all those men who preceded and who were in their time recognized as prophets, with the exception of Elijah, who is by some considered to have been the legitimate forerunner of Amos and those who followed him (Smend: LAR p.78 and 173-179).

Deborah (Jud.4:4) is called a prophetess, Samuel (ISam.3:20) is called a prophet, and an unknown prophet is mentioned in Jud.6:8; but these cases are only later applications of the title (Budde: RLB p.95). During the reign of David the prophet Nathan is spoken of; he, however, takes no part in the wars of his king, his function seems to have been of a moral and a religious character (II Sam. chaps. 7 and 12). In IKings 20:13-14 we read that a certain prophet approached Ahab on the eve of battle and in the name of Jahwe promised him victory over the Syrians; in verses 35-43 of the same chapter another prophet rebukes the king for sparing Ben-hadad and for making a covenant with him; in IKings 22 we learn that Ahab and Jehoshaphat consult the prophets before beginning a war and that Macaiah denounces the false prophets and predicts defeat. These passages tend to show that the prophets of the age are looked upon as the oracles of war,

but they do not instigate war, they do not incite king or people to battle.

This statement is supported by the whole career of Elisha. In IIKings 3:11-20 Elisha is consulted at a crisis in the war of Israel and Judah and Edom with Moab; in IIKings 6:8-23 Elisha warns the king of the camping places of the Syrians, and later leads a company of Syrian soldiers struck blind by God into Samaria, and at his advice the soldiers are not slain, but feasted and dismissed; and on his death-bed (IIKings 13:14-19) he is sought by Jeash and addressed with the words "The chariot of Israel and the horseman thereof". In this last quoted passage Elisha encourages the king to continue the war with Syria and predicts victories in three battles. This would lead us to believe that the prophet was the man upon whom the king depended, that the prophet sustained the king in days of doubt and stress.

The significance of this fact appears when we recall ^{the} history of the period. At the beginning of the monarchy the chief danger came from the Philistines on the east, with these Saul and David battled; during the century extending from about 870 to 770 the danger lay in the Syrian kingdom to the north, with this danger the kings of Israel had to deal directly and the kings of Judah indirectly. Several times during this great conflict it looked as if the Syrians would finally defeat and destroy the Israelites, and as many times we find that the prophets urge and encourage the war, or at least are consulted before the campaign is begun. This intimate relation of the prophets with war during the Syrian campaigns no doubt has some explanation. Why was it that they held so influential a

position, and why was it that their advice was so constantly sought and so highly valued? Throughout this period no mention is made of the oracles used in the early age of Saul and David, of the ark, the ephod, the Urim and Thumim. May it not be that in the course of time the prophet came to be looked upon as the legitimate and correct interpreter of Jahwe's will? This at least is the function assigned to him by the author of the Books of Kings.

One great exception stands out, namely, the prophet Elijah. Before him three prophets are spoken of who seem to have a moral purpose: Nathan and Gad during the reign of David, and Ahijah during the reign of Solomon. None of these men have any relation with the wars of their time, instead they are concerned with the morality of their sovereigns and with the religious corruption of the court. These men form the prototype of Elijah who lived during the Syrian conflict. He takes absolutely no part in a struggle which meant the political life or death of his people. This is indeed to be wondered at, for he towers forth as the most powerful figure of the period. His function in the accounts that compose his biography is religious and moral. He rebukes Ahab for the murder of Naboth (IKings chap. 21); and he contends unceasingly against the apostasy of the Israelites to Baal (IKings 18). Even when he is commanded by God on Mount Horeb to anoint Hazael king of Damascus, and Jehu king of Israel, and Elisha the prophet in his stead, the end in view is nothing more than punishment for religious and moral sin. This absence of any connection with war in the career of Elijah can be explained only by saying that the story of his

life as we possess it is legendary, for it is in conceivable that a man so great should not have taken some attitude toward the wars of Israel, and especially is this true when we remember that his disciple, Elisha, occupied a prominent place in the struggle with Syria, in fact was looked upon as the "Chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof".

After the defeat of Syria another danger arose greater and more fatal than the Philistine or the Syrian. From the banks of the Euphrates River the Assyrian armies were marching west; their objective point was Egypt, and to reach this they had to pass through Palestine. Assyria was determined to subdue Egypt; Egypt was equally determined to overcome Assyria. Palestine, as described in the Introduction, lay just between, which meant that the states in Palestine could take their choice of allying themselves with either Assyria or Egypt, or be crushed in the struggle. For two centuries ^{the contest} swung from side to side; Israel fell before the first was over, and Judah succumbed at the close of the second. If the prophets were true to their predecessors we should expect that they took a most active part in this threatened warfare. They did take an active part, but a part that proves most surprising.

In the year 767 B.C. the Assyrians forced their way as far as the Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea. A few years after this Amos suddenly appeared with the message that Israel must fall. (Amos 7:9-11). That this was a startling attitude to take toward a future enemy, we can readily understand. Jeroboam II was at the height of his power and did not suspect the danger to be near; on all sides the Canaanitish enemies had been subdued, and internally the nation of Israel was prosperous. What was it,

then, that caused Amos to predict defeat and destruction? If he saw the danger from the Assyrian army so clearly, why did he not arouse his people to a consciousness of the danger and urge Jeroboam to prepare for battle? At the very moment when Israel has reached the zenith of its success, why does this prophet prophesy its decline? Judging from the past one would think that he would have tried to save the nation. The answer is found in the reason that Amos gives for the future devastation and exile. "Because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes" (2:6); "Ye who turn justice into wormwood and cast righteousness to the earth" (5:7); "By the sword shall die all the sinners of my people" (9:10). Here is a new note in prophecy. In the Assyrian armies Amos sees a divine punishment for the moral and religious sins of Israel. The mighty significance of this thought can never be exaggerated, in the religion of Israel it marked an advance which almost seems a miracle. Before the advent of this prophet the enemies of Israel were the enemies of Jahwe, but now Amos declares that the future enemies of Israel will serve Jahwe as a means of punishing his own people. This new interpretation of war as an instrument of punishment in the hands of God was adopted and repeated by all the prophets who succeeded Amos, in truth it forms the basis of all subsequent prophetic activity.

Hosea presents this idea again and again (5:9, 8:1, 9:1-9, 10:13-15, 14:1), and in addition assures his people that alliances with Egypt and Assyria will not save them (5:13, 8:9, 7:11). It was internal strife and religious corruption which inspired his words, not the nearness of the Assyrian

er the Egyptian armies. Isaiah of Jerusalem was the first prophet who came into direct touch with danger which had been threatening for so long. In 735 B.C. Ahaz ascended the throne in Jerusalem. Shortly after Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel joined in a combined attack on Judah. Ahaz in fear of these two forces appealed to the Assyrian king, Tiglath-Pileser, for aid and sought his protection. This step gave the Assyrian an opportunity and an excuse which was soon taken advantage of; in 734 B.C. ^{Rezin} Pekah was executed and in 732 Damascus fell. (II Kings 16). Isaiah, it appears, opposed this alliance, and yet he saw in ¹ Tiglath-Pileser a servant of Jahwe and in the war that he would wage against Israel and Damascus a punishment for their sin. (Is. chap. 7). Thirty four years later, however, he assumes a different attitude toward the Assyrians. In 701 B.C. Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem. Twenty one years before Samaria had fallen, and it looked as if Jerusalem would have to yield also. Isaiah saw differently, he sent the envoys of the Assyrian monarch back with the defiance: "This is the word that the Lord has spoken: ever him: She despiseth thee, she laugheth thee to scorn, the virgin daughter of Zion" (Is. 37:22). As a result of this attack on Jerusalem, which to Isaiah was a holy place, the prophet turns upon the Assyrians and insists that God will send some nation to punish them. (Is. 10:5-11). And the same future he foresees for Babylon (Is. chaps. 13 and 14.). The whole policy of this prophet is summed up in one verse of a speech in which he warns his people against an alliance with Egypt: "For thus has said the Lord Eternal, the Holy One of Israel, in repose shall ye be helped; in quietness and in confidence shall be your

strength; but ye would not" (Is. 30:15). The position that Isaiah took was one of neutrality, or rather absolute confidence in and reliance on the God of Israel. For it was this God who used the Assyrians as a rod of punishment, and when the time would come, he would break the rod also.

In the year 627 B.C., the prophet Jeremiah was called by God to his great mission and for half a century he stood as a witness and a power in Jerusalem. During this half a century most important events transpired. In the early years the Scythian invasion swept down from the north; in 608 Nineveh was surrounded by the Medes and Chaldeans; in 607 Pharaoh Necho left Egypt with the intention of recovering from the weakened Assyrian Empire all the country between the Nile and the Euphrates; Josiah of Judah opposed him at Megiddo and was hopelessly defeated and killed; in 606 Nineveh fell, and in 605 the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar, defeated Necho and converted Judah into a Babylonian province; in 597 Nebuchadnezzar besieged and captured Jerusalem and led away thousands of captives; a few years later a number of conspiracies took place in Jerusalem, the Babylonian armies attacked Jerusalem again, and in 586 it was completely overthrown.

What attitude did Jeremiah take toward events and wars? Did he insist upon the inviolability of Zion, as did Isaiah, and threaten punishment to those who attacked Jerusalem? His preaching proves the contrary. In his first vision he sees the Scythians pouring down from the north and entering into the very gates of Jerusalem (Jer. 1:13-15); he scoffs at the thought that either Egypt or Assyria can help and declares that the nation's own wickedness has invited the punishment which the Scythians will

inflight(2:18,36). When the Babylonians approach Jerusalem he announces that Nebuchadnezzar will capture the city (20:4-6); that God will himself fight against Judah (21:4-11); and even goes so far as to call Nebuchadnezzar the servant of God, 'YHWH, the man singled out to fulfil God's purpose in the world (25:9, 27:6), and advises complete submission to Babylonian rule (27:6-22). After the capture of the city Jeremiah sends a letter to the exiles and tells them to build houses, plant gardens, multiply, and to pray for the country to which they have been banished (29:4-7). In answer to the conspiracy Jeremiah placed yoke-bars of wood about his neck to teach the people that God had placed the yoke of Babylon upon the earth. Hananiah, another prophet, broke the yoke of wood from off Jeremiah's neck, and in return Jeremiah proclaimed that the yoke would become one of iron instead of wood. (chaps. 27 and 28). And at the very moment that Egypt arose to help Judah Jeremiah prophesied that the armies of Egypt would return to their country and that the Babylonians would come back and take Jerusalem and destroy it (37:4-8), which they did. From these words of the prophet we can draw only one conclusion; in war he saw a means of punishment, as did Amos and Isaiah, but different from Isaiah, he believed that even Jerusalem would not prove too sacred to be destroyed.

Among the exiles carried off in 597 B.C. from Jerusalem was Ezekiel. In 592 he began to prophesy, and in all that he says he shows himself only a faithful pupil of Jeremiah. The burden of his book is that Jerusalem will be destroyed, that it must be destroyed as a result of its sin (chaps. 4, 6, 7); he compares Jerusalem to a harlot that will be devastated by her

former levers (chaps. 16, 23); he sees a glittering sword flashing over Israel (21:13-22); he denounces the false prophets who predict peace (13:1-16); and he declares with Jeremiah that Nebuchadnezzar is God's messenger against Tyre (26:7) and Egypt (29:19, 30:10, 25). In these prophecies Ezekiel adds nothing new to the prophetic attitude toward war. The closing years of the Exile, however, produced a prophet who carried on the ideas of Jeremiah and Ezekiel to their highest point of development. This prophet lived during the period of Cyrus the Great of Persia, and the hopes that he drew from the career of Cyrus are contained in chapters 40-55 of the present Book of Isaiah. In 550 B.C. Cyrus overthrew the Median power; in 546 took possession of Lydia; and in 538 captured Babylon. While Cyrus was completing his conquest of Lydia this great unknown prophet of the Exile saw in him the future redeemer of Judah sent in the name of God. (40:10, 41:1-3, 42:10-13). He calls Cyrus the man of God's counsel *אִישׁ שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר* (46:11), the one whom God loveth *אֱלֹהִים אֲהַב* (48:14), and even the one whom God has anointed *מָשִׁחַ* (45:1). The period of Judah's punishment was fulfilled and a greater power than Babylon would come to liberate the Exiles. This teaching was the logical outcome of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

After the return of the Judeans to Palestine the one hope was to re-establish the nation in all its ancient splendor. The post-Exilic prophets express this hope and in times of stress predict that all the nations will be subdued before God (Haggai 2:22, Zech. 2:2, 9:13, 10:3-6, Book of Obadiah, Joel 4:9-17). This is no advance upon the ideas that preceded, on the contrary, it is a return to the Isaiah conception of Zion's invic-

lability and of God's special protection of his people. And the other Minor Prophets in no way modify the view of war taken by their greater teachers (Micah 1:6,3:12,Zeph.1:7,3:6,Nahum 1:9,3:18-19,Hab.1:6).

Now it is possible for us to determine the attitude of the Prophets of Israel toward the wars of their people. When the prophets first appear during the Philistine war they seem to be the agitators among the tribes; during the Syrian wars the prophets were relied upon as the oracles and the supporters of war; in both these cases the prophet works in the name of Jahwe, but Jahwe is limited to the land of Israel and Judah and his only relation is with their armies. At the approach of Assyria, however, the prophetic vision seems to widen and Jahwe becomes the master of the Assyrian armies also and he uses them as means of punishment for his own people. This view extends through the centuries from Amos to the Second Isaiah, and as one nation fails to fulfil the mission assigned to it by God and the prophet another appears and is hailed as the new messenger of the God of Israel, as a new rod of punishment. The literary prophets looked on war as the only means of correcting injustice and of purging wrong from the world. War in itself was not deemed good, it was, as Ezekiel said (14:21), one of the four means of punishment for sin, and was classed with famine, wild beasts, and the plague.

RELATION OF JAHWE TO WAR.

The ritual of war, the legislation on war, and the attitude of the prophets toward war imply that Jahwe himself bore an intimate relation to war. The question now arises: What was this relation? When one thinks of the rites current among the ancient Israelites the temptation is very strong to assert that Jahwe was at one time nothing more than a war-god. The consultation of oracles like the ephod, the urim and thumim, and the ark; the burnt-sacrifices at the opening of a campaign; the taboos and destruction of cities and inhabitants in the name of Jahwe; the consecration of war and of warriors; these things seem to suggest that the people saw in Jahwe their leader in battle. This does not mean, however, that in Jahwe they saw only a God of war. The distinction must be clearly drawn between a deity whose only function is to lead in war, and one who as protector of his people helps them also in battle. Barten says: "This god (Jahwe), because of the nature of the weather in the region where his people lived, had become associated in their minds with clouds, storms, and thunder; because of their warlike struggles with their neighbors, he was also regarded as the giver of victory in war." (SSO p.291). This statement makes Jahwe first the protector of his people and then assigns to him the two spheres of weather and war. How true this statement is the facts in the Bible must prove.

In the Bible two ancient books are mentioned which are of some value

in this connection. In Numbers 21:14 we read of an excerpt from the *שִׁיר הַיָּמִין*, and in Josh. 10:13 and II Sam. 1:18 we find extracts from the *שִׁיר הַיָּמִין*. From these passages we learn that the Israelites possessed books in which they celebrated their triumphs and their heroes, and, outside of the Chronicles spoken of in the Books of Kings, these old battle songs seem to have been a most important piece of literature. This can be easily understood when we remember that from the time the Israelites began their immigration to the promised land down to a very late date they were continually concerned with war. On their way to Canaan they had to fight off the nations through which they passed; in taking possession of the country they found it necessary to subdue the inhabitants already in the land; in extending their kingdom they were compelled to overcome the surrounding peoples; and in preserving themselves against the greater nations that tried to overpower them they battled long and hard. It is not strange, therefore, that the Israelites possessed war songs. When we think of the contents of the Bible the two great facts that stand out most prominently are: worship and war. Of the social conditions we read little; of political conditions very little more; the chief concern is religion and it is significant that along with religion so much space is given to war. The only explanation that we can give is to say that war was waged in the name of and for Jahwe. This explanation is actually supported by two direct expressions in the Bible itself. In ISam. 18:17 and 25:28 David, the warrior-hero of Israel, is spoken of as fighting the *מלחמת יהוה*, the wars of Jahwe.

If the wars were fought in the name of and for Jahwe, we must now inquire what part Jahwe himself took in the battle. More than once the Bible describes Jahwe as a warrior and as leading the battle. Deberah pictures Jahwe as coming forth from Seir, as marching through the fields of Edom, in order to participate in the war with Sisera (Jud. 5:4), and she curses the inhabitants of Meroz because they came not to the help of Jahwe in the battle (Jud. 5:23), which clearly means that Jahwe led the army and fought among the heroes. In IISam. 5:24 David is told to wait for the attack upon the Philistines until he hears the sound of foot-steps among the tops of the trees, then he will know that Jahwe goes forth before him to smite the camp of the enemy. The natural inference is that the foot-steps are those of Jahwe himself. In Numbers 10:35 we find an address to the ark which reads as follows: "Arise, Jahwe, that thine enemies may be scattered, that those who hate thee may flee before thy face." This address is repeated in Psalm 68:2; and in the rites of warfare we found that the ark was sometimes carried into battle and that Jahwe was identified with the ark (ISam. 4:3 and 6-8). Here also it is evident that Jahwe was conceived as fighting and attacking his enemies. And finally, in the song of triumph celebrating the overthrow of the Egyptians at the Red Sea Jahwe is explicitly called an *nonbaw*, a warrior.

The dates of these passages are not easy to determine. The Deberah song in Judges 5 is conceded to be very ancient, and no doubt it gives us a correct account of the Israelitish belief at the time of the Judges. The god Jahwe was conceived as marching actually to battle. The conception

seems crude and anthropomorphic; but for this reason it is not to be rejected or explained away as a mere poetic conceit. The song very likely preserves within its verses something of ancient mythology, and it is in this sense that the conception of Jahwe is to be understood. The narrative in IISamuel 5:22-25 perhaps reflects a similar belief. What connection Jahwe had with the mulberry trees is not clear, we can only say that the sound of foot-steps in the trees was a sign that Jahwe would start to battle. The thought is not so crude as that in the Deberah song, and yet it possesses a distinctly mythological tinge. David without doubt believed that Jahwe went before him to aid smite the enemy. The address to the ark also has something about it which savors of the belief that Jahwe was thought of as entering into direct conflict with his enemies. The date, as Gray says (Com. to Numbers p.96) cannot be given; but it seems just to assume that it is as late as the time of the settlement in Canaan, for in this passage Jahwe is confined to the ark, as is the case in the story related in ISam. 4:1-8 and 5:1-12; whereas in the earlier times Jahwe came from Seir and no ark is mentioned in connection with him. The Song of the Red Sea (Ex. 15:1-18) has been assigned to periods ranging from the time of Moses to the time of the Maccabees. (Encyclopedia Biblica Vol. II p.1450). It is hardly possible to place this song, however, with the historical Psalm, such as Psalms 78, 105, 106, 114; for this song has a power which the Psalms mentioned lack entirely. The Psalms give little more than a versified review of historical events long past; this song presents us with a vivid, poetic picture of Jahwe in grappling conflict with the

Egyptian armies. It describes Jahwe as a warrior overturning the chariots and hurling the men into the sea, which the Psalms do not do, and in a way which makes one feel that if this song is not of an early date, it is at least the working over of an ancient theme, in which still lingers the ancient belief that Jahwe did personally attack and destroy the Egyptians.

The means by which Jahwe manifested his presence and by which he assisted his people have also been handed down to us. In Joshua's battle with the Amorites we read that Jahwe hurled down great hailstones upon the enemy and that more were killed by the hailstones than by the sword (Josh. 10:11). In explaining this passage it would be foolish to assert that a hailstorm happened during the battle, and that for this reason the passage is of no consequence. No doubt a hailstorm did happen during the battle, but in the hailstorm the Israelites saw the power and assistance of their God. Deborah sings that when Jahwe came forth from Seir the earth shook, and the heavens dropped, ~~xxx~~ and the clouds poured down rain, and the mountains melted before him (Jud. 5:4-5); and in these verses it is not difficult to see that the appearance of Jahwe was attended by convulsions of nature such as earthquakes, storms, lightning, and thunders. In other words Jahwe used as his instruments of war the elements of nature. This thought is confirmed by more than one passage in the Bible. The account of the Revelation on Sinai pictures Jahwe coming down to the mountain amid thick clouds, thunder, and lightning, and earthquakes (Ex. 19:16-18); the new revelation to Elijah in the still small voice shows plainly that previously Jahwe had been seen in the storm wind, the earthquake, and the lightning (1K.

19:11-12); and the Plagues in Egypt very likely are to be assigned to the same belief as a source; for among the plagues we can see Jahwe wielding the elements of nature, especially in the hail storm (Ex. chaps. 9 and 10). The most complete proof of the belief, however, is to be found in Psalm 18. This Psalm was closely associated with David, as is evidenced by its insertion in the Second Book of Samuel chap. 22; and it contains a very full description of the conception of Jahwe as a god of war and the natural forces. Jahwe is said to be the teacher of war (v. 35, compare Psalm 144:1); Jahwe assists his warrior in battle (vv. 30, 38-43); Jahwe rides forth on the storm-wind and the clouds, sheaths his lightnings and rears with his thunder and hurls down his hailstones and coals of fire. This, too, may be dismissed as poetry, but even as poetry it carries us back to a time when it expressed a sincere belief, when it was the mythology of the nation. Thus far, then, it seems safe to say that at one time Jahwe was conceived as a god of the elements and of war. If he possessed other attributes or functions, we have no record of them. Even in later times when the mythological element had been lost Jahwe was still thought of as accompanying the army, as we see from Psalms 44:10, 60:12 and the repetition in 106:12.

A further fact that shows Jahwe's relation to war is the expression: $\text{לְמַלְחָמָאֵלֹהִים}$ or in its fuller form $\text{לְמַלְחָמָאֵלֹהִים יְהוָה}$. The original meaning of this expression is still a matter of dispute (Smend: LAR pp. 201-204 and Marti: GIR pp. 139-141 and Schwally: SK pp. 3-9); and the argument turns upon the original application of the word $\text{לְמַלְחָמָאֵלֹהִים}$. In the Bible the word has many different applications. The whole people of Israel is called twice

the Hosts of Jahwe (Ex.7:4,12:41); the army of Israel is called the Hosts of Jahwe (ISam.17:45); the heavenly bodies are called the Hosts of Heaven (Deut.4:10, Jer.8:2,19:13,33:22, Is.40:26,45:12); super-earthly beings are called the Hosts of Jahwe (Josh.5:14), or Hosts of Heaven (IKings 22:19). It must also be noticed that in the song of Deborah the stars fight in the battle against Sisera (Jud.5:20); that Elijah was taken from the earth in a chariot of fire (IIKings 2:11); and that Elisha in the time of danger sees himself to be surrounded on the mountain by horses and chariots of fire (IIKings 6:17). The problem now is: How shall these passages be arranged chronologically? In the development of the Jahwe conception thus far considered we are justified in saying that Jahwe was in very ancient times a god of the storm; later he became the national deity of the Israelites; and then finally, the God of the world and all nations. In accordance with this development we should expect that in the phrase Jahwe of Hosts the words Hosts would refer first to the storm-powers of nature, next to the armies of Israel, and then to the armies and forces of the world. But among the passages that we have quoted no one admits of being applied to the storm-powers of nature; perhaps the phrase was coined after this early mythology passed out of the Jahwe conception. The passage in ISamuel 17:45 shows the application of the phrase to the armies of Israel; but this passage has been assigned to a late date (Smend: LAR p.202) and for this reason proves nothing. As to the application of the phrase to the nations at large, no passage suggests this directly; it may be inferred, however, from the general thought of the prophets who used the phrase, such

Ames and Isaiah. When they speak of Jahwe as Jahwe of Hests they undoubtedly think of him as master of all the armies within the range of their vision. (Ames 3:13, 5:14, Is. 1:24, Jer. 2:19, 6:6). But we still have no account for the application of this phrase to the heavenly bodies and the super-earthly beings. Marti (GIR p.139) merges these two cases into one, since the heavenly bodies were considered to be alive (Jud. 5:20 and Job 38:7). To what period does this idea belong? The worship of the heavenly bodies was introduced into Israel only after the contact with Assyria, and yet the passage in the Deborah song distinctly speaks of the stars fighting against Sisera. From this circumstance it seems that in early mythology Jahwe did not go into the battle alone; he had his own super-earthly army at the head of which he fought. This supposition will adequately explain the passage in Josh. 5:20 where an angel announces himself to be a captain of the Hests of Jahwe, and also the passage in II Kings 17 where Elisha beholds the mountain filled with chariots and horses of fire. This is similar to Schwally's conclusion (SK p.5), and best explains the facts we possess. Hence, we now can say that Jahwe was the master of a super-earthly host, of the armies of Israel, and of the armies of the nations.

Another Biblical expression also has some bearing upon this question. Jahwe's relation to war. In the prophetic literature we often come across the phrase Yom d'Jahwe, the Day of Jahwe. Ames uses it for the first time in our sources in chap. 5:18; and from the way in which he employs the expression we can infer that it was a current combination of words among

the Israelites. The content of this phrase was, no doubt, the hope of a day when Jahwe would overthrow Israel's enemies and give the final victory to his people. It was to be the day on which Jahwe would defeat the nations and prove his own power and greatness. The only way in which he could have done this was by war, and so here again we discover warlike attributes which were ascribed to Jähwe. Amos, however, gave a new significance to the Day of Jahwe. He declares that it will be a day of darkness, and not of light, for the people of Israel themselves (5:18-27, 8:9-10). The basis of this declaration is the firm belief of Amos that Jahwe is a God of justice and that as such he will punish the injustice of the Israelites. The means of punishment Amos saw in the approaching Assyrian hosts, as described in the preceding chapter. Hence, while Amos enlarged the conception of the Day of Jahwe to a victory, not of Israel, but of universal justice, he still saw the same instrument in the hands of his God, namely war. This new interpretation of the Day of Jahwe Amos bequeathed to his successors. The prophet Hosea does not use the phrase, but implies the thought ((chap. 10); Isaiah vividly describes the terrors of the day (29:1-8); Zephaniah makes the Day of Jahwe the very center of his message (1:7, 1:8-18, 2:1-4, 3:1-8). Ezekiel adds something new to the conception in his famous vision of Gog (chap. 38 and 39); here all the hostile nations will be gathered into Palestine and destroyed by Jahwe. The picture that he draws is one of almost universal disaster, a disaster that must precede the final reign of righteousness. Joel in his apocalyptic descriptions makes the Day of Jahwe practically the Day of Doom. Not only will the day bring a convulsion of na-

tions, it will bring also a cataclysm in nature (2:1-11, 3:1-5). Armies will overrun the earth like a devouring fire, horrible signs will be seen in heaven and on earth, the sun will turn to blackness and the moon will turn into blood. The same idea is carried out by Daniel (chap. 7 and 12), and this is as far as the Biblical writings develop the Day of Jahwe. As far back as we can trace the conception of the Day it is associated with war, and as the terror of the day itself increases during the centuries the magnitude of the wars accompanying it enlarges. (Marti: GIR pp. 114, 180-186, Smend: LAR pp. 201-204).

In all these facts concerning Jahwe's relation to war it is now possible to see a line of consistent development. The line of development seems to be this. Jahwe originally was a god of the elements of nature, the earthquake, the fire, and the storm; later, when he became the national deity of Israel, or even earlier, when he was the tribal deity, he was looked upon as the head of the tribes and, therefore, the leader in war; as the leader in war he personally entered the battle at the front of his own hosts or super-earthly beings; in the course of time the ancient mythological notions passed away, and Jahwe became the leader of the hosts of Israel, and then, under the prophetic influence, master of all nations and armies. To the very end, however, he retains his control of the elements of nature and uses them as his instruments of war. And finally, it is to be observed that as a national deity Jahwe wages war in order to redeem his people, Israel; but as God of the world he wages war only in order to exterminate wrong and to bring about the age of righteousness and peace.

PEACE.

The subject of peace in the Bible presents a number of problems. The time allowed for this work, however, will not permit a detailed discussion of these problems at the present. Therefore, only an outline of the different problems and the chapters in which they would be considered will be given, in the hope that they can be worked out in full in the near future.

I. Peace-treaties of Israel with other peoples.

Laws forbidding covenants with the Canaanites:

Ex. 23:32, 34:12, Deut. 7:2.

Treaty of Joshua with the Gibeonites: Josh. 9:3-27.

Treaty of David with Nachash (inferred): II Sam. 10:2, 12:26.

Treaty of David with Hiram of Tyre: II Sam. 5:11.

Treaty of Solomon with Hiram of Tyre: I Kings 5:15-25, 9:27-28, 10:11.

Treaties of Israel with Assyria and Egypt: I Kings 17:4, Hosea 5:13, 7:11, 12:2, Isaiah 30:1-5, 31:1-3.

II. Ritual of Treaties and Covenants. *ברית*

Dividing of an animal: Gen. 15:9-18, Jer. 34:18.

Oath and Sacrificial Meal: Gen. 26:28-30, 31:53-54, Josh. 9:14-15.

Sacrificial Meal: Ex. 24:11, I Sam. 11:15, II Sam. 3:20.

Salt covenant: Levit. 2:13, Num. 18:19, II Chron. 13:5.

III. "Covenant of Peace".

Origin:basis:application.

Jahwe with Pinchas:Num.25:11-13.

Jahwe with Judah:Ez.34:25,37:26.

Jahwe with Judah:Isaiah 54:10.

Jahwe with the Priesthood:Malachi 2:5-6.

IV. Ideal of Peace.

Content of the Ideal:

Peace in Israel.

Peace in the world.

Peace the result of obedience to the Commandments.

Peace the result of righteousness.

Contribution of the Legends:Peaceful life commended and preferred:Gen.4:4,21:21,25:27. Violence and war deprecated: Gen.34:25-31,49:5-7.

Contribution of the Codes:Lev.26:3-6,Num.6:24-26.

Contribution of the Prophets:

Hosea:2:18-22.

I Isaiah:9:1-6,11:1-9,19:23-25,32:15-20, (2:1-4).

Micah: (4:1-4).

Nahum:2:1.

Jeremiah:6:14,8:11,14:11-14,23:17,28:8,30:6,33:6.

Ezekiel:13:10,16,34:11-31.

IV. Ideal of Peace (continued).

Contribution of the Prophets (continued).

II Isaiah:48:17-22,45:7,52:7,54:10,55:12.

Haggai:2:9.

Zachariah:6:12-13,9:9-10,14:9-11.

III Isaiah:57:19,60:17,65:25,66:12.

Malachi:2:5-6.

Contribution of the Psalms:29:11,37:11,72:3-7,122:7,120:2-6,
125:5,128:6,147:14.

V. Relation of War and Peace.

Conclusion.