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INTRODUCTION

The problem and purpose of this thesis is to discover the various ideas which the pre-exilic literary prophets held in regard to peace. It also seeks to trace, in so far as is possible, any development of these ideas during the period of the pre-exilic literary prophets.

In regard to the limits which we have placed upon this study, we have confined ourselves to the pre-exilic literary prophets, a limitation which is self-explanatory. The problem of limits, however, is not as simple as it appears, because modern scholarship has questioned and in many instances rejected as exilic or post-exilic material found in the books of the pre-exilic prophets. In these instances we have not considered it part of our problem to give detailed consideration to the critical problems involved. We have attempted to find the consensus of modern scholarship and abide by its decision. Only passages generally accepted as the authentic work of the prophet to whom they are attributed have been considered.

In view of the traditional belief that the book of Ezekiel comes from the land of exile, it seems necessary at this point to justify our consideration of the first twenty-four chapters of this book in our study. Until 1900 the traditional view was not seriously questioned, and there is still much to be said for it. It is essentially the view that Ezekiel was a young priest who was carried into Babylon in the first exile in 597 B.C., and that after he had been there five years he began his
prophetic activity. This view was held by Davidson, writing in 1896,1 by Budde, writing in 1899,2 by Cornill, writing in 1904,3 by Redpath, writing in 1907,4 by Robinson, writing in 1918,5 by Bewer, writing in 1922,6 and by Cooke, writing in 1936.7 It is to be expected that the earlier writers mentioned would support the older traditional view, but when we find a writer of as recent date as Cooke, who carefully weighs the newer theories, supporting essentially the old view, we must realize that the matter is by no means settled.

Turning to the other side of the argument, we find that the traditional view of Ezekiel has been seriously questioned. Hermann, writing in 1908 and again in 1924, argues that the book cannot be thought of as a unity, but must be taken as a collection of sermon notes edited first by Ezekiel, and since worked over by several hands.8 Hölscher, writing in 1924, denies to Ezekiel all except passages which he recognizes as poetry, allowing in all some 250 verses.9 Torrey, writing in 1930, brought forth the theory that the original author came from the reign of Manasseh, but that the book as we have it is largely

1 Davidson, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, p. xvii.
2 Budde, Religion of Israel to the Exile, p. 199.
3 Cornill (trans. by Corkron), The Prophets of Israel, p. 115.
4 Redpath, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, p. xi.
5 Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 146.
7 Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, p. xxiii.
8 Hermann, as cited by Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, pp. 9ff.
9 Hölscher, as cited by Harford, op. cit., pp. 13ff.
the work of the third century, to which time he assigns the "fiction" of the exile. Dr. James Smith, writing in 1931, brought forth the theory that Ezekiel's prophecies were spoken in Palestine during the reign of Manasseh, and that they were addressed to North Israel. Hermtrich, writing in 1932, abandons the exilic framework of the book. Much of the first twenty-four chapters are Ezekiel's, but are addressed to the people of Jerusalem. The Babylonian framework in these chapters is the work of a later hand. Of the remainder of the book, chapters 33-39 may come from Ezekiel, having been spoken in the exile. The view of Hermtrich has been accepted almost in its entirety by Harford, and has been tentatively accepted by Dr. Leslie.

With the traditional view of Ezekiel so questioned, and in light of this new view which makes the first twenty-four chapters come from Jerusalem before the fall of the city, and in light of the fact that even according to the more traditional view these chapters come from before 586 B.C. (though, according to this view, from Babylon), we feel obligated to consider these chapters as part of our source material for pre-exilic prophetic thought.

Our method has been first to try to get a chronological

10 Torrey, as cited by Harford, op. cit., pp. 21ff.
11 Smith, James, as cited by Harford, op. cit., pp. 27f.
12 Hermtrich, as cited by Harford, op. cit., pp. 28ff.
13 Harford, op. cit., pp. 54ff.
14 Leslie, Brief Outline and Bibliography for the Later Prophets (Mimeograph), p. 1.
view of peace in prophetic thought by analysing the writing of each prophet for his views concerning peace and war, classifying such passages in accordance with the ideas which they involve. In interpreting these passages we have sought to use not only the context in which they occur, but also the help of modern scholarship by using commentaries and by comparing various translations. After making the chronological survey, we have sought to unify the material to discover the fundamental ideas revealed and the development that took place in the prophetic thought of peace during the pre-exilic period.

All the quotations from the Bible which are used in this study and which are not otherwise credited are from The Old Testament, An American Translation, edited by J. M. Powis Smith, and published by the Chicago University Press in 1935.
CHAPTER I. THE TERM SHALÔM

The first essential to an understanding of peace in the thought of the pre-exilic prophets is to grasp the fundamental meaning of the word which these writers used for "peace". It is true that in our later considerations we will find it necessary to deal with many passages in which that term does not appear, chiefly because of the very broad connotations of our term "peace," but we must begin with an understanding of the term shalôm.

shalôm is a late, or new, Hebrew word with a root meaning to be complete or sound. Something of its force and meaning is indicated by the way this root found expression in related languages. In Phoenician it carried the meaning complete, requite. In Arabic this root expressed be safe, secure, free from fault, make over, resign or submit oneself (especially to God, whence the words Muslim and Islam), safety, security. Assyrian words derived from this root carried the meaning be complete, unharmed, be paid, welfare. Aramaic words using this root connotate be complete, peaceful, safe, security, welfare. Old Aramaic used this root in words meaning reward, repay, submission. In Ethiopian this root expressed security, peace. 1

It is evident from the above that one of the fundamental concepts carried by this root is that of wholeness or completeness. Thus shalôm as a masculine noun has as its first meaning completeness, and its related verb has as its primary meaning to

be complete, finished, or ended. This same meaning is carried by a corresponding adjective which may be used in describing just weights, whole stones, or a full and abundant reward.

This wholeness expressed by šālōm may simply mean the physical wholeness or health of the individual. An example of the use of šālōm as indicating the wholeness of physical health is found in the rejoicing of the sick man who is healed. Thus when Hezekiah recovers from his illness he praises Yahweh: "My bitterness was healed to šālōm" (Is. 38:17).

The unit of wholeness is not necessarily confined to the individual. šālōm was used to designate the state of peace existing in the various wholes to which the individual belonged. Of special importance are the family, the town, and the nation. Peace consisted in the blessing of communal solidarity, whether that community be the family centering in the father, the town centering in the elders, or the nation centering in the King.

Closely related to the fundamental meaning of wholeness is harmony. For where there is "totality" in a community, there is harmony. In such a community the blessing flows freely among the various members. The place of harmony in the concept of peace may be illustrated by the family. The peace relationship in the family was perhaps the most intimate of all the Hebrew relationships, its dissolution meant the ruin of life. This

---

3 Pedersen, Israel, Its Life and Culture, p. 311.
4 Ibid., pp. 314f.
5 Ibid., pp. 275f.
6 Ibid., pp. 263f.
peace rested on a common will and a common responsibility, in short, on harmony. Not only in the family, but in all other phases of life, to act in peace was to act in harmony with those with whom one had to deal.

In our survey of the meaning of the root of shālôm, we noted that in Assyrian and Aramaic this root carried the meaning of welfare. This same meaning is carried by the Hebrew shālôm when it is used to indicate welfare, prosperity, and freedom from anxiety. The significance of this element of welfare and blessing in shālôm is demonstrated by the fact that "shālôm to you" was the usual greeting both at meeting and parting. In this greeting the Hebrew gave a blessing which meant well-being for the other and established a community between the two which at least meant inviolability. When a man was about to set out on a journey, the expression "go in peace" was used, implying that everything was as it ought to be, that those left behind were in harmony with him, and that his journey was to be successful.

The significance of shālôm as welfare is indicated by the fact that peace and blessing are so closely united that it is impossible to separate them. If one had peace, he had

7 Ibid., pp. 274f.
8 Ibid., p. 278.
9 Brown, Driver, and Briggs, op. cit., p. 1023. See also Smith, Ward, and Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel, p. 304.
10 Federsen, op. cit., p. 303.
11 Ibid., p. 312.
12 Ibid., p. 311.
complete harmony and happiness, and could wish for no more in life. As such a blessing it is a positive force and comprises all that the Israelite understood by "good" and "joy."\(^{13}\)

Another indication of the way in which welfare and prosperity were signified by shālōm is found in the close relationship between that term and fertility. If the family enjoyed peace it enjoyed fertility within itself so that it might never die out. It also enjoyed fertility in its fields and vineyards so that it had an abundance of the material blessings of life.\(^{14}\)

Our survey of the related words in other languages showed that they carried in almost every instance the idea of security. This same meaning is carried by shālōm. This security, however, in old, fighting Israel was limited to a mutual security among those who lived in peace.\(^{15}\) Thus peace as security was not necessarily the opposite of war. There were friends and there were enemies, and peace consisted of mutual security among friends and victory over one's enemies.\(^{16}\) Peace with one's enemies consisted in rendering them impotent and was thus identical with domination.\(^{17}\)

An important aspect of the concepts involved in the term shālōm is indicated by its close relationship to בְּרִית, the word for "covenant." The words are of different origin, but designate very similar relationships. They are often used

\(^{13}\) Ibid., pp. 313f.
\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 316.
\(^{15}\) Ibid., pp. 320f.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 311.
\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 322.
interchangeably, and where it does not appear in the context, we often cannot grasp the distinction between them. covenant is more commonly used of a community entered into by unrelated persons, but this is because there is more reason to refer to this type of peace relations. The two words are also frequently used together as "a covenant of peace," which is only a stronger expression for "covenant." 18

The making of a peace or covenant was followed by an exchange of gifts. These gifts were not only an outcome of the covenant, but served also to strengthen it.19 The power of the gift to make peace is indicated by one of the terms used to designate it, shalom-im, which is obviously related to shalom.20 An extension of this idea into international realms implied that commercial intercourse and the exchange of cultural characteristics were necessary between peoples who were at peace one with another.21

The covenant aspect of the term shalom is also indicated by the fact that this term is used to designate a covenant relationship with God.22

We find, then, that the prophets inherited in their term for peace a word which involved the concepts of wholeness, harmony, welfare, security, and the covenant relationship. We now turn our attention to a chronological survey of the place which

18 Ibid., p. 285.
19 Ibid., p. 296.
20 Ibid., p. 302.
21 Ibid., p. 293.
22 Brown, Driver, and Briggs, op. cit., p. 1023.
peace had in prophetic thought. In this survey we shall think of peace not only as expressed by the term shalom, but also with regard to that very important concept which we have included in our idea of peace, i.e., as the opposite of war.
CHAPTER II. A CHRONOLOGICAL VIEW OF PEACE IN
PROPHETIC THOUGHT—AMOS THROUGH MICAH

I. Amos

The term shālôm is not used in the extant writings of the first of the literary prophets.\(^1\) All that we can learn of Amos' thought of peace we must learn from those passages in which he deals with war, paradoxical as this may seem.

Amos was neither soldier nor statesman, but prophet. He made no suggestions concerning fortifications or armaments, nor did he attempt to shape the political policy of the state. We do not even know whether he regarded Jeroboam's state policy as wise or foolish. Rather, he concerned himself chiefly with the moral condition of the nation, holding that only by every man dealing justly with his neighbor could the state be strong.\(^2\) He saw Yahweh as a God of righteousness who would punish Israel for its moral faults. This punishment is variously represented as plague, earthquake, or eclipse, but it is most frequently represented as the overrunning of Israel in battle.\(^3\) Amos never names Yahweh's agent, but it seems probable that he thought of Assyria as the conquering force.\(^4\) The key to Amos' pronouncements of

---

1 Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, p. 736.
2 Edden, The Hebrew Prophet, pp. 198f.
3 Cripps, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos, pp. 28ff.
Judgment is found in Amos 5:18-27 where the prophet deals with the popular concept of the Day of Yahweh. The people had thought of this day as one of crisis when Yahweh would work for them a final victory over their adversaries. But Amos holds that instead this day, if the people continue in their present disregard of their moral obligations, will be a day of misfortune on which He will exile Israel "beyond Damascus."

We turn now to a review of the various oracles where Amos pictures war as the means by which Yahweh inflicts his judgment upon Israel.

The first such oracle is found in Amos 2:13-16 where the picture is of a terrible military disaster which will ere long overtake the nation, in which the bravest will flee in panic. Verse 13, which reads

"Behold, I am going to make a groaning under you. As a wagon groans that is loaded with sheaves," has sometimes been interpreted as referring to an earthquake, but Harper is probably correct when he finds nothing suggesting an earthquake in this verse. As he points out, the prophet's mind is filled with war, and the groans which come from the threshing floor under the weight of the threshing sledge is a suitable comparison for the groans of men in time of war.

In 3:11 Amos ends a prophecy of doom with the picture of a foe (not an affliction) surrounding the land and plundering the

5 Gripps, op. cit., p. 193.
6 Driver, op. cit., pp. 98f.
7 Ibid., p. 97.
8 Harper, op. cit., p. 61.
9 Ibid., p. 77.
In 4:3 we get a picture of the "cows of Bashan," as Amos termed the ladies of Samaria, being forced to leave the city through breaches made in the walls by the foe. They are not escaping as fugitives through breaches made for escape, but are being carried away captive by the enemy.

So far in these passages Amos has been talking about a war which is to be brought against Israel in the future, but in 4:10 we find past wars interpreted as the judgment and the act of Yahweh. The reference to Egypt is probably a later note, as is the phrase "Together with your captured horses;", but we feel that Cripps goes too far in saying that any allusion to any slaying with the sword is out of place in this verse. The prophet does not have in mind any particular battle such as the slaughter by Hazael and Benhadad in the reign of Jehoahaz, but rather to the whole of the long Syrian conflict.

In 5:3 we have a picture of a city with ninety per cent of its warriors destroyed. While Robinson points out that because they are mentioned as men of military power it does not necessarily follow that they are to be destroyed by war, we feel that the tone of the preceding verses justifies Buttenwieser's view, that this is a picture of defeat in battle which but ten

10 Driver, op. cit., p. 168.
13 Cripps, op. cit., pp. 174f.
14 Ibid., p. 174.
15 Harper, op. cit., p. 100.
16 Robinson, op. cit., p. 112.
per cent of the army survives.17

6:14 gives a picture of punishment at the hands of a nation which the Lord is raising up against Israel. The Hebrew here uses an idiom which indicates that the punishment is imminent, but it is to be noted that here the "affliction" carries with it no idea of captivity.18 The "nation" is not named here, but it is Assyria.19

"A Declaration of War" is the term applied to 7:7-9 by G. A. Smith.20 In this oracle Israel is measured by the plumb-line, is found wanting, and doomed. The destruction "with the sword" indicates that Yahweh's agent will be the army of an invader, most likely the "nation" of 6:14.21 It should be noted that the destruction of Israel is here pictured as climaxing in the destruction of the dynasty of Jeroboam.22

The conflict of Amos with Amaziah, related in 7:10-17, gives us another picture of the judgment of Yahweh being visited by war. This passage, unlike the rest of Amos, is in pure prose and it is the only section in which the prophet is referred to in the third person, pointing to the fact that it was not written by Amos, but the passage bears signs of being a true account of the actual facts.23 The judgment of Amaziah includes only

17 Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel, p. 216.
18 Gripps, op. cit., p. 216.
19 Harper, op. cit., p. 157; see also Robinson, op. cit., p. 119.
21 Driver, op. cit., p. 209.
incidents usual to the sack of a city in that time, and is not a special threat against the priest, but a repetition of Amos' prediction of the fall of the nation with the assurance that Amaziah shall see it. 24

In Amos 9:17-8 we get what most scholars 25 believe to be the last of authentic Amos material. Here we get an assurance that Israel will, because of her sin, be treated like the other nations, and that complete destruction awaits her, but we are not told the method of this destruction. If, as Cripps believes, verse 10 is also to be counted as genuine, this destruction is to be by war. 26

From these passages it is clear that Amos regarded destruction by war as one, and indeed, the major, method by which Yahweh would punish his people. 27 Contrary to many modern prophets, he regarded war as a means of producing a more sober, humble, and religious attitude among those upon whom it is afflicted. 28 Barton feels that because Amos thought of Yahweh as using war as punishment upon his people, that his concept was that of a just, but not an ethical God. 29 While we may feel that Barton's judgment is a bit harsh, we must admit that Amos does not think of peace as an ideal which God strives to maintain, but rather

26 Cripps, op. cit., pp. 264ff.
28 McFadyen, The Message of Israel, p. 117.
29 Barton, The Religion of Israel, p. 98.
thinks of it as a national blessing which God will revoke as a means of punishing his people.

Closely related to Amos' belief that war will be used of Yahweh in his judgment of Israel is his belief that He will also use war in judgment upon the foreign nations. This belief is preserved for us in Amos 1:3-2:5 where we have a series of oracles dealing with various neighboring nations. These oracles fall into a set form, first the formula "For the three transgressions of Damascus, And for the four, I will not turn it back;", then an instance of the nation's guilt, and finally, the degree of destruction by war and captivity. Assyria is not mentioned, but it is the Assyrian method of dealing with nations which is described, and it is safe to say that here again the prophet had that nation in mind as Yahweh's agent. 30

The authenticity of this section of material is one of the critical problems in the book of Amos. The oracles of 1:9-12; 2:4-5, against Tyre, Edom, and Judah, are most seriously doubted. Gripp feels that there are "good arguments" for retaining 1:9-12, 31 and Driver is inclined to retain 1:11-12. 32 Harper rejects these three oracles, 33 G. A. Smith rejects the oracles against Tyre and Edom, 34 and Wellhausen doubts the oracle against Edom. 35 This study is not the place for settling such critical problems;

31 Gripp, op. cit., pp. 283f.
32 Driver, op. cit., pp. 142ff.
33 Harper, op. cit., p. 28.
35 Driver, op. cit., pp. 142ff.
for our purpose we limit ourselves to the less questionable oracles against Damascus, Gaza (Philistia), Ammon, and Moab.

The oracle against Damascus is in 1:3-5. The specific crime is threshing Gilead "with threshing-tools of iron." This is probably a reference to a form of punishment inflicted upon prisoners of war, the prisoners being forced to lie on the ground and heavy threshing instruments were driven over them. The punishment to be inflicted for this barbarity is a fire and the breaking of "the bar of Damascus." Fire is here used symbolically for war. The bar was a part of the defense of the city gate, and when the city was captured, it was spoken of as "broken." 37

The destruction of Gaza in 1:6-8 is likewise to be accomplished by war, for there is a reference to fire (here, as above, equivalent to war), and to the cutting off of the inhabitants.

In 1:13-14 the Ammonites are judged for unnecessary barbarity--"they ripped up the pregnant women of Gilead"--in their territorial warfare. This is to result in their punishment by war, 38 suggested in the symbolical references to fire, the reference to the day of battle, and to the king and princes being taken to exile.

In the oracle against Moab, 2:2-3, we again have punishment depicted in terms of war, again there is the symbolical use of fire, and Moab is personified as dying under the assault of

37 Ibid., pp. 19f.; see also Cripps, op. cit., pp. 121f.; and Driver, op. cit., pp. 134f.
38 Driver, op. cit., pp. 147f.
From these oracles against the foreign nations we get another view of Amos' thought concerning war. It is true that in the oracles against Damascus and Ammon he condemns certain wanton aggravations of war, but he does not condemn war as a whole. Here, as in the case of his oracles against his own nation, Amos thinks of war as a method of divine punishment, of peace as a national blessing which God revokes to punish the nations.

There are two passages in Amos in which we have pictured the futility of any armed resistance against the enemy in the day of Yahweh's judgment. The first of these is 2:14-16, where in that time swiftness, strength, experience, and skill in the use of weapons fails. The second is found in 6:8-14, where Amos preaches that the nation's boasted strength will be powerless to avert invasion, in these words:

"'Have we not, by our own strength, Acquired power for ourselves?' 'For lo, I am raising up against you, 0 house of Israel,
...a nation;
And they shall crush you from the entrance of Hamath
Unto the brook of the Arabah.'"

This protest against confidence in military power is exactly what we should expect to find in Amos, for he held that the nation could not endure by virtue of military prowess, but only by virtue of righteousness. Quite naturally, therefore,

39 Ibid., p. 148.
40 Smith, G. A., op. cit., p. 133.
41 Buttenwieser, op. cit., p. 239.
military prowess would be to no avail against an army that was the agent of Yahweh's judgment. Is it too big a step to say, on the basis of this, that Amos was a pacifist? It probably is, for Amos, as we have seen, saw in war nothing that would make it impossible for Yahweh himself to use it as an instrument of judgment. But we are not overstepping when we see in Amos' thought a nascent pacifism, for he, as these verses indicate, held that peace would not come through military strength, but only by right and just dealings among men, which is the foundation principle of modern pacifism. Note, however that in modern pacifism, peace comes through right and just dealings among men of all nations, because of those right and just dealings, while with Amos peace comes because the right and just dealings within the nation secure the favor of Yahweh.

II. Hosea

The second of the literary prophets, Hosea, comes a generation after Amos. Like his predecessor's, Hosea's extant writings are marked by an absence of the use of the term shalom. Therefore, here again we are forced to learn the prophet's thoughts on the matter of peace from those passages in which he is concerned with war.

Like Amos, Hosea regards war as the means by which Yahweh will bring judgment upon his people. The passages which carry a specific reference to punitive war are, however, fewer in Hosea.

42 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
than in Amos. It is more characteristic for Hosea to pronounce the divine destruction without naming the agency which Yahweh will use to carry out this destruction. This seems to be the case in Hosea 5:12-14. One scholar of eminence sees verse 13 of this oracle as a reference to Assyria as the punitive agency, but most interpreters see this passage as a reference to the inability of Assyria to aid in preventing the divine chastisement. In an oracle contained in 7:8-16 we get two references which may more probably be interpreted as indicating that Hosea thought of war as Yahweh's instrument of punishment. The first of these is in verse 11, "I will spread my net over them." The net very obviously symbolizes captivity, and it would only be through war that a captivity would be accomplished. In the closing verse of this oracle the sword is mentioned. The sword here seems to be obviously the symbol of war, but it is not clear whether Egypt or Assyria will bring the sword.

In 8:1-3, which is perhaps best regarded as the climax of the preceding oracle, we have the pronouncement of inevitable war. The Assyrians will come with the swiftness of an eagle upon the land, for the people have rejected the good.

Our next threat of punishment which involves the thought of war is found in 8:13, "They shall return to Egypt," which is

45 So Brown, op. cit., pp. 67ff.
48 Harper, op. cit., p. 308; also Brown, op. cit., pp. 70ff.
to be regarded as a threat of an actual captivity in Egypt.49

Another threat of exile is found in 9:3. Both Egypt and Assyria are mentioned as the agents of this exile (which we think of as the result of war). Some have felt that Egypt is mentioned figuratively, but it seems rather that it is not yet certain in the prophet's mind whether Egypt or Assyria is to be Yahweh's agent.50

The same indecision as to the place of exile is revealed in 9:6, where the first line, most moderns agreeing,51 should be read "For lo, they shall go to Assyria." Here the people are viewed as if they had already left their war desolated homes to be buried in exile.52

An oracle in 10:13b-15 pictures judgment coming in the form of either civil war,53 or war from without. The mention of Shallum is probably a reference to the Assyrian conqueror Shalmaneser IV.54 The mention of this Assyrian monarch is obviously a threat of war, Israel will be destroyed in the same way in which he destroyed Beth-arbel.

In 11:5-7 we have a threat of the sword destroying the cities, fields, and fortresses. The war will result in exile either to Egypt or Assyria. The sword is here to be regarded as war personified.55

49 Ibid., pp. 73ff.
52 Brown, op. cit., p. 79.
54 Brown, op. cit., p. 95.
Some of these passages have been marked by a very general and sometimes veiled reference to war, but the last, 13:15-16, is unmistakably clear and rather horrible in its details.

"They must fall by the sword,
Their children be dashed in pieces,
And their pregnant women be ripped open."

These last details were certain to follow every defeat in war in this period.56

From this review we are convinced that Hosea, like Amos,57 could not have thought of peace as an ideal which God would strive to preserve, but rather thinks of it as a national blessing which Yahweh will violate to punish His people.

Unlike Amos, who had nothing to say concerning the nation's foreign policy, Hosea was continually denouncing foreign alliances.58 Indeed, such alliances constitute for Hosea one of the chief reasons for Yahweh's destruction of the nation.59

The first such denunciation is contained in Hosea 5:12-14. Ephraim, in his sickness, which includes political anarchy, civil war, and religious and moral deterioration, had sent to Assyria for help.60 This may refer to the tribute sent by Menahem to the King of Assyria in 738 B.C., or it may refer to an event in the reign of Ahaz, 734 B.C.61 The reference to Judah is read 'Israel' by many scholars, including Harper,62 but

57 Supra, p. 11.
60 Harper, op. cit., p. 278.
62 Harper, op. cit., p. 278.
Brown feels that 'Judah' should be retained as more appropriate. Whatever the right solution in regard to such details may be, the principle involved is clear—"But he (Assyria) is not able to heal you."

In 7:8-16 we have an oracle whose basic theme is Israel's disloyal foreign policy. It opens in verse 8 with the statement that "Ephraim wastes away among the peoples." The meaning here is not a loss of independence, nor the seeking of help from other nations, but the acceptance of foreign fashions and ideas. In verse 9 we have what is probably a reference to tribute paid by Menahem and to the territory lost by Pekah, but it may involve more recent experiences. In verse 11 the vacillating policy of turning first to Egypt and then to Assyria is compared to the flight of a "silly dove." Finally the passage is climaxed in verse 16 where the leaders, because of an Egyptian policy which is being followed, are doomed to the sword.

Turning to 8:9 we find Israel has gone up to Assyria and has given love-gifts. The going up to Assyria is not a reference to exile, but to dependence upon that power for assistance. The giving of love-gifts was the seeking of the aid of Assyria and Egypt with gifts. Verse 10 seems to continue the same thought, but it is taken as a gloss by Harper.

63 Brown, op. cit., p. 54.
64 Harper, op. cit., p. 301.
65 Brown, op. cit., pp. 67ff.
67 Ibid., pp. 317f.
68 Loc. cit.
Smith, and Marti.69 Verse 14 also belongs with this section of material, and continues the criticism of dependence upon foreign powers, but this verse is held to be genuine only by Brown,70 it is questioned by Marti, Duhm, and Hoffatt,71 and Harper.72 George Adam Smith holds that it is certainly a later addition, feeling that it is based on Amos.73

10:6 gives us a prediction of the calf, the idol of Ephraim, being carried to Assyria as a present to the king. Shame and reproach will rest upon Israel, not because they have taken an object from their temple to present to a foreign king, for this seems to have been common practice, but rather because of the dependence upon Assyria which is implied by this act.74

Reading 11:5-7 with the American Revised, we have in verse 6 a reference to "their own counsels" which Brown believes refers to Israel's foreign policy.75 If this be the case, we have here another criticism of the policy of seeking help from foreign powers and a statement of the inevitable destruction which will result from such a policy. It seems to be better, however, to read with J. M. Powis Smith, substituting "fortresses" for "counsels."76

In 12:1 we have another reference to Israel's dealings with

70 Brown, op. cit., pp. 73ff.
74 Harper, op. cit., p. 347.
76 This reading is also preferred by Smith, G. A., op. cit., Vol. I, p. 323.
the nations. Ephraim's activity here involves dependence upon Assyria and Egypt, and consequently an acknowledgment of these nation's gods.77

If 14:3 be from Hosea,78 we have here his last criticism of reliance upon foreign help. He is envisioning the ideal future, a time when Israel will abjure foreign help from either Assyria or Egypt, for the reference to riding on horses is probably to be interpreted as dependence upon Egypt rather than reliance upon military strength.79 The fact that the prophet should include this idea in his vision of the future shows something of the importance which he attached to it and the intensity of his opposition to foreign alliances.

This brief review has shown us that Hosea is consistently opposed to an alliance or dependence upon Assyria, Egypt, or any other foreign power. One reason for this opposition seems to lie in the fact that such alliances involved an acknowledgment of the gods of the allied power, and were, therefore, insulting to Yahweh.80 Whatever the reasons lying behind the opposition may have been, it is clear that Hosea was antagonistic to such alliances, and felt that they would only bring destruction, which, as we saw earlier, he frequently thought of in terms of war. In this respect Hosea may be thought of as similar to

77 Harper, op. cit., pp. 375f.
79 Brown, op. cit., p. 119.
George Washington whose advice to this nation "to avoid foreign entanglements" is famous. This is, so far as we know, the first "isolationist policy" in the history of the peace movement, although the theoretical foundation for it, absolute dependence upon Yahweh, is quite different from the foundation of modern isolationist programs.

Very closely related to Hosea's distrust of foreign alliances is his belief that armaments are equally powerless to save. This latter belief, unlike the former, seems to be similar to one held by Amos, who likewise preached that armaments were powerless to save.

The first passage in Hosea which reflects this attitude is the much disputed 1:7. This verse is rejected by Harper\textsuperscript{81} and George Adam Smith\textsuperscript{82} who see in it a characteristically late thought and a reference to the deliverance of Judah in the time of Sennacherib, 701 B.C. On the other hand, Brown,\textsuperscript{83} though recognizing that the verse is misplaced in our text, and W. Robertson Smith\textsuperscript{84} both accept it as authentic, and see in it a thought which is characteristic of Hosea. We are inclined to accept it as genuine, but who ever may be the author, it would seem clear that it represents a pre-exilic prophetic thought; that Judah will not be saved by war, but by Yahweh.

The next section from the prophet which expresses his disapproval of trust in "fortified cities" is 8:14, a passage,

\textsuperscript{81} Harper, op. cit., p. 213.
\textsuperscript{83} Brown, op. cit., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{84} Smith, W. R., op. cit., p. 186.
which, as we have already seen, is open to serious doubts. If, as George Adam Smith holds, it is based on Amos, or if, as Brown holds, it is authentic with Hosea, we are justified in considering it here. In this passage the prophet protests the increase of fortified cities by Judah.

In 10:13b-14 we have an undisputed passage in which the prophet protests trust in armaments. The prophet's thought here is very clear if we read with the LXX:

"Because thou hast trusted in thy chariots, in the multitude of thy warriors, the tumult (of war) shall arise among (or against) thy peoples, and all thy fortresses shall be laid waste."

In 11:6 we have our last reference in Hosea to the futility of trusting in armaments where he pronounces the destruction of Ephraim's fortresses.

While two out of the four passages demonstrating Hosea's thought in this matter have been highly questionable, it seems that the accumulative evidence justifies us in saying that, for Hosea, trust in armaments was as futile as was reliance upon foreign alliances, neither policy could save Israel from Yahweh's destruction. While Hosea's belief here is very closely related to that of Amos, which we called nascent pacifism, it should be noted that the motive is different. For Amos armaments are ineffective because peace can come only by right and just dealings among men. It would be incorrect to say that Hosea denies this.

85 Supra, p. 20 for a discussion of the authenticity of this verse.
87 Brown, op. cit., pp. 73ff.
88 Ibid., p. 94.
principle, but he places much more stress on another, that armaments are ineffective because peace can come only through trust in and devotion to Yahweh.

Whether or not Hosea had what can be thought of as a concept of an ideal or messianic age is a matter of dispute. Among the scholars who in some way or other indicate that such an age was not envisioned by the prophet are Henry Preserved Smith, 89 Lods, 90 Harper, 91 Volz, Nowack, and Marti. 92 Scholars who indicate that Hosea may have held such a concept are Brown, 93 Jefferson, 94 W. Robertson Smith, 95 Wellhausen, A. R. Gordon, and Moffatt. 96 If Hosea had such a concept, we must gather our knowledge of it from such passages as 1:10-2:1; 2:18; 3:5; and 14:3. Of these passages, the second and the last, by inference, are the only ones which reveal the place that peace held in this concept.

Reversing their order and taking the more indefinite and vague passage first, we consider 14:3 in the light of peace in the future age. In this passage Hosea gives a confession which Israel will make in the latter day, no longer do they rely for protection on Assyrian or Egyptian might, but find it rather in God's promise to show a father's pity. 97 Protection, a feature

89 Smith, H. P., op. cit., pp. 248f.
90 Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 94.
91 Harper, op. cit., p. ciii.
93 Brown, op. cit., pp. 22f.
95 Smith, W. R., op. cit., p. 166.
96 Smith, G. A., loc. cit.
97 Ibid., vol. I, p. 343. For critical notes on this passage see footnote 78, supra, p. 21.
of, if not synonymous with, peace, in the ideal age will come from Yahweh.

In 2:18 the picture of peace in the ideal age is more specific. It begins with a peace between Israel and the animal world. The bow and the sword are to be broken, indicating disarmament, war will cease, and security will be the lot of the nation.98

In these two passages we get what seems to be a most important view of Hosea's idea of peace. First, peace comes through disarmament, the abandoning of foreign alliances, and trust in Yahweh. Second, the peace consists of (a) freedom from the destruction of herds, crops, and life by the animal world; (b) freedom from war, and (c) a sense of security in the land.

III. Isaiah

Hosea's great successor was Isaiah, whose works are preserved for us in that book which bears his name, along with the works of several other prophets. Without going into the problems of criticism involved, we are limiting our consideration to those passages which modern scholarship generally accepts as genuine to the eighth century Isaiah. These are 1-12; 14:24-20; 21:11-23; 28-33, and 36-39.

Unlike his predecessors, Isaiah does make use of the word shalom, the term appearing some eight times in the accepted sections. It first appears in 9:6 and 7.99 In verse 6 it is

98 Brown, op. cit., pp. 22f.
99 Young, op. cit., p. 736. The critical problems relative to these verses will be treated when they are again before us.
the fourth element of a descriptive name applied to the child who is to be the ideal ruler of the future, "Prince of Peace," in verse 7 shalom is used as descriptive of his reign, "And of peace, there will be no end." It seems apparent that in both cases the word is used with the same implications, but our problem is to discover what its implications are. A very natural inference for us to draw, from the background of our own concept of peace, is that this is to be an age marked by the absence of war, and that the Prince of Peace will not rely upon violence. This view receives support from the fact that earlier in the oracle the paraphernalia of war are assigned as "food for the fire." Such a view is supported by Cheyne,100 Gray,101 Jefferson,102 Pedersen,103 and W. Robertson Smith.104 Cheyne suggests that this ideal may have been inspired by contrast to the false ideal represented by Assyria.105 While Jefferson suggests that it grew up in contrast to the qualities of Ahaz.106 Objections to this view, however, arise from the fact that the second and third parts of the child's name are translated by some "Divine Warrior,"107 and "Father of Booty,"108 respectively. If these interpretations be right, then to think of peace meaning the

100 Cheyne, Commentary on Isaiah, p. 62.
103 Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 322ff.
105 Cheyne, op. cit., p. 62; note, however, that Cheyne, in his Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, denies Isaiah's authorship of this passage.
107 Wade, Isaiah, pp. 67f.
108 Barton, op. cit., p. 105.
absence of war in its usage here is contradictory. In this case we will have to think of the Prince of Peace as one who rules his conquered territory in peace, bringing to his subjects the blessings of prosperity. However Gray and Whitehouse are representative of many scholars when they deny the interpretations "Divine Warrior" and "Father of Booty," and we feel that we are correctly interpreting the prophet's usage of the term when we say that he is thinking of an age marked by the absence of war. However, we feel that, in view of the broad implications of the term noted in the first chapter of this work, it is placing too narrow an interpretation upon the word to think that the prophet was designating only an age free from war. The idea of the blessings of prosperity suggested above must also be included, and Davidson is probably right when he says that here peace implies "the state of enjoyment of all that is called blessing," 112

From 19:21 we get an insight into quite a different meaning of the term shālōm. Here a verb form is used to indicate the paying of one's vows.113 This usage is in close harmony with the fundamental meaning of wholeness or completeness noted in our first chapter.

In 32:17 and 18 we have two more uses of the term shālōm. This passage is doubted by Cheyne, Marti, and Box, but George

109 Ibid., p. 105; and Wade, op. cit., pp. 67f.
111 Whitehouse, Isaiah, p. 151.
112 Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, p. 367.
113 Brown, Driver, and Briggs, op. cit., pp. 1022f.
Adam Smith considers their reasons for doubt inadequate, and contends that there is no prophecy more characteristic of Isaiah. It is accepted by Bewer, Wade, and Duhm and on their opinion we feel justified in considering it genuine. The two clauses using the term may be translated "And the effect of righteousness will be peace," and "My people will dwell in peaceful homes." The context gives us the idea that peace here includes fertility of the soil, social justice, and security. This interpretation is supported by George Adam Smith, Bewer, and Pedersen.

Our next mention of peace is in 33:7. The whole of the chapter, however, is seriously questioned. Duhm and Marti put it in the Maccabean period, while Cheyne would seem to place it in the Persian period, although in another work he suggests that it has an Isaiahic basis. Wade would accept the chapter with the exception of verse 15, 16, and 20-24, while Whitehouse feels that a pre-exilic editor has incorporated Isaiahic fragments in verses 1-12. The term is used in verse 7 "The ambassadors of peace weep bitterly." From the context it
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123 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 189.
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is evident that the ambassadors of peace are envoys who have failed to obtain any abatement of the enemies' demands.126 Hence it is evident that peace is here thought of as the termination of the war. If this passage does come from Isaiah, he uses the term here to mean the absence of war in much the same way in which he uses it in 9:6 and 7, except that here the term carries none of the broader implications which it had in that passage.

The term "peace" again appears in Isaiah 38:17, but this whole passage is a psalm, probably late, which was certainly combined with Isaiah at a late date,127 and so is outside the scope of this study.

The last use of the term "peace" by our prophet would seem to be in 39:8 where Hezekiah congratulates himself "At least there will be peace and security in my time." But the whole chapter was written long after Isaiah's day, though it is historically accurate,128 and this last sentence is in all probability the addition of a late scribe.129 Therefore we are not justified in using it to discover how Isaiah thought of peace.

It should be noted that in every instance but one the passages where Isaiah uses šālôm are open to question, but, with the exception of the last two passages above, the opinion of scholars is so divided that we feel justified in considering the

126 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 190; and Wade, op. cit., p. 211.
129 Skinner, op. cit., p. 304.
evidence which they present. This evidence has shown that by peace Isaiah implied the absence of war, more positively, blessing and prosperity, including fertility of the soil, social justice, and security, and that the prophet used a verbal form of the same word to indicate the paying of one's vows.

We now turn our attention to the study of those passages where the prophet is concerned with war in an attempt to learn from them something of his thought concerning peace. Up to this point in our study we have attempted to be complete in that we have tried to consider every passage which the given prophet uttered which in any way related to the problem. Here, however, we find an overabundance of material due in large measure to the fact that Isaiah lived in exceedingly critical times. Therefore it is probable that here we will not mention certain passages which may relate to the problem, we have, however, tried to get every point of view represented.

The first intervention of Isaiah into the political affairs of the nation came with the invasion of Israel and Damascus in 735 B.C. The king proposed to call in Assyria, a policy which met the stiff opposition of Isaiah. This same opposition to foreign alliance carried through to the critical years of 705-702 B.C., when Isaiah opposed the policy of forming foreign alliances for the support of an insurrection. The first passage protesting a proposed foreign alliance is found in 7:1-16.

130 Smith, H. P., op. cit., p. 155.
Isaiah assures Ahaz of the certain failure of the coalition, on the basis that he be quiet, that is, enters neither into alliances with Syria and Ephraim in submission, or with Assyria in an appeal for help, but places his confidence in the Lord.  

The problem of whether or not the child of the sign in 10-16 is the Messiah does not here concern us. Whether or not the passage be messianic, its purpose was to assure the king that the threatening powers would become incapable of doing harm because of the intervention of Yahweh.  

If verse 17 was uttered at this time, a threat of invasion from the Assyrians is made because of the king's refusal of Isaiah's policy, but it seems probable that 17 does not belong to the interview with Ahaz.  

Closely related to 7:1-16, but probably delivered at a later time when Ahaz's decision to seek an alliance with Assyria was definitely known, are verses 17-25. Attempts have been made to pronounce verse 17 a gloss, but this theory is rejected because of a lack of connection between 16 and 17 which such a theory implies.  

The whole section is rather fragmentary, and it is probable that the relative clauses in verse 18 which apply the figures to Egypt and Assyria are glosses, but the meaning is clear: because trust is placed in Assyria rather than in

132 Tade, op. cit., pp. 45ff.
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Yahweh, the land will suffer an invasion.  

8:5-8 gives us another oracle which is along this same theme. "Because this people have spurned the waters of Shiloah, that flow gently," that is, Yahweh's help, and have insisted, rather, on making an alliance with Assyria, that nation shall invade Judah.

Our next set of oracles which clearly reveal Isaiah's opposition to foreign alliances come from 705 B.C., following, when Assyria was being distracted by the ascension of a new monarch, Sennacherib, and Philistia and Egypt were bringing pressure on Israel to take advantage of the situation and revolt.

The first passage which probably comes from this period is 18:1-6. The passage has been referred to such later dates as 585 B.C., 573 B.C., 348 B.C., and 332 B.C., but Gray and George Adam Smith agree that it is probably Isaiah's, and Skinner feels that it must come from between 705-701 B.C. The envoys of Ethiopia are seeking to establish an alliance and the prophet's message is intended to guide the king to refuse the alliance on the basis that Yahweh will destroy Assyria without human help.

The most vivid pronouncement of Isaiah against foreign alliances is found in chapter 20. Here, in the only symbolic act

---

139 Ibid., p. 53; and Wade, op. cit., p. 50.
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of Isaiah's of which we have record,\textsuperscript{145} the prophet, by going
about "for three years" dressed as a captive, showed the foolish-
ness of placing trust in an alliance with Egypt and Ethiopia.
His action was symbolic of the state to which Egypt and Ethiopia,
in which Israel was want to trust, would be reduced by
Assyria.\textsuperscript{146}

It is possible that we have a protest against the Egyptian
alliance in 28:15:

\begin{quote}
"We have struck a covenant with Death,
And have formed a compact with Sheol."
\end{quote}

This may be a reference to religious rites by which the treaty
was placed under the sanction of Osiris and Isis.\textsuperscript{147} This view,
however, is not in general favor. It seems more probable that
these verses refer to the practice of necromancy and have no
reference to the Egyptian alliance.\textsuperscript{148}

The prophet's criticism of the Egyptian alliance is nowhere
more clearly seen than in 30:1-7, a section which probably dates
from c. 703-2 B.C.\textsuperscript{149} The stand of the prophet here is best
shown by quoting his words:

\begin{quote}
"Woe to you rebellious children,...
Who carry out a purpose that comes not from me,
And who form an alliance that is not according to
my mind.
Adding sin to sin--
\end{quote}

\begin{quotation}
\textsuperscript{145} Cheyne, \textit{Prophecies}, pp. 123f. The authenticity of verses
1 and 2 are doubted by Cheyne, but their omission would not
change the message.
204ff.; Lock, op. cit., p. 105.
\textsuperscript{147} Skinner, op. cit., p. 225.
\textsuperscript{148} Loc. cit.; and Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 297.
\textsuperscript{149} Wade, op. cit., 192.
\end{quotation}
Who set out on the way to Egypt,  
Without asking my advice,  
To take refuge in the protection of Pharaoh,  
And to take shelter in the shadow of Egypt!  
Therefore the protection you seek in Pharaoh  
shall turn to your shame,  
And the shelter you seek in the shadow of Egypt  
to your confusion."

Yet another oracle protesting the alliance with Egypt is 30:15-17, where salvation is pictured as lying in the direction of returning to Yahweh rather than in trusting in horses, which are here used in reference to Egypt.150

The same theme is emphasized in 31:1-3 where disaster is pronounced upon those who rely upon the military resources of Egypt for safety rather than upon Yahweh.151

In the final chapter of material from the eighth century Isaiah we get another account which shows this typical attitude of opposition to foreign alliances, this time with Babylon. As mentioned above,152 this chapter was written after Isaiah's day but is historical in reflecting his attitude. It is a report of Isaiah's criticism of Hezekiah's reception of the embassy of Merodach-Baladan, probably in the year 704 B.C.153 The passage adds nothing new to this phase of the prophet's message. Such alliances will end in destruction, in this instance, exile.

This survey has shown us that, like his predecessor, Hosea, Isaiah consistently opposed foreign alliances with any nation. In foreign affairs he followed what we today think of as an

150 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 117; and Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 313.
151 Wace, op. cit., p. 201.
152 Supra, p. 19.
153 Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 368.
"isolationist policy." His reasoning here seems to be practically identical with Hosea's: peace comes only as a result of trust and reliance upon Yahweh. Foreign alliances result in disaster because they are an insult to Yahweh who alone can give peace.

Like Amos and Hosea, Isaiah regarded war as an instrument of divine punishment. The first passage which may contain a reference to war as a punishment upon Judah is found in 1:18-20. "But if you refuse and rebel, you shall taste the sword." This translation, however, is questioned by some. Thus Gray prefers "On husks shall ye feed."\(^{154}\)

The next passage which suggests war as the instrument of God's punishment is 3:16-4:1. Here, again, the critics have raised their questions. The passage is fragmentary, and there is evidence that it has been worked over by a late editor. Verses 16-24 are generally accepted, but 3:25-4:1 is thought to be a poetic fragment,\(^{155}\) verses 25-26 perhaps coming from a poem written to bewail the capture of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.\(^{156}\) Thus we lose the most explicit statement of war as a means of punishment in this particular oracle. In the genuine material, however, the condition of the women of Zion is pictured as to imply captivity, especially in the "ropes for girdles" and in the branding,\(^{157}\) and the punishment of captivity can only be thought of as the result of war.

---

155 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 21; and Harper, op. cit., p. 30.
156 Wade, op. cit., p. 30.
The next reference which implies the use of war as punishment is likewise a mention of exile. Indeed, it is the only explicit mention of exile which can without question be attributed to Isaiah.\textsuperscript{158} It is 5:13, where the whole people are doomed to exile because of the lack of the knowledge of God.\textsuperscript{159}

We turn now to the closely related passages 7:1-16 and 17-25.\textsuperscript{160} Lods sees an invasion into Judah announced in the first passage. This view, however, interprets the reference to curds and honey in 15 as meaning that the land has been reduced to a wilderness and that the few inhabitants have reverted to a pastoral life.\textsuperscript{161} But, as Skinner points out, this interpretation is very questionable, because "curds and honey" are elsewhere always used as a synonym for plenty.\textsuperscript{162} Moving over into the next section, however, the picture of invasion is certain. A picture of the complete desolation of the land at the hands of the Assyrians is painted in unmistakable language.

As was pointed out above in connection with our study of the prophet’s attitude on foreign alliances, 8:5-8 pictures Yahweh using Assyria to punish Judah.\textsuperscript{163}

In 10:5-6 we have the following words put into the mouth of Yahweh, showing that Isaiah thought of him as using the Assyrian invaders as his instrument of punishment:

\begin{itemize}
\item 158 Harper, op. cit., p. 39.
\item 159 Gray, op. cit., p. 92.
\item 160 Supra, p. 32.
\item 161 Lods, op. cit., p. 103.
\item 162 Harper, op. cit., p. 60; so also Wade, op. cit., p. 123.
\item 163 Supra, p. 32.
\end{itemize}
"O Assyria, rod of my anger,  
And staff of my fury!  
Against a godless nation I send him,  
And against the people of my wrath I charge him,  
To despoil them, and to prey on them,  
And to trample them down like mire of the streets."

Our next passage dealing with the punishment of Judah by means of war is found in the critically very difficult section of material 22:1-14. This section of material most probably originates from the time when the siege of Sennacherib was raised in 701 B.C. As Cheyne says, it is tenable that on the whole the passage is of Isaiahic authorship, but he doubts the authenticity of verse 6, which is a description of the enemies' army. Whitehouse argues for the authenticity of verse 6, but, along with Gray, follows Duhm in regarding 9-11a, a prose note, as a later insertion. Skinner, on the other hand, feels that this prose section serves to enhance the contrast of the passage and that it is not necessarily an insertion. The best analysis of the passage is that of Skinner. Verses 1-4. The city, despite the disgrace of its arms, has abandoned itself to gaiety. Verses 5-7. Either in a vision, or in a description of the past, the Assyrian forces are seen thundering at the gates of Jerusalem. Verses 8-11. Going back to the past, the prophet pictures the attention paid to the defences of the city.

165 Cheyne, Prophecies, pp. 133ff.  
166 Whitehouse, op. cit., pp. 252ff.  
167 Gray, op. cit., pp. 373f.  
169 Ibid., p. 176.  
170 So also Gray, op. cit., pp. 373f.
with never a thought being given to Yahweh. Verse 12-14. A situation calling for thought and penitence is being passed over with revelry, so Yahweh pronounces judgment. From this analysis it is clear that, even without the evidence from the doubtful passages, the prophet is here thinking of war as the means that Yahweh has chosen to punish his people, and the fact that they have not given heed to its solemn meaning is the cause for this passage which has been called "the most pessimistic of all Isaiah's prophecies."171

As we saw above,172 the work of Isaiah as it is preserved for us ends with a threat of exile, 39:6-7, which we can only think of as the result of war. This exile being announced as the punishment of Yahweh. In view of our acceptance of the historical accuracy of this passage despite its late origin,173 we feel fairly confident that we can accept this passage as further evidence of Isaiah's belief in war as Yahweh's instrument of punishment.

To be related to these passages in which the prophet pronounced divine punishment upon Judah by war are those in which he saw the same kind of punishment meted out to foreign nations. In this phase of his thought Isaiah follows his earlier predecessor, Amos, who likewise saw Yahweh use war against foreign nations. The first passages involved are 7:1-16, 17.174 In the

172 Supra, p. 34.
173 Supra, p. 29.
174 For the critical problems raised by these verses, see supra, p. 30 and 31.
first section the destruction of Ephraim and Syria is announced and then confirmed in the sign of Immanuel. Before the child is two or three years old the land of Judah's enemies will be desolate. In these first sixteen verses Assyria is not mentioned, but it is generally assumed that the prophet has that power in mind as the agent of destruction. This view is supported by the fact that in the following section, beginning with verse 17, where the destruction of Judah is announced, Assyria is named as the agent.

In 8:1-4 the prophet leaves no doubt but that Syria and Ephraim are to be punished by Assyria. First "Speeding to the spoil, Hastening to the prey." are to be written on a great tablet, then the prophet's son is to be given these words for a name, and it is added that before the child can talk "the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away by the king of Assyria."

According to Cheyne "this people" in verse 6 here applies to the Northern Kingdom, which would make 6-8 a prediction of Assyrian invasion into Israel as well as Judah. We have, however, found no other scholar who interprets "this people" as other than a reference to Judah, and this seems to be more in harmony with the context.

We find in 9:8-10:4; 5:25-30 a long prophecy dealing

176 Cheyne, Prophecies, pp. 52f.
177 These sections united by Smith, J. M. P., American Translation; Wade, op. cit., pp. 67ff; and Gray, op. cit., p. 95. The latter two both doubt 10:1-4 as originally a part of this particular poem.
with the destruction of Ephraim. In the first part of the poem the destruction is announced, but no agent is named. If verses 10:1-4 belong to this poem, the first suggestion of the agent of destruction is found in verse 3, for "the storm which will come from afar" is a reference to Assyria.178 Coming down to the final strophe of the poem we get a description of the nation that the Lord is summoning from afar, a description that all scholars recognize as being of Assyria. It is true that in verse 26 a plural is found, "nations," but this is either taken to rever to the nations of the Assyrian empire,179 or is read as singular.180

The oracle which immediately follows introduces a unique element not hitherto noticed in Isaiah's thought. Up to this point Assyria has been the agent by which Yahweh will punish either Judah or Syria and Ephraim. Now, in 10:5-17, Yahweh announces that after he has used that power to punish Judah, he will break it because it has attributed its success to its own power. The destruction of Assyria is nowhere specifically stated to be by war, but Gray sees that the reference to fire in verse 16 may be symbolic of war.181 This symbolic usage of fire would be in harmony with Hosea's usage of the term.

In 14:28-32 Philistia is rejoicing because Assyria is broken, but Isaiah predicts that the new Assyria shall be as

178 Wade, op. cit., p. 71.
179 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 35.
180 Wade, op. cit., pp. 56f.
181 Gray, op. cit., p. 201.
powerful, and in verse 31, that it shall destroy Philistia. The passage is regarded by some as post-exilic, but Gray,\textsuperscript{182} and Cheyne,\textsuperscript{183} feel that it is genuine, the latter referring it to the time of the death of Sennacherib.

Chapter 20 gives us Isaiah's symbolic prediction that Assyria will lead Ethiopia into exile. The warning being issued at the command of Yahweh.

In chapter 23 we have an oracle against Tyre. No reference, however, is given to Yahweh's instrument of destruction unless we find it in verse 13. As it stands, this verse is quite unintelligible,\textsuperscript{184} but the most probable meaning is that just as Chaldea (Babylonia) has fallen prey to Assyria, so Tyre cannot escape, the reference being to the third Assyrian invasion of Babylonia made by Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{185} If this be correct, the prophet thinks of war again as Yahweh's instrument of destruction.

From this review one thing is very clear, no matter how much the prophet opposed foreign alliances as leading to war, and in spite of his belief, as we shall see, that armed resistance was futile, Isaiah is in no sense a complete pacifist, for like Amos and Hosea, he sees war as something which Yahweh uses to execute his will. Peace, therefore, for Isaiah, must have been a blessing which Yahweh at his discretion revokes to punish either His own nation, or the enemies of His own nation.

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid., p. 267.
\textsuperscript{183} Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{184} Gray, op. cit., pp. 392f.; and Skinner, op. cit., p. 190.
\textsuperscript{185} Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 139; and Skinner, loc. cit.
The first passage to show the prophet's distrust in military resources is 2:5-10. This passage cites as the cause of the coming of the Day of the Lord the apostasy and ungodly pride of the people, including trust in "horses and chariots." 186

Another passage which demonstrates the prophet's distrust of military resources is 22:8-11. As noted above, 187 the greater part of this passage, 9-11a, is open to serious doubt, but even apart from the prose note, there is a description of the people attending to the material defences of the city while neglecting Yahweh. 188 The prose note, if it is allowed, greatly strengthens this picture.

A third statement of the futility of military resources is found in 31:1-3. Let the prophet speak for himself:

"Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help, And rely on horses; Those who trust in chariots, because they are many, And in horsemen, because they are very numerous; But look not to the Holy One of Israel, Nor consult the Lord!

And their horses are flesh, and not spirit."

Here the horses and chariots are doubly objectionable to the prophet, because they are first, objectionable in themselves, and are second, objectionable because they are obtained through foreign alliances. 189

These three passages may seem to be slight evidence upon which to base the statement that Isaiah had a deep distrust of

186 Skinner, op. cit., p. 18; and Wade, op. cit., p. 16f.
187 Supra, p. 37.
188 Gray, op. cit., pp. 373f.
189 Skinner, op. cit., p. 252.
military strength, but it is essential to note that they come from either end of his career. The first, 2:5-10, must come soon after 740 B.C., while the second and probably the third come from the close of the prophet's long career, about 701 B.C. It should also be noted that this distrust is very closely related to his distrust of foreign alliances, for which we had such ample evidence. In both cases the prophet feels that peace cannot come through trust in the devices of man, but must come from a return to full faith and confidence in Yahweh.

So far we have seen that Isaiah thought of war as an instrument in the hands of Yahweh in his belief that Yahweh used war to punish Judah and foreign nations, and in his belief that armed resistance was futile. This principle of Isaiah's thought is further supported by his belief in the inviolability of Jerusalem. Yahweh would bring the foe up to the very gate of His city, but He would not allow them to destroy it.

The first hint of the inviolability of Jerusalem is contained in 8:8c-10. Jerusalem itself is not mentioned in this passage, but the fundamental idea which rests under the idea of Jerusalem's inviolability is clearly announced. Though the Assyrian forces invade Judah, it is announced to the nations, the "distant parts of the earth," that any plan against Judah shall "come to nought" because "God is with us." Gray considers this announcement to be post-exilic, while Skinner says that

190 Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 102, who here follows Marti.
191 Gray, op. cit., p. 374.
192 Ibid., p. 145.
there is no reason to doubt it and Whitehouse regards it as a statement of the central idea of Isaianic prophecy. 193

In 31:5-9 we have a definite statement of the inviolability of Zion itself. Verses 5-9 are questioned, in whole or in part, by various scholars. Cheyne makes the whole post-exilic. 194 George Adam Smith accepts verses 5 and 6, 195 while Wade declares only 6 and 7 to be an interpolation. 196 Verse 5, which is freest from question, makes the essential point:

"Like hovering birds...
So will the Lord of Hosts protect Jerusalem,
Protecting and delivering, sparing and saving."

The next passage which pictures Jerusalem as inviolable is 33:20-22. The passage is of doubtful origin, 197 but if it is genuine, it portrays God as the refuge and strength of Jerusalem. 198

Our last passage asserting the inviolability of Jerusalem is 37:33-34. Hitzig has denied these passages as a later addition, but Cheyne, citing this fact, says, in effect, but why not say that they were added by the prophet himself? 199 They are accepted as authentic by Whitehouse. 200 This passage states that the king of Assyria shall not enter Jerusalem "For I will defend and save this city for my own sake, and for my servant

193 Skinner, op. cit., p. 74; and Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 141.
194 Cheyne, as cited by Wade, op. cit., p. 201.
197 For critical comments on ch. 33, see supra, p. 28.
199 Cheyne, Prophecies, p. 222.
David's sake." It is followed by the narrative of the miraculous lifting of Sennacherib's siege.

As was suggested at the introduction of this survey of Isaiah's theory of the inviolability of Jerusalem, it shows that in the thought of the prophet war was Yahweh's punishment and He could control it, and would not let His city be destroyed.

War as punishment upon Judah, war as punishment upon other nations, the futility of armed resistance to war, the inviolability of Jerusalem, these all add up to say that in Isaianic thought war is a divine punitive instrument, and that peace can be obtained only by turning to Him.

We turn now to discover what place peace held in Isaiah's thought of the future. In prophetic thought there were two closely related, though different, foci for predictions of the future. One of these was the Day of Yahweh, which, as we have seen, was central in Amos' thought of the future, the other was the Messianic hope which first appears in rather vague form in the thought of Hosea. Isaiah uses both of these concepts.

We saw how Amos took the Day of Yahweh and converted it from a day in which Yahweh would triumph over His people's enemies to one in which Yahweh would visit His wrath upon His people. Isaiah adopts this same view. This view is best shown in the magnificent poem found in 2:11-17 where on the Day of Yahweh everything which stands for self-sufficiency, self-conceit, and pride, including "horses and chariots", is visited.

201 Smith, H. P., op. cit., p. 158.
with the divine wrath. 202 Aside from the fact that man’s instruments of war are to be destroyed in that day, however, this passage reveals little to us for it does not tell whether or not war is to be used to bring about the day of judgment. The general tenor of the poem would imply, however, that here the prophet is thinking of Yahweh acting without the aid of human agents.

While there is some question in regard to 22:5-6, the most probable view is that this passage likewise refers to the Day of Yahweh. 203 If this be correct, we have here a picture of the Day of Yahweh as one of tumult with an army drawn up against the city of Jerusalem. 204

That Yahweh should use war on His Day would be in harmony with Isaiah’s general view of war as an instrument of divine punishment, while His overthrow of “horses and chariots” is in harmony with Isaiah’s pronouncements regarding the futility of armed resistance. Together they show what we have noted before, that in prophetic thought war and peace alike are sent of God, and that man can gain peace only by turning to full faith and confidence in God. Here again we see the basic principle of modern pacifism. The modern pacifist does not think of war as ever sent of God, but he does believe that real peace can only come by a practical application of God’s principles as revealed

202 Loehr, op. cit., p. 96. "Horses and chariots" are mentioned in verse 7, which is an integral part of this poem.
203 Supra, p. 37.
through Christ. This view represents a great advance over that of Isaiah, but its foundation is the same, real peace is achieved only by a complete practice of true religion.

One rich source of prophetic thought concerning peace and the future in the book of Isaiah is the messianic passages. Some scholars would maintain that all these passages are post-exilic, \(^{205}\) or that they are at least later than Isaiah. \(^{206}\) On the other hand, we have the view of Professor Cornill, accepted by George Adam Smith, that these passages are "conceivable as marking the zenith of Isaianic ideas," but that they are an "unmixed marvel if they are the production of a post-exilic teacher of the Law." \(^{207}\) With scholars so divided, it would be little more than the result of wishful thinking if we should accept as final either view, but the argument for Isaianic authorship seems to us to be strong, sufficiently so to justify our consideration of these passages as possibly giving us an insight into the mind of Isaiah.

The first of these passages is 2:1-4, whose grand climax

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
And their spears into pruning-hooks.
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Nor shall they learn war any more."

has probably been the text for more peace sermons and addresses than any other single passage of prophecy. The authenticity of this section, however, is open to severe doubt, quite apart from

---

any considerations mentioned above, for this passage, slightly expanded, appears again in the fourth chapter of Micah. Three explanations are possible. This poem may have been a floating anonymous oracle which, older than either Isaiah and Micah, was used by them. It may be genuine with either Micah or Isaiah, who were contemporaries. Or it may have been a floating oracle of late origin which was attached to both books. The first view has been revived in modern scholarship by Box. Isaianic authorship is held to by George Adam Smith who cites Duhn as holding the same view, Skinner, and Whitehouse. Late authorship is maintained by Wade, Stade, Nowack, Hackmann, Cheyne, Toy, and Marti. We are inclined to favor the possibility of Isaianic authorship. If the passage is genuine, the prophet here paints a picture of Yahweh ruling in Jerusalem. All the nations go up for instruction and for the arbitration of their disputes, and it is on the basis of this arbitration that the nations disarm.

The next passage which is sometimes given a messianic interpretation is the sign which Isaiah gives to Ahaz in 7:13-16. Regarding this passage as the first statement of the messianic doctrine, as a rough draft from which the messianic cycle should

210 Skinner, op. cit., p. 15.
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spring, are Cheyne, Wade, Skinner, George Adam Smith, and Whitehouse. An equally imposing list of scholars see no possible messianic reference, but simply a reference to a child born in the ordinary course of nature which the prophet is using as a sign, they are Gray, Bower, Lods, and H. P. Smith. Neither list is by any means exhaustive, and problems of scholarship are not settled by counting heads, but we are inclined to agree with Jefferson when he says that modern scholarship compels us to the opinion that this passage is not a reference to the Messiah. If, however, this passage is regarded as messianic, its meaning must be that Immanuel will be a divinely appointed means of insuring Judah permanent security, i.e., peace, against the Assyrians.

The next messianic passage is found in 9:2-7. As to the critical problems of this passage, it may be said that those who hold that any of the messianic passages come from Isaiah accept this passage. Two references to peace during the messianic era are made in this passage. The first is a picture of the burning of the blood-stained miscellanea of war, which

216 Cheyne, Prophecies, op. cit., p. 48.
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226 Wade, op. cit., p. 44f.
227 Supra, p. 47.
indicates that the new age is to be one of peace. The second is in the title, "Prince of Peace," the significance of which has already been considered. 228 It is sufficient to reiterate that this passage portrays a broad idea of peace involving not only freedom from war, but also the blessings of prosperity.

In the messianic passage of 11:1-9 "no figure is too strong to paint this reign of peace and order." 229 Like the above, this passage is questioned only by those who deny that Isaiah held any messianic thoughts. Here we have a picture of a messianic king whose might (verse 2) consists not of the might of a great soldier, but of having power to execute right. 230 Perfect justice and fairness will be executed, to the extent that nature is to be revolutionized so that beasts of prey become like tame animals. 231 The picture of righteous and prosperous peace and security indicated in this oracle is based on a faith in Yahweh as a God of social righteousness, and it has been called the highest expression of such a faith. 232

The next, and last passage which we shall consider from Isaiah is 32:1-5, 15-20. In uniting these two passages as a description of the condition destined to prevail in the messianic age, we are following Duhm. 233 Here, in a passage that comes from the closing years of the prophet's life, he paints

---
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his richest picture of social justice and social peace, though
these concepts had been fundamental with him throughout his
ministry.\footnote{Bewer, op. cit., p. 116.} \footnote{Pedersen, op. cit., p. 321.} Perhaps here again the most effective thing will
be to let the prophet speak for himself. To be noted is the
stress which the prophet here places upon security in this peace
of the future.\footnote{Pedersen, op. cit., p. 321.}

"Then will the steppe become garden land,
And the garden land be counted an orchard.
And justice will dwell in the steppe,
And righteousness abide in the garden land;
And the effect of righteousness will be peace,
And the product of justice quietness and
confidence forever.
My people will dwell in peaceful homes,
In secure abodes, and in quiet resting places..."

This review of Isaiah's pronouncements on the Messianic
state reveal that war had no place in his thought of the ideal
future. God might, indeed did, use war in Isaiah's day, but
with the advent of the messianic king, war would be replaced
with an ideal peace. Features of this ideal peace included
political peace based upon divine arbitration, the peace of a
prosperity so wide-spread that even the wild beasts contributed
toward it, and the peace of social justice and security. Truly
such a peace would be a peace indeed!

IV. Micah

Isaiah's younger contemporary was the prophet Micah. His
work is preserved for us in the book which bears his name, but
along with it here is much which many critics feel must have
come from later hands. There is every reason to accept the first three chapters as genuine, with the exception of 2:12-13, for the last sentences of chapter 3 are quoted as Micah's in Jeremiah 26:13.\textsuperscript{236} The remainder of the book, though universally admitted to contain some of the noblest utterances in the Old Testament, is so different in tone, style, and general character that some feel that none of it came from Micah.\textsuperscript{237} Others, however, feel that parts of the latter half of the book are not inconsistent with conditions implied in the first three chapters and may come from Micah. Bewer admits the threatening passages of chapter 4,\textsuperscript{238} a position with which Wade seems to concur,\textsuperscript{239} Povah admits 6:1-8,\textsuperscript{240} while Bewer feels that 6:1-7:6 are "likely" Micah's.\textsuperscript{241} This review shows us the doubtful nature of much of our material. More will be said later concerning specific passages when they are up for consideration.

There are two passages in Micah in which the word シェロ being appears, 3:5 and 5:5.\textsuperscript{242} In the first of these the prophet is denouncing false prophets. The way he here uses シェロ being is best seen by quoting:

"Regarding the prophets who lead my people astray,
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Who preach prosperity (shālōm) when their mouth is filled:
But if one does not put something in their mouths,
They declare war against him!"  
Peace or prosperity is preached to those who pay these false prophets well, but war, which is here not national, but probably implies a tyrannical species of backmail,²⁴³ to those who do not pay them well. Pedersen points out that this shows how great a place peace played in the sayings of these false prophets, for Micah here makes it their characteristic message. He goes on to say that it is no wonder that it had such a place in their message, because as it is here used it is the same as the very growth of life.²⁴⁴ This suggests that more than material prosperity is involved, but that it is a blessing of well-being in all of life.

The second occurrence of shālōm is in verse 5 of that highly questionable chapter 5. Davidson²⁴⁵ and George Adam Smith seem to accept the passage in which this occurs, but the latter notes that it is placed in exilic or post-exilic times by Marti, Nowack, J. M. P. Smith, and Budde.²⁴⁶ Wade denies this passage to Micah, but dates it twenty years prior to the fall of Jerusalem.²⁴⁷ It seems, therefore, that this passage falls outside the scope of our consideration. If, however it is accepted as from Micah, or at least of pre-exilic origin,

²⁴³ Smith, Ward, and Bewer, op. cit., pp. 74f.
²⁴⁴ Pedersen, op. cit., p. 341.
²⁴⁵ Davidson, op. cit., p. 362.
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it perhaps contributes something to our understanding of peace in prophetic thought. The use of šālôm here is open to three possible interpretations. The passage is commonly read "and this man shall be our peace." If this reading be right, then šālôm must stand for "peacekeeper," or possibly for "protector." Either of these connotations is different from any we have up to this time met in the prophets. There is, however, another possible interpretation for which Wade argues effectively. The Hebrew reads literally "and this shall be peace," and this admits the reading "And in this was (as explained in the rest of the verse) will peace be insured." If this reading is right, peace is here freedom from military conflict with the Assyrians due to the seven shepherds and eight princes which are to be drawn up.

As it stands in the text, it would seem that 2:8 does not contain the term šālôm, but it would seem that both Robinson and J. M. P. Smith reconstruct the text to include it. Robinson's rendering is very similar to that of Smith's, which is

"But you are my people's foe;
You rise against those who are at peace.
You strip off from those who pass through in confidence
Spoils of war."

Here peace would seem to indicate those who were living in a state of harmony with the whole community, a meaning which we

248 Loc. cit.
249 Robinson, op. cit., p. 135.
noted, in chapter I, to be characteristic of šēlōm.

From this survey we judge it most probable that Micah used the term šēlōm twice in his writings so far as we know them. In both instances he used it in a very broad manner. Once to connote blessing, prosperity, and well-being, and the second time, to connote a state of harmony between the individual and his community.

We turn now to those passages where Micah thinks of the violation of peace, war, as a means of divine punishment. The first of these passages is chapter I. The chapter vividly portrays the destruction of both Israel and Judah either as imminent or as actually happening. The verb forms used suit either of these alternatives. For these reasons it is probably best located historically between 725 B.C. and 720 B.C. In the first part of the chapter the destruction is pictured more in the terms of a theophany, but later Assyria is introduced as the agent. Very little is said of the sins for which this punishment is to come, but it is significant, from our point of view, that the slight reference which is made, in 13, is to chariots, which were military implements. The chapter closes with the threat of exile.

Micah 2:1-11 continues the threat of war as divine punishment. This oracle, however, differs from that of chapter 1 in

251 Supra, p. 2.
253 Loc. cit.; Robinson, op. cit., p. 132; and Lods, op. cit., p. 112.
254 Peters, op. cit., p. 239.
that it is characterized by a pointed statement of the reason for their captivity. It is a woe pronounced upon those who

"For the sake of a mere trifle, You take a heavy mortgage."

A woe against those who are described

"They covet fields and seize them, And houses, and carry them off. So they crush a yeoman and His house, A man and his possessions."

But the result of their oppression is that the enemy will possess the land and they will sing a lament

"To our captors our soil is allotted; we are utterly ruined."

They who now oppress are soon to be the victims of war and are to be carried off captive by the enemy.

Exactly the same tone carries through 3:9-12, where the prophet, unlike his contemporary, announces the fall of Jerusalem as the result of the evil of the people. In this respect Micah is in close agreement with his early contemporary, Amos.

These three passages, which, it should be noted, comprise the bulk of the undoubted material in Micah, clearly show that Micah, like his predecessors, saw nothing inconsistent in a God who required social justice using war to punish his people.

While the evidence is not so certain, it seems that Micah, like his predecessors, had only condemnation for the instruments of war, represented by chariots. But, if this be the case, we must think that Micah condemned them on the same basis as did

256 Smith, H. P., op. cit., p. 148.
his predecessors, because they showed that the confidence of
the people was being placed in these instruments rather than in
Yahweh. For Micah is not wrong in itself, but is an inter-
ruption of the blessing of peace.

The first picture of the messianic age as one of peace in
the book of Micah, 4:1-5, is almost identical with the picture
described in Isaiah 2:1-4. The critical problems which this
creates were dealt with when the latter passage was under con-
sideration. The passage in Micah adds but one detail, found
in verse 4.

"And they shall sit each under his vine,
And under his fig tree, with none to frighten
them."

If this passage is accepted as pre-exilic, and as coming possi-
bly from Isaiah or Micah, a position which we found tenable
when we considered the critical problems, the addition of this
thought in Micah is significant. It adds to the picture of
national peace the picture of prosperity and security. It rep-
resents each member of the messianic community owning his own
vineyards and fig trees, and as enjoying the leisure and secur-
ity implied in sitting under them. Thus is added to the picture
of peace as freedom from war the ideas of personal prosperity
and security.

Chapter 5 contains three oracles of Messianic significance,
2-4, 5-9, and 10-15, and while it is probable that these were
not uttered at the same time, they must be considered in

257 Supra, p. 47.
close relationship with each other. First of all we must face the problem of authenticity. While the chapter is not a unity, the critics line up on the whole in the same way in which they lined up on 5:5, and the conclusion is the same, the passages are probably outside the scope of our consideration, being of exilic or post-exilic origin. However, there are those who accept them as pre-exilic and possibly from Micah, so we will glance briefly at their significance.259

Verses 2-4 carry no reference to peace as freedom from war, nor is the word shalom used, but they do picture Israel under the messianic king as enjoying prosperity and security, which, as we have seen were fundamental to the prophets' thought of an age of peace.

Verses 5-6 pictures the protection from Assyria which will be furnished in the messianic age. Here the Messiah is ignored, and leaders are raised up from among the people, seven shepherds and eight princes are to "shepherd the land of Assyria with the sword."260 This would seem to indicate that the peace of the land of the new Israel is to be secured by military means—a concept which is unusual in messianic thought.

Verses 10-15 are not quite so generally questioned as the rest of chapter 5, being accepted by Wellhausen and Nowack,261 but nevertheless the weight of critical opinion, as we have pointed out above, is against these verses. If they are accepted

259 For the positions of the various critics, see supra, p. 53.
the prophet here, in light of the messianic deliverance which has been promised, pictures the destruction on that day of armaments, fortresses, magic, and idolatry. These things will no longer be necessary and will disappear.262 This thought of peace established by Yahweh without the aid of, and here it would almost seem conditional upon the destruction of, armaments is more in harmony with general prophetic thought than is the shepherding of Assyria with the sword noted above.

This survey has shown us that there is no secure basis for any statement of how Micah thought of peace in the messianic age, because we have no passage describing that age that we can with any confidence attribute to him. All we can say is that those passages which are now in the book of Micah picture that age as one in which peace is thought of as the absence of war, based either upon the power of the sword, or upon divine power without the aid of armaments, and that this idea of peace is expanded to include also the ideas of prosperity and security.

CHAPTER III. A CHRONOLOGICAL VIEW OF PEACE IN
PROPHETIC THOUGHT--ZEPHANIAH THROUGH EZEKIEL 1-24

I. Zephaniah

From the time of Micah until the appearance of the next literary prophet there elapses approximately seventy-five years. Then, with the appearance of a great national crisis, there comes the remainder of our pre-exilic prophets. Exact dates are hard to assign for Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habukkuk, but it seems probable that they come in this order and that they are contemporary with the early ministry of the great Jeremiah.

Zephaniah in no place uses the term shalom, hence we here find ourselves forced to gather all our information concerning his ideas of peace from his passages concerning war.

Zephaniah reminds us very much of Amos. Just as Amos saw the approaching armies of the Assyrians and made them the instrument of punishment on the Day of Yahweh, so Zephaniah saw the approach of the Scythians and made the same interpretation.

The punishment on that Day was to fall both upon Judah and upon neighboring nations. We will deal first with the pronouncement of punishment on Judah.

The punishment of Judah on the Day of the Lord is pronounced in chapter I. In the opening verses of the chapter the punishment is world-wide in scope and seems to be more or less supernatural in nature. Beginning, however, with verse 4,

---

2 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
3 Smith, H. P., op. cit., p. 163.
Jerusalem and Judah are specifically mentioned, and from verse 14, onward, the destruction is unmistakably pictured in terms of war and invasion. The fortified cities and lofty battlements will be of no avail in that day. Destruction by war is coming because of the sins of Judah.

Zephaniah's pronouncement of destruction upon the neighboring nations is found in 2:4-15. The nations denounced are Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Egypt, and Assyria. Because of the fact that Moab and Ammon were not on the line of the Scythian invasion, and because the verses referring to them, 8-10, are not in the elegiac measure, the oracle against them is generally regarded as a later insertion. Verse 15 is questioned as a later addition as is the political hope in verse 7. The climax of the oracle is reached in the prediction against Egypt and Assyria. The sword is mentioned but once in the entire passage, in verse 12, but the general tone of the oracles, and the historical background from which they come, support the thesis that Zephaniah thought of the Scythian invasion as the means by which Yahweh would execute His judgment.

These two passages have shown that Zephaniah, though

5 Ibid., vol. II, pp. 41ff.; and Bewer, op. cit., p. 137.
These verses are held genuine by Davidson, The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah (Hereafter referred to as Nahum, etc., to distinguish from the author's Old Testament Prophecy.), pp. 101ff.
7 Bewer, op. cit., p. 137.
separated by a considerable period of time from his predecessors, follows them exactly in picturing the invading army as Yahweh's agent against Judah and the surrounding nations. For him, then, as for the others, war is not something outside the divine plan, but peace is a blessing which Yahweh violates to punish the nations.

The one picture of peace given by Zephaniah is found in 3:13. While it can scarcely be called a messianic passage, it is a picture of the remnant after Yahweh's punishment is over. This remnant is pictured as a poor and humble people who now seek refuge in the name of the Lord and do no wrong, with the result that "they shall feed and lie down, with none to disturb them." Kuenen denied this picture of the future to Zephaniah, but most critics find that it has "every mark of genuineness." Accepting this passage as genuine, the figure here is one of perfect security from all external evils, permitting the peaceful expansion of the community. Zephaniah's thought of peace in the future, then, seems to be one characterized by security and well-being.

A more hopeful and peaceful picture of the future is contained in 3:14-20, but like the picture of the future found at the close of the book of Amos, this is generally denied to Zephaniah, and we have to be content with verse 13 as giving

10 Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 103; so also Bewer, op. cit., p. 138; and Smith, G. A., op. cit., vol. II, p. 71.
11 Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 134.
us our only trustworthy picture of Zephaniah's thought of peace in the future.

II. Nahum

The word shalom occurs once in the book of Nahum, in 1:15. This verse, however, is part of an alphabetic psalm, 1:2-2:2, which is recognized by practically all modern scholars as of post-exilic origin. Therefore we must get all of our information concerning Nahum's thought of peace from passages which do not use the word.

The remainder of Nahum's prophecy, 2:3-3:19, is all along the same theme, and for our purpose may be considered as a unit, though it seems to be made up of at least two separate poems, the first ending at 2:13. This material dates from either the siege of Nineveh by Cyaxares in 625 B.C., or from a period shortly before the fall of Nineveh in 606 B.C. Nahum might well be called the nationalist of the prophets. He sees Nineveh about to be destroyed by war, and his heart, filled with vengeance for his nation's oppressor, greets its overthrow with enthusiasm. He sees its fall as a vindication of the justice of Yahweh upon an oppressing tyrant.

13 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
14 Lods, op. cit., p. 158; Bisselen, op. cit., p. 494; Smith, G. A., op. cit., vol. II, pp. 84f. Smith also cites Bickell, Gunkel, Kaufman, Kennedy, Budde, and J. M. F. Smith as of the same opinion. Dissenting from this view is Davidson, Nahum, etc., pp. 18ff.
taking this attitude Nahum shows himself to be of that group of
prophet patriots who had reverted to the national Yahwism which
preceded the eighth century prophetic movement, and that he pic-
tures Yahweh as reconciled with Judah and as making the cause of
Judah His own cause.18 Perhaps this judgment is essentially cor-
rect, because Nahum is motivated apparently not because he sees
Assyria as morally condemned before Yahweh, but by the most in-
tense hatred of Assyria.19 Nevertheless, whatever his motive
may be, he is at one with the rest of the literary prophets in
that he sees nothing wrong in attributing to Yahweh the use of
war to destroy a people.

III. Habakkuk

The word șālôm occurs nowhere in the prophecies of
Habakkuk,20 and we are therefore, forced, as we have been in
other similar instances, to learn all that we can concerning
Habakkuk's thought of peace from what he has to say concerning
war.

In our treatment of previous prophets we have formed our
opinion by a consideration of pertinent, but isolated, passages.
The problem of interpretation of Habakkuk is such, however, that
this short book does not readily lend itself to this method of
treatment, and we shall consider the various interpretations of
the whole work, except chapter 3, which we regard as having no

18 Lods, op. cit., p. 158.
19 Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 21.
20 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
original connection either with the prophet or his utterances, in the hope that we may thereby gain some knowledge of the possible attitudes toward war and peace taken by Habakkuk.

The first interpretation which we shall present is that of Budde, one which is followed by George Adam Smith. According to this view the oppressors of Judah in 1:1-4 are an external foe, either Assyria or Egypt. 1:5-11 are out of place, and 1:12-17 follows 1:1-14 with a continued description of tyranny with which Judah is oppressed. Then follows 2:2-4 with Yahweh's promise that the just shall live by faith, after which, 1:5-11, the Chaldeans are raised up as Yahweh's instrument for the punishment of the Assyrians.

For our second possible interpretation, we shall follow Davidson, whose view is representative of the majority of critics. The injustice and evil complained of in 1:1-4 is the internal wrong of Judah, social injustice and oppression. The prophet complains that Yahweh has disregarded evil. The answer of 1:5-11 is that the fierce Chaldeans will be raised up to punish the nation by invasion. This, however, rather than solving the prophet's moral problem, only intensifies it, and in

21 Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets (Hereafter designated as Prophecy to distinguish it from the same author's The Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms.), p. 115; and Smith, G. A., op. cit., vol. II, pp. 128ff.
22 Budde as cited by Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 50.
24 Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 47.
1:12-17, he asks how long this brutal nation is to be allowed to continue. His answer comes in 2:1-5, where he sees that moral distinction is involved in ultimate destinies, and the righteous shall live by faith. This is followed by a series of woes in which the downfall of the Chaldean is predicted.

Both of these interpretations are open to criticism and involve difficulties, and while the second seems preferable to us, we must admit the possibility of the first.

According to the first interpretation, Habakkuk's thought of war is similar to that of Nahum's. Judah is oppressed by a foreign nation, probably Assyria, and Yahweh will raise up another nation to punish the enemy of his people by war.

If, on the other hand, the second interpretation is correct, as we believe, then we see our prophet holding a position which is a considerable advance over Nahum, and indeed, over all his predecessors. For according to this view, the prophet sees war coming upon Judah as God's punishment for its sin. But, rather than solving the moral problem, this war intensifies it, and the prophet becomes the first to question war, even though he regards it as Yahweh's act. It would be easy to make a hasty generalization here and say that our prophet questions war as in itself immoral, but such a thought is beyond him. He is questioning the rectitude of a particular war because in it the faithless and wicked nation is swallowing up one which is more righteous than itself. Then the prophet sees that the ultimate solution lies in the fact that he who has "despoiled many nations," and has "violence done to the land" will be brought to
mought, while the righteous shall live by faith.

IV. Jeremiah

Without question the greatest of the seventh century prophets was Jeremiah. Up to this point, none of the seventh century prophets whom we have studied have used the term *shālōm*, but in Jeremiah quite a different situation exists. We find in all some seventeen passages where he makes use of it. 26

In our study of Micah we saw that he made the preaching of *shālōm* a characteristic feature of the preaching of the false prophets. 27 The same thing is true of Jeremiah, who uses the term four times, 6:14; 8:11; 14:13; and 23:17, when speaking of such prophets. The essential meaning of Jeremiah's use of the term in these verses is seen in the fact that in *The Bible, An American Translation*, it is rendered "all is well" except in 4:13. Peace in these three passages would seem to be used by the prophet to indicate the broadest possible blessing and welfare. Pedersen has said that it is here identical with the "very growth of life." 28 It would seem likely that the same kind of blessing is indicated in 14:13, but here it is contrasted with the sword and famine, indicating that the prophet thought of peace as a blessing that was destroyed not only by war, but also by famine. This would suggest the importance of prosperity and material abundance in the prophetic idea of peace.

26 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
27 Supra, p. 52.
28 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 314.
In 25:37 the word *shallom* is used in connection with the familiar symbol of the shepherd and the flock: "And the peaceful folds are destroyed." To us it would seem that the most normal interpretation here is that the folds are peaceful in the sense that all is well with the flock, but Pedersen is probably right when he points out that the idea of the fertility of the flock is involved. This would be in harmony with the last idea suggested above, that the blessing of peace in prophetic thought includes material abundance, in which the fertility of the flock would have a very definite role.

There are a number of places where Jeremiah's use of the term *shallom* shows either explicitly or implicitly that he is thinking of peace as a state of well-being for the community, the city, or the nation. The first of these is 4:10 where the king, princes, priests, and prophets are horrified and shall say:

"Ah Lord God! thou hast certainly deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying, 'All shall be well *(shallom)* with you,' when the sword was reaching the life."

Clearly peace is here the blessing of well-being for the people and city the disruption of which is threatened by war.

In 8:15 and in 14:19 we have two passages which are identical. Probably we are justified in considering one or the other of these passages a repetition, but it is difficult to say which.

29 Ibid., p. 316.
30 The American Standard Revision puts these words into the mouth of Jeremiah. We are here following The Bible, An American Translation, and Peake, A. S., Jeremiah, vol. I, p. 120, who so read on the basis of the Arabic Version.
one. Thus Peake, in his note on 8:15, says "repeated 14:19b; perhaps in its original place there," but in his note on 14:19 he says "quoted from 8:15." The prophet in this passage is speaking for Judah, saying:

"We looked for prosperity (shālōm), but no good has come, For a time of healing, but lo! disaster."

While The Bible, An American Translation by its translation makes shālōm equivalent to prosperity, Pedersen would give it an even broader connotation. He says that here it comprises all that the Israelite thought of as "good." To be considered with these passages, as likewise showing the close relationship between shālōm and all that is good, is 33:9. This verse comes from a questionable passage, the whole of chapter 33 having been denied to Jeremiah. The first part of the chapter, 1-13, however is recognized by Smith, Lofthouse, and Peake as Jeremiahic material which has been worked over by a later editor. Therefore, we feel that we can tentatively accept 33:9 as representative of Jeremiah's thought. In this verse the nations of the earth are pictured as amazed at "all the good and all the prosperity (shālōm) that I will bring to her (Jerusalem)." The close connection here between

32 Ibid., vol. I, p. 204.
33 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 313.
34 Welch, Jeremiah, His Time and His Work, p. 231; also Duhm, Cornill, and Schmidt as cited by Peake, op. cit., vol. II, p. 127.
36 Lofthouse, Jeremiah and the New Covenant, p. 196.
shalom and the good is obvious.

That Jeremiah thought of peace as a blessing bestowed upon Judah by Yahweh, to be withdrawn by Him at His will, is shown by his use of shalom in 16:5.

"'For I have withdrawn from this people my good will (shalom), my kindness and pity,' is the oracle of the Lord."

The word shalom occurs in two verses, 29:7, 11, of the letter which Jeremiah sent to the exiles. The passage is doubted by some, but most commentators recognize in it a substantial historical element and feel that it was probably included in Baruch's biography of Jeremiah.\(^{38}\) The meaning of shalom as welfare is well seen in the first of these two verses:

"And seek the welfare (shalom) of the land to which I have carried you into exile, and pray to the Lord on its behalf; for in its welfare (shalom) shall you find your welfare (shalom)."

The second of these verses also uses shalom in the sense of a blessing, here the fullness of the blessing implied is perhaps best conveyed by our word "good", as we have noticed to be the case in some of the passages considered above:

"'For I know the thoughts that I cherish toward you,' is the oracle of the Lord, 'thoughts of good (shalom), and not of evil...""

Perhaps the last of the passages in which the prophet's use of shalom is such as to connote blessing or well-being for the city or nation, in this case the former, is 33:6. The wide implications of the term in this verse and of the kind of

\(^{38}\) Ibid., vol. I, p. 54.
well-being which it connotes is suggested by the words that are used with it, complete recovery, healing, and security. The verse reads:

"Behold, I will bring them complete recovery and healing, and will reveal to them abundance of peace and security."

The use of shalom to designate political peace, that is, freedom from war, is found in two passages. The first of these is 28:8,9. The prophet is here in conflict with the prophet Hananiah. He tells the latter that since it is customary for prophets to prophecy of war, famine,39 and pestilence, any prophecy of peace must be proved by its fulfilment. Very evidently, not only from the passage itself, but also from its general context, peace is here used as opposed to war, and we feel that this was the primary thought in Jeremiah's mind at this time. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that very explicitly peace here is not confined to mere absence of war, but it is also used in contrast with famine and pestilence, indicating that peace is a state of well-being in which the absence of war is only a part of the total blessing.

Another passage using shalom in contrast to war is 34:5. Here the prophet is consulting with the king, and warns him that the city is to be given into the hands of the Babylonians and that he shall see the king of Babylon face to face, yet

39 In reading "famine" instead of "evil" we are following Smith, J. M. P., The Bible, An American Translation; and Peake, op. cit., vol. II, p. 51, who says that this is the reading of some of the MSS.
Zedekiah is not to die by the sword, but shall die in peace and is to be buried with his fathers. In other words, the king is not to die in the war or as a result of the war, but is to die when he, and his country, is at peace. It is probable that this promise was originally conditional, but it plainly speaks of peace as a condition in contrast to a state of war and invasion.

In sharp contrast with these passages where shalom indicates the absence of war, is 43:12, where it is used to indicate a complete victory and domination over Egypt by the Assyrians. True it is that The Bible, An American Translation renders the word shalom here as "unmolested," and that George Adam Smith, in a free rendering, gives it as "safely," but the Assyrian is here pictured as unmolested and safe only because he has completely reduced the land. This is the first time that we have found shalom used by the prophets in the sense of safety through victory and domination over the enemy, but such an interpretation is consistent with the fundamental concepts involved in shalom.

If the rendering of the American Standard Revision is correct, 12:5 stands in sharp contrast to the above passage, because in it peace is not the security which comes from victory, but the security of the safe land of Judah as contrasted with

42 Supra, p. 4.
the jungle of Joraan. The preferred reading, however, based on an emendation suggested by Hitzig which substitutes boræah for boteah, is as follows:

"And if you take to flight in a safe (shālōm) land, How will you do in the jungle of Jordan?"

This rendering lessens the sharpness of the contrast, but does not destroy it. The land of peace is here identical with the land which is safe and secure.

Again in 12:12 shālōm is again used in the sense of security. That this is the meaning here is best seen by quoting the prophet.

"For the sword of the Lord has devoured From end to end of the land, So that no flesh is safe (shālōm)."

The desolation of the land has been such that there is no peace, no well-being, no security for anyone, would seem to be the prophet's meaning.

Also closely related to the thought implied by shālōm in 12:5 is the thought of 30:5. Here again peace is not produced by war. The latter has produced horror, indeed, as the following verses suggest, it is contrary to nature, and peace is, in contrast to this horror, security. If 51:56 could be accepted as genuine, we would have the prophet using shālōm in the sense of recompense or reward, a meaning which we have seen to be in harmony with the fundamental

---
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concepts implied by the term. It seems probable, however, that this verse could not have come from Jeremiah.

We have in Jeremiah our best opportunity to see how the prophets used the term shalom, since he used that term almost twice as many times as all the literary prophets before him had used it together. We have seen that in the main Jeremiah used peace to designate a blessing of well-being and prosperity for the community, city, or nation. We have found that in Jeremiah's thought essential elements of this state of well-being were material abundance and the fertility of the flocks, freedom of the state from war, and security. In one instance we found that Jeremiah used the term to designate the peace of the victor. Among the literary prophets this usage of the term is unique to Jeremiah, though it seems to have been a common usage at an earlier time. Aside from this one instance, the usage of shalom by Jeremiah is in complete harmony with the way we have found it used by his predecessors.

Like all his predecessors, Jeremiah lived and worked in crucial times. Like Amos, his early career was marked by the appearance of a foe in the North. Like Isaiah, Jeremiah lived and prophesied through a siege of Jerusalem. Unlike the other prophets, he lived to see the city that Isaiah had declared inviolate fall before the enemy and he himself spent his last

46 Supra, pp. 1, 5.
48 Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 320f.
days in involuntary exile. It was inevitable that during a forty-year career marked by such momentous events the prophet should have a great deal to say about national policy, and that much of this should be related to threats of war on the one hand and to trying to preserve what little peace Judah had left on the other. Indeed, he had so much to say along these lines that, as was the case with Isaiah, we shall probably fail to review some of his statements which relate to our problem, but we shall strive to find every aspect of his thought affecting peace.

The first threat of punishment from the North coming upon Judah is found in the vision of the boiling cauldron in 1:13-14. The vision is short, and difficult to interpret, but it seems clear that Jeremiah sees trouble coming from out of the North. It is not clear from this vision that the prophet is here thinking of a real enemy, but if he was, it was probably the Scythians.49

This last statement will not pass unchallenged, however. Most, if not all, of the oracles of chapter 1-6 deal with a foe from the North,50 but it is difficult to positively identify this foe. Thus Welch finds that there is nothing in the descriptions of the foe from the North that could only have been uttered by one thinking of the Scythian hordes, and that there are features in the description which do not agree with the

49 Peake, op. cit., vol. I, p. 84.
50 Smith, J. H. P., op. cit., p. 112.
characteristics of that nation which have come down to us. He also finds nothing in historical evidence to support a conclusion that the Scythians invaded Palestine at this period. Therefore he follows Volz and Wilke, whom he cites, in rejecting the identification of Jeremiah’s foe from the North with the Scythians. In Welch’s judgment this foe is not to be identified with a historical figure at all, but is to be given an eschatological interpretation.51

Occasionally Chaldeans, who in later years the prophet recognized as the ultimate foe from the North, are thought to be referred to here.52 The early date of these oracles, 626 B.C., however, argues against this, for at this date the Chaldeans had not appeared in this connection.53

While few are dogmatic about it, most scholars agree with Peake as cited above, that the foe in the prophet’s mind was probably the Scythians.54 The objections to this identification raised by Welsch seem to us adequately answered by J. M. Powis Smith, who says that these oracles were edited later in Jeremiah’s career and have been supplemented by later hands to make them apply more closely to the events of the later years.55

Closely related to the vision of 1:13-14 is the prose

51 Welch, op. cit., pp. 103f., 126.
52 Robinson, op. cit., pp. 198f.
54 This is the view of Robinson, op. cit., p. 198; Bewer, op. cit., p. 143; Povah, op. cit., p. 69; and Smith, J. M. F., op. cit., p. 112.
55 Smith, J. M. F., op. cit., pp. 112f.
oracle of 1:15-16. Here the foe from the North is pictured as against the gates and walls of Jerusalem and against all the cities of Judah because of their apostasy.

After a long passage on the apostasy of Israel we come to another passage, 2:14-17, where Israel is pictured as being punished by war because of her neglect of Yahweh. This passage, however, breaks the context and has been regarded as a later insertion by Ewald and Cornill, though these scholars did not question the Jeremianic authorship.56 Verse 16 almost certainly refers to the defeat and death of Josiah at Megiddo, and the brief subject of Judah to Egypt, which makes it probable that the whole oracle dates from a later period in Jeremiah's career than the bulk of the chapter.57 Whatever portion of the prophet's career this may come from, and whether the Chaldeans, or Egypt is the enemy, one fact is clear, in this passage Jeremiah is picturing war as the just punishment of Judah for her neglect of Yahweh.

From 4:5 through chapter 6 we get a group of poetic oracles reflecting the Scythian invasion.58 Of this group of oracles, frequently known as the "Scythian Songs," the first is 4:5-8.59 This oracle calls the people together at the fortified cities because the "destroyer of nations" is bringing destruction from the North. All because the fierce anger of the Lord

58 Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, pp. 110f.
59 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 56.
has not yet been turned back.

In a prose oracle in 4:11-12 the foe is pictured as coming as "a scorching wind from the desert heights" because Yahweh has pronounced judgment against His people.

Another poetic oracle is found in 4:13-17, where the invaders are pictured as coming with "chariots like a whirlwind," and with horses that are "swifter than eagles." Yet there is hope for Jerusalem, if she will wash her heart of wickedness. Verse 14, which contains this note of hope, however, is inconsistent with the description of the enemy as already coming and so has been regarded as an interpolation by Duhm and by Erbt.60 Peake thinks that it was probably not in the original prophecy, but may have been added by Jeremiah when he dictated the role the second time.61 Whatever the real status of verse 14, the oracle as a whole is clear, punishment is coming swiftly in the form of an invasion because Jerusalem has rebelled against Yahweh.

In 4:29-31 we have an oracle which pictures the whole population in flight at the approach of the horsemen and archers. Judah in desperation tries again the harlot's art, but in vain, for her enemies are seeking her life.62

We have our next allusion to the Scythians as the agents of punishment in 5:6. This verse is part of a longer poem which details the moral reasons for the doom with which the people are

60 Duhm and Erbt as cited by Peake, op. cit., vol. I, p. 121.
61 Peake, loc. cit.
62 Robinson, op. cit., pp. 207f.
threatened.\textsuperscript{63}

In 5:15-17 we have a vivid description of a "very ancient nation" whose men are "all men of war" being brought upon Judah by Yahweh. The picture is one of the complete destruction of the land, and of the battering down with the sword of the fortified cities. Many of the details of this poem have been held to refer to the Chaldeans.\textsuperscript{64} Peake, however, argues rather effectively that in its original form this prophecy belongs to the period in which the Scythians were the foe, and also, that all of the details could have, from Jeremiah's point of view, been ascribed to the Scythians.\textsuperscript{65} Bewer\textsuperscript{66} and Lodz\textsuperscript{67} also recognize the Scythians in this passage.

Another of the Scythians Songs is found in 6:1-8: There is some question, however, in regard to the authenticity of the last three verses. The command to besiege the city has been regarded by Duhm and Cornill as quite unsuitable to the Scythians, who might take a city by assault but who were unequal to a siege. This would be appropriate to the Chaldeans, but Cornill denies it to Jeremiah because of its unmetrical character.\textsuperscript{68} Whatever is done with verses 6-8, which, if taken

\textsuperscript{63} Smith, G. A., \textit{Jeremiah}, op. cit., pp. 118f.; see also Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{64} Smith, G. A., \textit{Jeremiah}, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{65} Peake, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. I, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{66} Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{67} Lodz, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 167f.
in connection with 1-5 only amplify them, the meaning of 1-5 is clear. The people are to flee from Jerusalem because the pastoral hordes have come up against the city and will attack it by day or by night, such is their fury.69

The last of the poems which may be referred to the Scythian invasion is 6:22-26.70 It is a picture of a mighty, cruel, and pitiless nation riding against Zion in battle.

But the disappearance of the Scythians does not mark the cessation of Jeremiah's prophecy of war upon Judah as punishment for the people's lack of faith in Yahweh. Such an oracle, probably dating from an early period in Jehoiakim's reign, is found in 8:14-17.71 Bewer would refer these verses back to the Scythian period,72 but Peake agrees with J. M. Powis Smith in making them of later origin.73 It is a picture of siege and inevitable doom because "the Lord our God has doomed us to death."

Another group of oracles of about this same period, being assigned by Lofthouse to 613 B.C., the year of Assyria's revival,74 is found in 10:17-25. The text here is very corrupt, and has been expanded at several places,75 but there is no reason to deny that it has a Jeremianic basis.76 The general picture is one of siege, inevitable and perhaps imminent, the enemy coming

69 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 58.
70 Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, p. 130.
72 Bewer, op. cit., p. 149.
74 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 102.
76 Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, p. 207.
from the North and laying waste the cities of Judah. In the closing verses the prophet begs Yahweh to use justice and not wrath in His punishment, lest they be reduced to nothing. Verse 25 is to be regarded as a later insertion for it is entirely out of harmony with the temper of Jeremiah.77

In 12:7-13 we have another picture of invasion. These verses are undated, but are generally believed to reflect the mixed hordes let loose on Judah by Nebuchadrezzar in 602 B.C. or 598 B.C. and the description is probably of an actual invasion rather than of an imminent one.78 This evil is pictured as falling upon Judah since the Lord hates her because she has "lifted up her voice" against Him.

From 13:15 to the end of the chapter we have a group of oracles of war and of exile, but they do not all come from the same period. The first, 13:15-17, probably comes from the reign of Jehoiakim, and may have been part of the roll destroyed by the king.79 George Adam Smith thinks that the last verse of this oracle was added at a later date.80 The message of these verses is that the people must go into captivity because they are haughty and will not turn to the Lord.

Coming from a later period than 13:15-17, is 13:18-19, a dirge on the approaching downfall of the king and queen-mother. While Duhm and Rothstein have objected, it is most natural, and

80 Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, p. 212.
probably correct, to assign this oracle to the reign of Jehoiachin. The oracle predicts the downfall of the king and the complete exile of Judah.

In 13:20-27 we have a long poetic oracle which probably comes from an early period in Jehoiakim's reign. It is a picture of an enemy, Babylon, coming from the North to Judah because of its many sins.

14:11-18 gives us a picture of Yahweh forbidding the prophet to pray for his people because He is determined to punish the land by sword and famine. Some see in this oracle a reflection of the situation after Megiddo, but it is more likely that it comes after the fall of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar.

If 15:1-4 are genuine, they continue the same line of thought.

15:5-9 is an oracle which probably comes from the years following 601 B.C. when detachments from the Chaldean army and troops from the surrounding nations were pillaging and destroying the country, but before the actual siege had commenced.

It tells of the destruction of Jerusalem and its people because they have cast off Yahweh, and ends:

"And the rest of them will I give to the sword before their enemies, is the oracle of the Lord."

A prose oracle in 16:5-9 repeats to us in terms that have

---

85 Lofthouse, op. cit., pp. 124f.
now grown familiar, the threat of exile because "your fathers forsook me and ran after other gods," while you have "behaved worse than your fathers."

Punishment by an enemy is again predicted in 18:17, the last verse of a poetic oracle. Here Yahweh will scatter Israel before the enemy on the day of their doom in just the same way as men flee for shelter from the sirocco of the desert.86

One of the most interesting passages showing that Jeremiah thinks of war as used of Yahweh for the purpose of inflicting punishment is found in 18:18-23. Here Jeremiah is complaining because a plot has been laid against him for defying the leaders of the community. Upon discovering the plot, the prophet makes a bitter plea for vengeance. He pleads that Yahweh shall not pardon their guilt, but shall punish them and their households with war.87 This from the man who has sometimes been thought of as the first "conscientious objector!"

Baruch, Jeremiah's Boswell, gives us, in 19:1-9, the account of the symbolic prophecy where Jeremiah took a clay flask and, breaking it, predicted that Judah and Jerusalem should fall to their enemies because of their apostasy.88

Another incident, likewise reported for us by Baruch, and taking place in the reign of Jehoiakim, seems to have taken place directly after the breaking of the flask. Jeremiah

87 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 92.
repeated his prophecy in the temple, thereby getting himself arrested. When the priest released him from the stocks the next morning, Jeremiah, with emotion which had doubtless been growing during the uncomfortable night, turned upon him and renamed him "Terror-on-every-side." Then he proceeded to give meaning to this name by telling the priest that he, his friends, the entire population, and the treasures of the city would be carried off to Babylon. Lofthouse thinks that this oracle, 20:1-6, was, chronologically, the first mention which Jeremiah made of Babylon. 89

An oracle against an unnamed king occurs in 22:6-9. The first two verses of this oracle are in poetry and there is no reason to question their Jeremianic authorship, though its precise date cannot be determined. The prose addition, on the other hand, is generally regarded as a late insertion. 90 The authentic oracle warns that the house of the king will be made as "a desert, as an uninhabited city," because Yahweh "will bring destroyers."

Along with the oracles against rulers in chapter 22, there is one, 20-23, against some woman, most likely Nehushtan, mother of Jehoiachin. 91 Because she has failed to listen to the warning in times of prosperity, and because of all her wickedness, she shall see all her friends and neighbors driven into

89 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 120.
90 Robinson, op. cit., p. 212; and Peake, op. cit., p. 252.
91 Robinson, op. cit., p. 213. Smith; G. A., Jeremiah, p. 224, makes this oracle part of the following one, and holds that it is addressed against Jehoiachin.
exile, and she herself will groan with pain.

The fate of Coniah, or Jehoiachin, is announced in 22:24-30. There are two oracles here, the first, in prose, 24-27, announces that the king, together with his mother, will be turned over to Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, and that both of them shall die in exile. The poetic oracle, 28-30, repeats this threat, and adds that Jehoiachin shall die childless, with no successor to sit upon the throne of Judah. 92

Much critical discussion is raised by the long oracle contained in 25:1-14. This is not the place to go into a detailed discussion of the critical problems involved. Sufficient it is for us to say that most critics recognize a large Jeremianic element in it. Bewer recognizes as genuine 1-11. 93 Lofthouse accepts 1-10. 94 Peake rejects verses 4, 7, 11b, 12, 13c, and 14. 95 George Adam Smith accepts as genuine 1-11 and perhaps 13a. 96 This oracle is dated in the year 605 B.C., the year in which Nebuchadrezzar defeated Egypt at Carchemish. In it the prophet repeats the charge that his people have refused for twenty-three years, certain now that the Chaldeans were the Northern enemies that he had announced so long and that Nebuchadrezzar was Yahweh's servant who by war and exile would punish Judah for its disobedience. 97

93 Bewer, op. cit., pp. 154f.
94 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 128.
96 Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, p. 179.
97 Loc. cit.; and Bewer, loc. cit.
Another account coming from 605 B.C., the year of the fall of Egypt at Charchemish, is found in chapter 36. This is the story of the writing of the scroll and the reading of it, both in the temple and before the king, who burned it. The verses that interest us are 29-31, for they tell us that the roll announced the destruction of the land by the king of Babylon. These verses then threaten again the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem, but more especially, the king and his line, because they have refused to listen. There are difficulties connected with this passage, and it is rejected by Duhm and others, but the fact that the prophecy was not literally fulfilled tells against the view that it is an editorial insertion. 98

We turn now from the oracles of the years between the Scythian threat and the siege, and examine those passages coming from the time of the Chaldean siege which reveal that the prophet considered war as punishment from the Lord. The first such passage is 21:1-10. This account comes from the beginning of the siege. The king sends a delegation to Jeremiah asking for the word of Yahweh. Jeremiah answers to the effect that the city and king shall fall into the hands of Nebuchadrezzar, Yahweh himself fighting on the side of the enemy.

A second oracle against Zedekiah, this time not sought by the king, but evoked by the progress of the Chaldean arms, is found in 34:1-7. Its genuineness is supported by the

unfulfilled promise of a peaceful death for Zedekiah, though this promise in its original form was most likely contingent upon the unconditional surrender of the king. The main point of this oracle is the same as we have found so often, the city is being given by Yahweh into the hand of the king of Babylon.

Coming from the period of the temporary lifting of the siege is 34:8-22, of which verses 20-22 especially concern our study. During the siege the slaves had been released in accordance with the long neglected law, but with the lifting of the siege the slaves were again pressed into service, with the result that Yahweh will give the land to the enemies, who will destroy and make desolate the cities of Judah.

From this same period comes 37:1-10, which is an account of the delegation sent by the king to the prophet. The latter warns that the relief is but temporary, and that the Chaldeans are returning to destroy the city. Of this oracle, verses 1 and 2 are probably editorial, and there are editorial touches throughout, but on the whole it is trustworthy.

Because of a charge of desertion, Jeremiah found himself under arrest, at which time the king came to him, this time personally. This interview is reported in 37:17-21. In answer to the king's question, "Is there any word from the Lord?"

Jeremiah replies "You shall be given into the hand of the king of Babylon."

Another passage which distinctly shows that Jeremiah thought of Yahweh as responsible for the giving of the city to the king of Babylon is found in 32:1-5. This passage purports to represent the situation in the last year of the siege. It pictures, however, our prophet in prison because of the king, while in all other places the king is as friendly to the prophet as he dare be, the real source of Jeremiah's imprisonment being the nobles. Therefore most scholars agree that this passage must be regarded as an editorial supplement. 103

We have here surveyed thirty-seven oracles, the great majority of which can with confidence be attributed to Jeremiah. These oracles have come from all phases of his career, from the time of the Scythian threat, from the intervening years, and from the time of the fall of Jerusalem at the hand of Babylon. All of these oracles have had one characteristic. The prophet has thought of the war, captivity, or exile which he has pronounced as the just punishment of Yahweh upon an apostate people. It is true, especially in the early years, that Jeremiah often thought of Yahweh's punishment as coming by some means other than war, but even Welch, who gives an eschatological interpretation to these early years, 104 says that the prophet's favorite description of doom is that of an invading and

103 Ibid., vol. II, p. 113; and Smith, G. A., Jeremiah, op. cit., p. 286.
104 Supra, pp. 75f.
irresistible army. After the fall of Nineveh, Jeremiah is unwavering in his conviction that Babylon is Yahweh's chosen instrument for the punishment of His people. In one instance we saw our prophet actually go so far as to pray Yahweh to punish His own personal enemies by war, an extreme to which no other literary prophet went, so far as our record is preserved. We see, therefore, that in Jeremiah's thought there is nothing inconsistent about a God who uses war to execute His wrath. As with the other prophets, national peace must then be for Jeremiah a divine blessing contingent upon the will of Yahweh.

Not only did Jeremiah think of Yahweh as using war to punish Judah, but like Amos, Isaiah, and Zephaniah, he thought that war was also used of God to punish foreign nations. The first passage showing this aspect of the prophet's thought is 25:15-38. Here we have a long parable where the prophet is compelled by Yahweh to take a "wine cup of wrath" from the hand of Yahweh and make certain nations drink of it "because of the sword which I am sending among them." This passage raises serious critical problems, and has been denied by such scholars as Schwally, Giesebricht, and Duhm largely on the basis of comparison with the LXX, that it is inconsistent with some of Jeremiah's earlier oracles, and that it contains traces of

105 Welch, op. cit., p. 98.
107 Supra, p. 85.
later style and thought. It seems better, however, to recognize with Peake and George Adam Smith that the passage is based on a genuine element which has undergone editorial expansion. The latter thinks that the nations which were included in the original were Judah, Egypt, Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, the remnant of Ashdod, Dedan, Tema, Buz, "and their epipt neighbours in Arabia," all of whom were affected by the Chaldean terror.

Most of the oracles against foreign nations found in our book of Jeremiah are gathered together in chapters 46-51. These oracles have been the center of a considerable amount of controversy. The last, on Babylon, 50:1-51:58, is now almost universally denied to have any Jeremianic basis. All of them have been denied to Jeremiah by Stade, Wellhausen, and Duhm. The oracle against Egypt is contained in chapter 46. The first 12 verses of this oracle are accepted as substantially genuine by Peake, Eiselen, and Bewer. Chapter 47 is devoted to an oracle on the Philistines and is accepted as having a Jeremianic basis by most of those who recognize a Jeremianic nucleus in this section of the book. A very long oracle on Moab is found in chapter 48. The very length of this

111 Smith, G. A., loc. cit.
113 Stade, Wellhausen, and Duhm as cited by Peake, loc. cit.
115 Eiselen, loc. cit.
116 Bewer, loc. cit.
oracle and its dependence upon other oracles makes it highly questionable, 118 though Peake and Eisel both feel that it has a genuine nucleus. 119 Chapter 49 contains oracles against Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Arab tribes, and Elam. Like the others, these oracles have all been subject to considerable expansion, but are believed by many scholars to have genuine nucleuses. 120

Most, if not all, of the genuine material in these oracles against the nations date from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the year of the battle of Carchemish. 121 Certainly a most natural time for Jeremiah to announce Nebuchadrezzar as Yahweh's agent against the nations.

Baruch has preserved for us, 23:9-13, the story of a symbolic prophecy in which Jeremiah announces that Yahweh is sending Nebuchadrezzar to punish and purge the land of Egypt. This prophecy against Egypt is not open to the same critical doubts as have been the other prophecies against foreign nations which we have reviewed. 122

This review of Jeremiah's utterances against foreign nations has shown us that while there is much controversy as to just how much of the material originated with Jeremiah, we may say with some confidence that Jeremiah thought of Yahweh as

120 The summary of critical opinion on these passages is best presented by Peake, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 239f., 242f., 248f., 250, and 252.
121 Ibid., p. 225.
using war not only to punish Judah, but also to punish foreign nations. This supports the conclusion which we reached after surveying the pronouncements of war upon Judah. Jeremiah thinks of national peace as a divine blessing contingent upon the will of Yahweh.

Like Hosea and Isaiah, Jeremiah adopted an "isolationist policy" in that he was strongly opposed to foreign alliances. The first passage reflecting this point of view is 2:18:

"Now what business have you on the road to Egypt, To drink the water of the Nile? Or what business have you on the road to Assyria, To drink the water of the River?"

The prophet here is not condemning the turning to foreign gods so much as he is condemning political alliances, though these political alliances, to the prophet, represented distrust of Yahweh. 123

The same essential message is repeated in 2:36-37, where, added to the condemnation of the seeking of alliance with Egypt and Assyria, is the prediction that it shall result in exile to those nations. 124

After the defeat of Egypt at Carchemish in 605 B.C. there seems to have been a tendency to seek an alliance with Babylon, against which Jeremiah protested in 4:30. The passage in which verse 30 is now found is one of the Scythian Songs, but this verse does not suit the Scythians, and is generally thought to be the Babylonians. Though Judah woos Babylon, it is about to

123 Smith, H. P., op. cit., p. 170.
become her tyrant. 125

A very similar passage is found in 13:21. Judah has wasted her time trying to woo Babylon for her friend, for that power is soon to be set over them. This passage, likewise, probably comes from the reign of Jehoiakim, after 605 B.C. 126

After Judah became subject to Babylon, however, Jeremiah opposed those foreign alliances which were proposed in an attempt to regain freedom. His attitude here is best seen in chapters 27 and 28, which relate the symbolic prophecy of the wearing of the yoke. During the reign of Zedekiah, in 593 B.C., there was a movement to combine the states of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Sidon, and Judah in a league against Babylon. Representatives of these nations were gathered in Jerusalem to bring Zedekiah into the alliance. Public opinion seems to have been divided, but a very strong group headed by the priesthood and the prophetic group represented by Hananiah, seem to have favored the alliance. 127 Jeremiah appeared wearing a yoke and charged whatever nations would not put their necks under the yoke of Babylon would be destroyed by Babylon. Hananiah, claiming to speak also for Yahweh, broke the yoke, predicting that the yoke of Babylon would so be broken within two years, but the next day Jeremiah again reiterated his prophecy, this time wearing a yoke of iron.

127 Loehr, op. cit., p. 100; and Welch, op. cit., p. 199.
Very closely related to Jeremiah’s opposition to foreign alliances was his advocacy of desertion to the enemy during the siege. This is first seen in 21:1-10\textsuperscript{128} where in an interview with the king at the opening of the siege Jeremiah tells the king that there is before him a way of life and a way of death, and that the former is by surrendering to the Chaldeans. He that stays in the city shall die, but he who surrenders shall live.

As we have already noted, it is quite probable that the promise of a peaceful death for Zedekiah, contained at the close of the oracle found in 34:1-7, was originally conditional upon his surrender to Babylon.\textsuperscript{129}

That Jeremiah’s advocacy of desertion was well known is suggested by the fact that, during the temporary lifting of the siege when Jeremiah found it necessary to leave the city to look after some property, he was arrested at the gate under the charge that he was deserting to the enemy.\textsuperscript{130} The account of this incident is preserved in 37:11-16.

The command to desert to the Chaldeans is again given in 38:2, an oracle spoken while Jeremiah was confined in the guard court. This verse has been questioned by Dubm and Cornill, but George Adam Smith, after citing their objections, effectively argues for the genuineness of the verse.\textsuperscript{131}

\begin{itemize}
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In the secret interview with the king reported in 38:14-22, we find Jeremiah again urging the king to surrender to the Chaldeans on the plea that it is the only escape from destruction.

There have been those modern pacifists who have called Jeremiah one of their own because of his isolationist policy and because of his advocacy of allegiance to Babylon and of his refusal to support the war even after the city was besieged. We have seen, however, that Jeremiah believed in war as divine punishment either upon Judah or upon foreign nations, and hence it is erroneous to think of him as a pacifist. His distrust in these normal methods of defense was really based on his belief that war was the act of Yahweh, for he held that these means of defense were ineffective because the invading agent was Yahweh's agent, and the only salvation lay in a return to Him.

When we look for Jeremiah's thought concerning peace and the future, we find that there is but one passage of messianic significance, 23:5-6, and that its authorship is questioned. Skinner says that evidence for its authenticity is about evenly divided, but that its form and its subdued colors are not inconsistent with the way in which Jeremiah elsewhere depicts the future blessedness of Israel. Peake, after telling us that it is denied to Jeremiah by Duhm, vola, Marti, and others, and claimed for him by Giesebruch, Rothstein, and Cornill, accepts it as authentic. The picture of the Messiah which Jeremiah

132 Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, pp. 311ff.
gives us is not that of a warrior king, but of a pious ruler who maintains righteousness and is the mediator of divine security to his people. 134

Concerning the non-messianic pictures of the future, Houghton has said that some of the most beautiful ideals of the perfect state are Jeremiah's, and cites 31:10-14; 32:38-41; and 31:23, 25. 135 We might also add that chapters 30 and 33 are likewise concerned with the future, but were probably left out by Houghton because of their doubtful authenticity which we will discuss later.

The picture of the future state found in 31:10-14, however, is denied to our prophet by most authorities because of its marks of relationship to Deutero-Isaiah and the post-exilic period. 136

The passage cited by Houghton from chapter 32 would seem to us to begin with verse 37 instead of verse 38. This passage, 32:37-41, is taken by Peake to refer back to the New Covenant and he accepts it as from Jeremiah. 137 This passage tells us of the return of Judah from exile and of the people living in security because they are following Yahweh's everlasting covenant.

The third passage which Houghton accepts, 31:23, 25, is a prophecy of restoration to Judah. It pictures a restored prosperity. The passage is highly questionable, being denied to the

134 Skinner, op. cit., pp. 318f.
135 Houghton, op. cit., pp. 319f.
prophet by Peake, who is ordinarily rather conservative in his
denials.138

Promises of return and security are found in chapter 30,
but the whole chapter is very questionable. Lofthouse accepts
it as basically genuine.139 Welch rejects 12-17.140 Peake,
after a careful consideration of critical opinion, rejects the
whole chapter,141 and we are inclined to agree with him. If it
is accepted, it paints a picture of Judah and Israel returned,
living in freedom, security, and prosperity.

Chapter 31, outside the two passages discussed above, is
largely concerned with the future. The whole of this chapter
is accepted by Lofthouse as essentially Jeremianic.142 Welch
accepts all except 7-14 and 35-37.143 Peake accepts 2-6, 15-
22, and 31-34.144 Again we are impressed with the care of
Peake's analysis and are inclined to accept his opinion as cor-
rect.

2-6 is a prophecy of return for Israel. Its essential
elements are the prosperity of the vineyards and the worship of
Yahweh on Zion.

15-22 tells of the repentance of Ephraim and of his restora-
tion, but it gives no hint of the condition of the restored
community.

138 Ibid., p. 97.
139 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 213.
140 Welch, op. cit., pp. 226f.
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31-34 is the great section dealing with the New Covenant. It pictures a time when Israel and Judah shall live with the law of Yahweh written on their hearts. They shall all know the Lord, and sin will be no more. Such a state would be a complete utopia if it could ever be realized.

Chapter 33 is concerned almost entirely with pictures of restoration, but, except for 4-9, it is rejected by Peake, and by Welch and Lofthouse without reservation.

We see from this review that any statement in regard to Jeremiah's thought concerning the future rests on very questionable passages, but we are probably justified in saying that he thought of peace in the future as resting upon a return to Yahweh under the New Covenant and that this peace would be marked by security, righteousness, and prosperity. There seems to be no mention of Israel's relation to other nations in this future, except that Israel is to be free politically. It is primarily the picture of a well-ordered commonwealth enjoying the blessing of Yahweh.

V. Ezekiel 1-24

Having discussed in our introduction the critical basis for including Ezekiel 1-24 in a study of pre-exilic prophets, we turn our attention first to those passages in which our prophet, who, from our point of view, was a contemporary of

146 Welch, op. cit., p. 231; and Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 176; also see supra, p. 69.
147 Supra, p. vii.
Jeremiah in Jerusalem, uses the word shālōm. The first use of this term occurs in 7:25. This verse occurs in the last of a series of five oracles of doom upon Jerusalem. The picture of the turning over of Jerusalem to the destruction of the enemy has been given:

"Therefore I will bring in the worst of the nations, and they shall take possession of their houses; I will also silence the stronghold on which they prided themselves, and their sanctuaries shall be profaned. Panic shall come; and they shall seek peace, but in vain."

The whole context here suggests that peace is here being contrasted not only to war, but also to the general state of panic which has grown up out of the war.

The only other place where the term is used in the pre-exilic portion of our prophet is in chapter 13, where it occurs twice, in verses 10 and 16. The use of the term here is in relation to the message of the false prophets, and the phrase in which it occurs in verse 10 is parallel with that of Jeremiah 6:14, except that the latter repeats shālōm. The meaning of the term here, as we found in Jeremiah, is welfare. The false prophets have been prophesying peace, welfare, prosperity, while in reality Yahweh is about to let loose his fury upon Jerusalem. The idea of safety and security was essential to and involved in the idea of welfare. Freedom from war is, then, here implied, but it is a negative aspect of what is here essentially a positive concept.

148 Young, op. cit., p. 736.
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Thus we find that in the two instances in which we have the term šālōm used by Ezekiel, he used it with the identical thought held by his predecessors. It is used primarily to designate a state of well-being and prosperity, of which freedom from panic and from war are important, but negative, aspects of a great positive ideal.

We now turn to those passages in which we learn of the prophet's thought concerning war. Like his predecessors, Ezekiel thought of Yahweh coming to destroy Jerusalem. The pre-exilic material is practically all of this nature, and much of it pictures the destruction as coming through war. The first such passage is 4:1-3. This is an account of a symbolic prophecy of the siege of Jerusalem in which the prophet built up a miniature siege against a tracing of the city of Jerusalem which he had made on a clay brick.

The second such symbolic prophecy is reported in 4:4-17. This pictures the prophet lying on his side and eating scant rations, symbolic of the siege of Jerusalem, and eating unclean food, symbolic of the exile. Parts of this passage are open to question, verse 6 being questioned by Herrntrich 151 and verse 7 by Cornill. 152 Either of these verses can be omitted, however, without seriously affecting this account so far as it concerns our problem. The account clearly shows that Ezekiel expected Yahweh to punish Jerusalem by war and exile.

151 Herrntrich, as cited by Harford, op. cit., p. 30.
152 Cornill, as cited by Lofthouse, Ezekiel, p. 78.
5:1-4 gives us a third account of symbolic prophecy. In this passage we have the dividing of the hair into three parts, symbolizing the destruction of the people of Jerusalem by the siege, the sword, and the exile.

In the remainder of chapter 5 we have the first of a series of five prophecies consequent upon the three symbolic actions mentioned above. These verses, 5-17, have been rejected by Harnischfeger, but are accepted by those who follow the older view. If these verses are accepted, they simply reinforce the message of the symbolic prophecies, predicting the destruction of Jerusalem by famine, siege, and exile because of her sins.

6:1-10 gives us the second of the series of five prophecies mentioned above. This passage announces the destruction of the mountains and, almost incidentally, the cities of the land by war. The emphasis here is placed primarily upon the mountains, since they were the places of worship and the reason for the destruction here pronounced is the apostasy of the people. Verses 8-10 add to the threat of war that of exile, but these verses are not accepted by Harnischfeger.

The third prophecy of this series is found in 6:11-14. This passage is denied to Ezekiel by Harnischfeger, but is accepted by those who follow the more conventional view, though

153 Harnischfeger, as cited by Harford, loc. cit.
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Lofthouse does mention surprise at finding these recapitulatory passages. 157 If the passage is accepted, it is simply a recapitulation of the charge of apostasy and threat of punishment by war found in 6:1-10.

The last passage of this series which concerns us is 7:5-27. The passage is difficult, having been accepted by Herrntrich, but only as "hopelessly corrupt." 158 Verses 5-13 are especially difficult, because of the way in which they echo one another, and are held by Cooke to be a group of short oracles on the immediacy of the doom which have been inserted to preface the more detailed passage in 14-27. 159 The latter part of the oracle details the siege, the slaying with the sword of him who is in the open field, and the death of those in the city from the famine and pestilence which attend the siege. The prophecy closes with an announcement of the profaning and looting of the temple, and a description of the panic which shall prevail in the city.

Though the intervening passages are not free from threat of punishment, the next passage which sees punishment coming by war is 11:1-13. It seems that in ancient Judah, as today, a building boom was taken to indicate a feeling of prosperity and security. Ezekiel comes upon a group of twenty-five "realtors" at the city gate planning to build houses, and proceeds to predict the destruction of the city by the sword. Of this passage

157 Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 57; see also Redpath, op. cit., p. 58; and Cooke, op. cit., pp. 71ff.
158 Herrntrich, as cited by Harford, loc. cit.
159 Cooke, op. cit., p. 75.
Herntrich accepts as genuine only 1-7, 11a, and 13,160 but this makes little essential difference, since the verses that he omits only make more explicit the punishment and tell us that it is coming because they have not obeyed the statutes of Yahweh.

The first of the two prophecies predicting exile by symbolic action is recorded in 12:1-16. The prophet is commanded to dig a hole through the wall and carry out his baggage as one going into exile, as an omen that those who are saved from the sword, famine, and pestilence shall be carried into Babylon.

A second prophecy of the same nature, also accompanied by symbolic action is preserved in 12:17-20. Here we are told that the desolation, which is to come to all the inhabited cities, is the result of the lawlessness of the land. The eating of bread with quaking and the drinking of water with anxiety is symbolic of the famine and distress that will ensue upon the captivity.16

In 14:12-23 we find the pronouncement that the sin of Jerusalem is such that even though Noah, Daniel, and Job, three symbols of righteousness, were in it, it could not be saved.

Four possible methods of punishment are mentioned, sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence. In each case the result would be the same, the destruction would be complete, and only the righteous themselves would be saved.

A long allegory of Jerusalem as an unfaithful spouse is found in chapter 16. The portion of this allegory which here interests us is 35-43, for here Yahweh is pictured as bringing

160 Herntrich, as cited by Harford, loc. cit.
161 Bedpath, op. cit., pp. 54f.
punishment by war:

"I will hand you over to your lovers ...; they shall bring an assemblage of people against you, who shall stone you and slash you with their swords; and they shall burn your houses, and execute judgments upon you... ."

The allegory of the eagles and the vine, and its interpretation, is found in 17:1-24. The first eagle is the king of Babylon, who had established Zedekiah on the throne, and the second eagle is Egypt, to whom Zedekiah had appealed, an act which was certain to bring down the vengeance of Babylon. The interpretation of the allegory, which is in prose, has been regarded as secondary by Holscher, but it is more reasonable to treat the passage as a whole. The essence of the prophet's message here is that Judah must go into exile in Babylon because he has broken his covenant by appealing to Egypt. The prophet sees this not so much as the punishment of Babylon for the violation of what we would think of as a treaty, but as the punishment of Yahweh for the violation of His covenant.

As it now stands, chapter 19 contains two poems of lament for the Royal princes. The second poem, verses 10-14, is denied to Ezekiel by Holscher and, while held genuine, is placed after the exile by Cooke. Either of these views places the second poem outside our consideration. The first poem, which comes from the general period 592-1 B.C., is concerned with the fate of Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin. The mother, contrary to the

162 Cooke, op. cit., pp. 181f.
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general view, is Judah personified.\textsuperscript{165} While it is true that Jehoahaz was led to Egypt as a result of the clamor of the nations against him, and that Jehoiachin was led to Babylon under the same circumstances, the wars are simply referred to as historic facts in the poem, and there is nothing to tell us how the prophet regarded them. What does interest us here is that in the case of both princes the prophet lauds them because

"He learned to catch the prey, mankind he devoured."

In the case of the second, this is expanded to

"He ravaged their palaces, and their cities he laid waste; The land was awed and all who were in it, at the sound of his roaring."

It is clear that rather than condemning war, our prophet is here lauding the princes for their aptitude in the art.

While most probably written as separate oracles, 20:45-21:32 is concerned with the same subject, fire and sword, and may best be considered as a unit. The passage opens, 20:45-48, with a prose account of a divine command given to Ezekiel to face the south and to prophecy destruction by fire against the forest land of the south. The prophet complains that already he is spoken of as a "maker of allegories." In answer to this complaint, the prophet is told, 21:1-7, to prophesy against Jerusalem to the effect that Yahweh has unsheathed his sword against all flesh from south to north. This is followed by the "Song of the Sword," 21:8-17, a moving poetic outburst in which

\textsuperscript{165} Loc. cit.
the prophet pictures something of the havoc which the sword will make. The next passage, 21:18-27, identifies this sword with the sword of the king of Babylon, and tells of the capture of Jerusalem because of "your flagrant transgressions." This is followed by a passage in which the same sword is unsheathed against the Ammonites, 21:28-32, but this passage, while it may be from Ezekiel, is best taken as coming from after the fall of Jerusalem.166

Another allegory is found in chapter 23, where Samaria and Jerusalem are represented as two adulterous sisters. The passage of this allegory which interests us is 22-27, because in it six different nations are pictured as coming against Jerusalem in war because of the political coquetry in which she has indulged.

It is most interesting to note the reaction of the prophet on the day that the Babylonians invested Jerusalem. This record is contained for us in 24:1-14. On that day Yahweh gave to the prophet an allegory in which Jerusalem was compared to a filthy pot which could not be cleansed. Therefore Yahweh is now going to expend his fury upon Jerusalem, and will not relent until it is punished in accordance with its ways. Ezekiel, judging from this passage, must have thought of the invasion as the wrathful, but justified, punishment of Yahweh.

This review has shown us that there is for Ezekiel no questioning of the moral rectitude of the punishment which Babylon

166 Cooke, op. cit., p. 226. Note that Lofthouse, op. cit., p. 185, who cites Davidson and Kraetzschmar as favoring a date after 586 B.C. for this section, rejects this position and dates it with the rest of the chapter.
is bringing upon Judah such as we found in Zephaniah. Like Jeremiah, he thinks of war as the just punishment which Yahweh is bringing upon Judah and Jerusalem for its apostasy and its "harlotry." We find that, far from making any condemnation of war, in one place he actually commends two princes for their aptitude and skill in war. This is something that we have found in no other prophet, though the attitude toward war which it reveals is not so far removed from that which Jeremiah revealed when he prayed for Yahweh to punish his personal enemies by war. Ezekiel frequently referred to the sword, famine, and pestilence in the same passage, suggesting that war is for him in the same category as these other disasters which we of today think of as natural evils. All three were for Ezekiel methods by which Yahweh might violate, for punitive reasons, peace, which was for him equivalent to well-being.

We have two passages in which Ezekiel protests military alliances with foreign powers. The first of these is found in 17:1-24. In this passage Ezekiel protests the move to break the covenant under which Babylon had established Zedekiah by sending "Ambassadors to Egypt, asking for horses and a strong army." As we have already noted, this protest is based largely on a religious, rather than a political, basis. It is not so much the breaking of the covenant with Babylon, or the sending to Egypt that is protested, as such, but it is that this act involves the

167 Supra, p. 66.
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breaking of the covenant made with Yahweh. 169

The second passage which protests political alliances is found in 23:1-27. This passage, which is the allegory of the two adulterous sisters, brings to our mind the allegory of chapter 16, 170 but the seductions in that passage were religious in nature, while here her ruin is definitely linked with political alliances. 171 Intrigues with Assyria, Chaldea, and Egypt are all mentioned, and as a result of these intrigues six nations are pictured as coming against Jerusalem with military forces.

It seems clear from these passages that Ezekiel's protest of foreign alliances is not based upon any "isolationist" political philosophy, but that he sees the whole situation in a religious light. Israel's one hope of peace lies in being the true lover of Yahweh. After Babylon has been made Yahweh's punitive agent, and the vassalage of the nation had been sanctified by covenant, the breaking of that covenant incurred the wrath of Yahweh. This is substantially the same view which we found in Hosea, 172 Isaiah, 173 and Jeremiah. 174 National peace for the prophets is a blessing bestowed upon the nation by Yahweh, and will be removed by Him for punitive purposes, therefore peace can be maintained only by a policy of complete trust in Him and by righteous living.

169 Ibid., p. 104.
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172 Supra, pp. 21f.
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CHAPTER IV. PROPHETIC IDEAS OF PEACE

The pre-exilic prophetic thought concerning peace can be gathered around three great central ideas. The first of these is peace as a state of well-being, giving the broadest possible interpretation to this term. Thus this state of well-being involves the wholeness of the individual or the community, harmony in communal relationships, blessing, prosperity, and security. This, we discovered, was the essential meaning of the term נָדַעַם.¹

We discovered when examining נָדַעַם that this well-being might be personal, as indicating a state of physical health,² or a state of personal blessedness and prosperity.³ The term, however, is rarely used in this sense by our pre-exilic prophets. In no case have we found it used to indicate personal health. The first use of it to indicate personal prosperity and blessedness was found in Micah, when he puts the term into the mouth of the false prophets.⁴ Micah also used it in a personal sense to designate a harmonious relationship between the individual and the community.⁵ The only other prophet to use peace in this sense is Jeremiah, where he tells the exiles that their welfare is bound up with the welfare of the land of their exile.⁶

¹ Supra, pp. 1f.
² Ibid., p. 2.
³ Ibid., p. 3.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 52f.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 54f.
⁶ Ibid., p. 70.
The fact that we have little reference to peace in the personal sense among the prophets is exactly what we should expect when we recall that the prophets were primarily concerned with the community and the nation. They were religious leaders, and religion was communal and national rather than individual in the pre-exilic period, no hint of individualism appearing until the great Jeremiah. This fact would also lead us to expect to find a great deal in their thought about peace as the well-being of the community, and such is the case.

This is most apparent in their use of the term shalom. Without exception we find that the prophets who use this term use it primarily to express the well-being of the community, city, or state.7 Throughout prophetic thought the essential elements of this state of communal well-being were material prosperity, security, and freedom from war.

The same view of peace is disclosed in the prophetic oracles which deal with war. War for the prophets, we have discovered, was in the same class as famine and pestilence. It is an instrument which God uses to punish a people, and it is punitive because it interrupts the blessings of national well-being.8

Perhaps the passages which best reveal the importance which the idea of peace as national well-being had in prophetic thought are the messianic passages. Thus in our first glimpse of the messianic ideal, in Hosea, we found that his ideal concept of peace was that of a state of well-being in which

---

7 Ibid., pp. 29f., 55, 74.
8 Ibid., pp. 11f., 14, 18, 41f., 56.
prosperity was not marred even by beasts of prey, nor was it broken by war, and it was characterized by a sense of security which prevailed through the land. The same ideas mark the pictures of the ideal future given to us by Isaiah and Micah. Zephaniah's picture of the future is essentially one of security and well-being. We find the same emphasis in Jeremiah, who, in more somber tones, pictures the future as marked by security, righteousness, and prosperity.

The emphasis upon security as a part of peace as well-being is held by Pedersen to be a peculiar emphasis of the prophets. In our study of the meaning of shalom we found that it contained the idea of security, but that in old Israel this was limited to mutual security within the community and to victory over one's enemies. In the prophets, however, we find only one instance where security is based upon military victory. In Jeremiah we once found war as horror contrasted to peace as security. The emphasis which the prophets make, especially in the messianic passages, is not on victory, but on quiet development. Perhaps the outstanding statement of this is in Jeremiah's pronouncement of the New Covenant, where he pictures the people living with the law of Yahweh written on

9 Ibid., p. 25.
10 Loc. cit.
11 Supra, p. 59.
12 Ibid., p. 62.
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14 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 321.
15 Supra, p. 4.
16 Ibid., p. 72.
17 Ibid., p. 73.
their hearts, and sin being a thing of the past. This emphasis upon security is one of the major contributions which the prophets make to the thought of peace.

This leads us rather naturally to the second idea around which the prophetic thought concerning peace centered, namely, peace as the absence of war. Any consideration of this aspect of prophetic thought must be prefaced with the warning that we have seen that none of the prophets question war itself. All of them recognize it as a fitting method for the visitation of divine wrath. The greatest contrast between the prophets on their attitude toward war is probably between Nahum and Habakkuk. Nahum represents the old nationalistic school which rejoices in the idea that Yahweh is making Judah's cause His cause and is punishing the tyrant. On the other hand is Habakkuk, who goes so far as to question the moral rectitude of a particular war, though any attempt to generalize from this fact would be fallacious. Even considering Habakkuk's great advance, we must, to be true to the facts, say that none of the prophets question the moral rectitude of war itself.

Yet, on the other hand, to be true to the facts we must also remember that in only two instances do the prophets give their explicit approval to war. Jeremiah once prayed for war against his enemies, and Ezekiel once lauded the military

---
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prowess of two princes. 22 Perhaps Isaiah's theory of the inviolability of Jerusalem 23 should be regarded as a tacit approval of resistance to the siege, but over against this we have his distrust of military resources and of foreign alliances. 24

We have recognized what we have called a nascent pacifism in the prophetic protest against trust in military power. We found such a protest made by Amos,25 Hosea,26 and Isaiah.27 Yet we must always remember that this protest was based in the prophetic belief that war was sent of Yahweh, and that military resistance was futile against His divine will. Peace could come only through righteous living in accordance with Yahweh's will, and through full faith in Him. This is quite different from the basis of modern pacifism.

Throughout we have referred to the prophetic protest against foreign alliances as an "isolationist policy." Foreign alliances were opposed by Hosea,28 Isaiah,29 Jeremiah,30 and Ezekiel.31 Yet, as we have constantly pointed out, in these passages the prophets differ from the modern "isolationist," in that their theory was not primarily political but religious. Foreign alliances are in the main opposed because they represent distrust in the ability of Yahweh to protect His people

22 Ibid., pp. 104f.
23 Ibid., p. 45.
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and because they are futile if Yahweh has decided to punish His people. Yet we suspect that keen political as well as religious insight prompted Isaiah to protest Ahaz's appeal to Assyria and Jeremiah to protest Zedekiah's appeal to Egypt. Nevertheless, the prophets were primarily religious leaders, and only secondarily statesmen.

Worthy of special mention is Jeremiah's advocacy of desertion to Babylon during the siege. If this incident stood by itself, Jeremiah could rightly be classed as a conscientious objector, but, as we have seen, this is a misrepresentation of our prophet. He advocated desertion only because the besiegers were Yahweh's agents, and it was therefore futile to resist them.

Perhaps the greatest emphasis on peace as the absence of war is found in the messianic passages, but we are going to leave these passages for later consideration, confining ourselves here to the prophets' thought concerning the world in which they lived rather than including the ideal world of which they dreamed. As we have said over and over again in our survey of the prophetic material, so far as their own age was concerned, the prophets looked upon war as the punishment sent by Yahweh. It was an interruption of the peace of well-being, and could be avoided by faithful allegiance to Yahweh and His will.

The third great idea around which prophetic thought centered was that of peace as a spiritual quality. The most
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obvious use of peace in this connection was its use to designate a covenant relationship with God.33 This usage, though fundamental in shalom, finds expression only once in the prophets, it being used in this sense by Isaiah.34 Closely related to this usage was Ezekiel's protest against seeking an alliance with Egypt because it was a violation of a covenant made with Yahweh, the breaking of which would incur His punishment.35

The spiritual quality of peace in prophetic thought is seen in the way in which they thought of all war and all peace as directly from Yahweh. We have continuously pointed out in this study that for the prophets war comes as Yahweh's punishment, the invading nations being but tools in His hands, and that peace is likewise for them a blessing which Yahweh grants when the nation faithfully follows Him.

The two great spiritual concepts around which prophetic thought of peace gathered were the Day of Yahweh and the messianic hope. The popular notion of the Day of Yahweh was that of a day on which Yahweh would bring peace to Israel by destroying her enemies. Nahum makes no mention of the Day of Yahweh, but his belief that Yahweh is bringing peace to Judah by destroying Assyria by war seems to be an expression of this old popular notion that the Day of Yahweh is to be one of peace because of the intervention of Yahweh against Israel's enemies.36 With the exception of Nahum, we find the prophets all follow Amos:

33 Ibid., p. 5.
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who repudiated this concept of the Day of Yahweh and made it the day of the visitation of divine wrath upon Israel for her sins. This new concept of the Day of Yahweh deepened the spiritual significance of peace. For the prophets peace no longer depended upon Yahweh intervening on behalf of His people, but depended upon His people living a life of such moral and spiritual qualities that they were worthy of the blessing of peace.

The great spiritual ideal which developed with the pre-exilic prophets was that of an ideal messianic state which was some time to be established. Peace was to be one of its basic characteristics.

Peace as absence of war found a very important place in the messianic ideal. Thus Hosea pictures this age as one in which swords are broken and war is unknown. Isaiah makes fundamental the idea of the Messiah as the Prince of Peace, and pictures the messianic age as one in which war implements are converted into implements of cultivation, the political peace being maintained by divine arbitration. In the passages preserved in Micah peace in this age is in one instance maintained by armaments, and in another conditional upon the destruction of armaments, but we found it impossible to attribute, with any degree of confidence, either of these passages to our pre-exilic prophet. Freedom from war was essential to the picture
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of the future painted by Zephaniah.\(^1\) Jeremiah, the last of the pre-exilic prophets to envision an ideal future, makes no definite statement concerning the absence of war in that future, but war is entirely incompatible with his picture of a well ordered commonwealth living under the New Covenant.\(^2\)

But the idea of peace in the ideal future was much larger than simply freedom from war. As we have already seen, under our discussion of peace as centered around the idea of well-being, the peace of the messianic future was the fullness of Yahweh's blessing, special stress being laid upon righteousness, security, and prosperity.\(^3\)

These three great ideas are not mutually exclusive, but are best thought of as three great foci around which prophetic thought concerning peace concentrated. The fundamental contributions of the prophets to peace were their stress on the element of security in peace as well-being, to show that peace as freedom from war was dependent upon right relationships to Yahweh, and to introduce the great spiritual ideal of messianic peace.

---

41 Ibid., p. 62.
42 Ibid., p. 98.
43 Ibid., pp. 110f.
The term shalom, which is the late Hebrew word usually translated as peace, comes from a root meaning to be complete. This same root in cognate languages found expression in words meaning be complete, peaceful, safe, secure, welfare, reward, submission, and peace. In Hebrew usage shalom expressed wholeness, harmony, welfare (including blessing), security, and covenant relationship.

The word shalom was not used by Amos. We found that the key to his thought lay in his inversion of the popular concept of the Day of Yahweh. Amos was primarily concerned with war as the punishment which Yahweh was about to bring upon His own land, but foreign nations did not escape Amos' pronouncements. Because war was instigated by Yahweh as punishment, it was futile to place confidence in the ordinary methods of military defense. For Amos peace was primarily a blessing which could be obtained only by exercising social justice within the nation, and thus reestablishing a proper relationship with Yahweh.

Hosea, who likewise did not use shalom, followed Amos in thinking of war as the method by which Yahweh would bring his judgment on Israel. Hosea went beyond Amos in that he concerned himself with the foreign policy of the nation and opposed all foreign alliances, on the basis that they showed a lack of confidence in Yahweh. Like Amos, he saw that armed resistance was futile against Yahweh's judgment. If Hosea was the author of the messianic passages found in his book, and we believe that he
was, he thought of peace in that ideal state as coming through disarmament and through trust in Yahweh. This peace included not only freedom from war, but also prosperity and security.

The first of the prophets to use shalom was Isaiah, who shows by his use of the term that for him peace meant not only the absence of war, but blessing and prosperity, including fertility, social justice, and security. Like Hosea, Isaiah was very much concerned about the policy which the king was pursuing. He opposed foreign alliances, and, holding that war was Yahweh’s method of punishing both Judah and foreign nations, maintained that armed resistance to war was futile. Yet he preached the inviolability of Jerusalem when the foe was at the gates of the city, because he did not think that Yahweh would let His house be defiled. Isaiah’s thought about the future centered around two ideas, the Day of Yahweh, and the messianic era. He interpreted the former in the same way as did Amos, it was to be a day on which Yahweh would inflict punishment upon His people by war. In the messianic passages, however, the outlook is quite different, with the advent of the messianic king war would be replaced with an ideal peace, which included political peace based on divine arbitration, prosperity, social justice, and security.

Micah used the term shalom in the same sense in which Isaiah used it, and in addition, once used it to indicate a state of harmony between the individual and the community. War for Micah was an interruption of the blessing of peace, and would be used by Yahweh to punish His people. If the messianic
passages of the book belong to Micah, which is doubtful, he added nothing to Isaiah's thought of peace in the messianic era, but did stress the element of security in that peace.

We find the prophet Zephaniah reminding us very much of Amos, with his emphasis upon the Day of Yahweh and war as Yahweh's judgment upon Judah. As with Amos, the foreign nations were also to be victims of the divine wrath. Unlike Amos, he gives us a picture of peace in the future, though this picture falls short of the great pictures given to us by Isaiah. It is a picture of a poor and humble people who seek refuge in the name of the Lord and dwell in security.

Nahum is best regarded as one of the prophet patriots who had reverted to the national Yahweism which preceded the eighth century prophetic movement. He saw Yahweh use war to destroy the enemies of Israel, and rejoiced in it.

There are two possible interpretations of Habakkuk. If the oppressors of Judah are an external foe, then Habakkuk sees the Chaldeans being raised up to punish the Assyrians, and is practically on the same level as Nahum in his reactions. If, as seems more probable to us, the oppressors are within the nation, then Habakkuk first protests Yahweh's disregard of evil and then protests the method of punishment, for he can see nothing just about the use of an unrighteous nation to punish a more righteous one. If this be the correct view, then Habakkuk reaches the greatest height of all the prophets, for he is the only one to question the moral rectitude of war. It is, however, a particular war, and not war in general, that he
questions.

Jeremiah, who used shalōm more than any other prophet, used it primarily to designate a blessing of well-being and prosperity for the community, placing special emphasis upon the idea of security. Living in especially crucial times, he was greatly concerned about state policy. He saw both the Scythians and the Chaldeans as Yahweh's instrument to punish both Judah and the nations. He was opposed to foreign alliances, on the ground that they would bring the wrath of Yahweh and war rather than peace. At the time of the siege he saw that it was futile to resist Yahweh's agents of punishment, and held that safety lay in deserting to the enemy. Our knowledge of his thought concerning the future rests primarily on questionable passages, but it seems probable that for him the peace of the future was to be one of security, righteousness, and prosperity.

Like his predecessors, Ezekiel used shalōm to designate a state of well-being and prosperity. For this prophet war was the just punishment inflicted upon Judah by Yahweh. It is for him in the same category as famine and pestilence, all being methods by which Yahweh might, for punitive reasons, violate the peace of well-being. Foreign alliances are opposed on the grounds that they violate the true love relationship which ought to exist between Yahweh and Judah.

Pre-exilic prophetic thought concerning peace centered around three great ideas: peace as the well-being of the community, peace as absence of war, and peace as a spiritual quality. These ideas are not mutually exclusive, but are three
foci around which prophetic thought concerning peace shaped itself. The fundamental contributions of the prophets to peace were to stress the element of security in peace as well-being, to show that peace as freedom from war was dependent upon right relationships with Yahweh, and to introduce the great spiritual ideal of messianic peace.
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