

## **YHWH AS GOD OF WAR AND GOD OF PEACE**

### Introduction

Whether we want to acknowledge it or not, the Church is at war, fighting not only external enemies but a civil war as well. She is, after all, the Church Militant, not the “Church Pacifist” that avoids engagement with enemies or believes those who cry, “Peace, peace” where there is no peace. Spiritual warfare with outside enemies will be her lot until Christ returns. But does she need be torn apart by her own children?

Can we learn anything from Scripture that explains this conflict? Are there lessons to be learned by the 21<sup>st</sup> century Church about her warfare from the warfare narratives of the Old Testament? How can we understand God as both warrior and granter of peace? What, as the theme of this Exegetical Symposium suggests, are the “echoes of Scripture in the life of the Church”?

Finding a biblical, theological response begins with several probes into the literature. First, we must tend to the dry, academic requirement of surveying scholarly opinion. Second, and this comes as no surprise to those who know me, an examination of the books of Chronicles is helpful for developing a theology of warfare; thus, an equally dry review of Chronicles is important. These I will attempt to make as painless as possible. Third, I will examine warfare narratives as they relate to the institutions of Davidic kingship, prophets, Temple and divine call to repentance as four lessons for the Church. Finally, I will attempt to bring into focus the bigger picture of symmetry and patterns. Along the way, I will also point to the implications of YHWH as God of peace and God of war as they relate to the life of Church and her conflict.

I. An Overview of the State of the Question in Scholarship

*The Contribution of Gerhard von Rad*

Scholarly inquiry into Old Testament warfare has been dominated since the mid-twentieth century by Gerhard von Rad's *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*.<sup>1</sup> However, neither von Rad's reconstruction of the Israelite concept of holy war as the product of late theological reinterpretation or his use of the term "holy war" were original with him.<sup>2</sup> Nor has the name "holy war," associated with von Rad's work, found universal acceptance;<sup>3</sup> nevertheless, I will use the term since it has become a technical term for the phenomenon described by von Rad.

Von Rad theorized that holy war narratives in the Hebrew Bible were a late rereading of history with several stages of development,<sup>4</sup> that they were connected to a

---

<sup>1</sup>Gerhard von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).

<sup>2</sup> Patrick D. Miller, Jr. (*The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, HSM 5 [Cambridge: Harvard, 1973] 2) acknowledges, "Among those works of the last three decades which have been seminal and influential in Old Testament studies, Gerhard von Rad's small monograph *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* occupies a place of first rank."

<sup>3</sup> Some scholars have argued in favor of the term "Yahweh War" rather than "Holy war" since the former is a biblical term while the latter is drawn from Greek usage. Gwilym H. Jones, "'Holy War' or 'Yahweh War?'," *VT* 25 (1965) 654-8; Rudolph Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation* (New York: Abingdon, 1970) 36-7; Manfred Weippert, "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien: Kritische Anmerkungen zu Gerhard von Rads Konzept des 'Heiligen Krieges im alten Israel,'" *ZAW* 84 (1972) 460-93; Fritz Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Krieg. Kriegstheorien und Kriegserfahrungen im Glaube des alten Israels* (ATANT 69. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972).

<sup>4</sup> First, in the period of the Judges, holy war was connected to a tribal confederation and understood as a synergism (that is, joint fighting) of Israel's army and God (*Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* 18). Later, in the post-Solomonic period, holy war became a monergistic (that is, God fighting alone) battle of YHWH against the enemy. Von Rad studied four texts (Josh 7--Joshua at Jericho; Judg 7--Gideon and the Midianites; Ex 14--the Reed Sea; 1 Sam 17--David and Goliath) in detail to reach the conclusion that the idea of Yahweh fighting unaided by and on behalf of Israel was a post-Solomonic reinterpretation of history. Finally, at the time of the eighth-century, Isaiah used holy war theory when he applied the post-Solomonic interpretation of holy war as miracle and insisted on strict reliance upon YHWH's divine intervention rather than foreign alliances. Isaiah encouraged Ahaz, during the Syro-Ephraimite War (Is 7-8), and later Hezekiah (Is 30f.), to rely on Yahweh's miraculous intervention (*Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* 56f).

tribal confederacy and that they were primarily defensive in nature. Von Rad's theory that holy war was essentially a literary phenomenon is best illustrated by his twelve holy war characteristics, which he referred to as "Die Theorie vom heiligen Krieg".<sup>5</sup>

### *Scholarship since Von Rad*

Von Rad's theory has formed the primary point of departure for subsequent scholarship. Although not completely separate, two schools of thought emerge. First, there are scholars who, like von Rad, understand holy war as non-historical spiritualizations (Manfred Weippert,<sup>6</sup> Peter Craigie,<sup>7</sup> Kang<sup>8</sup> and the Albright-Cross

---

<sup>5</sup> Von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* 6-14.

1. The blowing of a trumpet as the announcement of the holy war (Judg 3:27; 6:34f; 1 Sam 13:3)
2. The naming of the army as the "people of YHWH" (Judg 5:11,13; 20:2).
3. The sanctification of the participants (Josh 3:5; 1 Sam 14:24; 21:6; 2 Sam;1:21; 11:11f.; Num 21:2; Judg 11:36; Deut 23:10-15).
4. The sacrificing of an offering and/or the consultation of YHWH (Judg 20:23,26,27; 1 Sam 7:9; 13:9f,12; 11:4;14:8f; 30:4; 2 Sam 5:19,23).
5. The announcement of victory by YHWH, "I have given...into your hand" or similar phraseology (Josh 2:24; 6:2,16; 8:1,18; 10:8,19;Judg 3:28; 4:7,14; 7:9,15; 18:10; 20:28; 1 Sam 14:12; 17:46; 23:4; 24:5; 26:8; 1 Kgs 20:28).
6. The announcement that YHWH goes out before the army (Judg 4:14; Deut 20:4; 2 Sam 5:24; Josh 3:11).
7. The claiming of the war as "YHWH's war" and the enemy as "YHWH's enemy" (Exod 14:4,14,18; Deut 1:30; Josh 10:14,42; 11:6; 23:10; Judg 20:35; 1 Sam 14:23).
8. The encouragement not to fear because the enemy will lose courage (Exod 14:13; Deut 20:3; Josh 8:1; 10:8,25; 11:6; Judg 7:3; 1 Sam 23:16; 30:6; 2 Sam 10:12).
9. The fear of YHWH among enemy troops (Exod 15:14-16; 23:27f; Lev 26:36; Deut 2:25; 11:25; Josh 2:9,24; 5:1; 7:5; 10:2; 11:20; 24:12; 1 Sam 4:7f.; 17:11; 28:5).
10. The war-shout (Judg 7:20; Josh 6:5; 1 Sam 17:20,52).
11. The practice of the "ban", the slaughter of all enemy men, women and children (Exod 23:27; Deut 7:23; Josh 10:10,11; 24:7; Judg 4:15; 7:22; 1 Sam 5:11; 7:10; 14:15; 14:20).
12. The dismissal of the troops with the cry, "To your tents, O Israel" (2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kgs 12:16; 22:36).

<sup>6</sup> Manfred Weippert, "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien" 460-93. Weippert's detailed study reveals that a number of Hebrew Bible holy war phenomena are held in common with Assyrian divine war, including the Assyrian troops as the the troops of the god Ashur, the war as their god's war, the enemy as their god's enemy, the consultation with deity, and the assurance of his help. According to Weippert, these holy war elements were appropriated by Dtr after the fall of the North in 721 B.C. When the biblical writers attribute a victory to YHWH, they merely follow an established ancient near eastern tradition of attributing victory to the gods.

school represented by the work of Patrick Miller<sup>9</sup> and Duane Christensen<sup>10</sup>). There are also those who believe that there is some historical reality behind the narratives (Roland de Vaux,<sup>11</sup> Fritz Stolz,<sup>12</sup> Rudolph Smend,<sup>13</sup> Edgar Conrad,<sup>14</sup> and T.R. Hobbs<sup>15</sup>). While

---

<sup>7</sup> Peter C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 117-22.

<sup>8</sup> Sa-Moon Kang, *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East*, BZAW 177 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989). Kang approaches his study in two parts. In Part I, he examines ancient Near Eastern epic, hymnic, annalistic, and ritual texts from Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Syro-Palestine, and Egypt dated from the third millennium to the first half of the first millennium B.C. In Part II, Kang examines the motifs of YHWH war up to the time of the Davidic kingdom by applying the conclusions of Part I to specific texts in the Hebrew Bible. These texts are grouped as wars in the traditions of Exodus-Conquest, of the Judges and Saul, and of David. Kang concludes that:

In the official/canonical traditions of the Exodus-Conquest and even in those of Judges and Saul, the motifs of YHWH war are not found in the historical realities of battles, and for the first time in the rising period of the Davidic kingdom, the motifs of YHWH war began to appear in the historical battles of David.

In Kang's analysis, the "motifs of YHWH war were formulated in the Davidic kingdom in the light of those of divine war in the ancient Near East."

<sup>9</sup> Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Miller's work is primarily a study of texts dealing with the divine warrior motif found in Ugaritic, Phoenician and Israelite literature. According to Miller, ancient Israel's concept of Yahweh as "divine warrior" and his involvement in earthly warfare were derived from other ancient Near Eastern divine warrior motifs.

<sup>10</sup> Duane L. Christensen, *Transformations of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy. Studies in the Oracles Against the Nations*, HDR 3 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975). Christensen's stated purpose is to trace the historical development of the war oracle in ancient Israel from earliest times to ca . 580 B.C. Christensen makes no attempt to go beyond Jeremiah to the later oracles against the nations found in Ezekiel, Second Isaiah and the other exilic and post-exilic writers (p.15), but limits himself to examining the oracles against the nations in the two chronological extremes of Amos 1-2 (beginning) and Jeremiah 46-51 (end).

<sup>11</sup> Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1965) 1:213-266. De Vaux argued on the basis of numerous texts from the earliest strata of the Hebrew Bible through Qumran that war, like all of ancient Israel's institutions, was invested with a sacred character. It has its own particular ideology and rites and is thus unique among other wars of antiquity. Although with time the sacral character of war faded into the background, it retained its religious character.

<sup>12</sup> Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege*. Stolz criticizes both von Rad and Smend on a fundamental level by rejecting Noth's hypothesis of an early tribal confederation. In Stolz's view, any war before the time of Saul was that of an individual tribe and not of a tribal confederation. Yahweh War reached its peak in the time of Saul and by the time of the writing of the Deuteronomic history had been divorced from reality and converted to theory. Thus, Stolz differs from von Rad and Smend in his understanding of the origins of Yahweh War. Stolz also departs from von Rad by identifying Yahweh War as an offensive as well as defensive phenomenon. In fact, the pre-kingship tribal relationship with the city-states of the Canaanites and the Conquest partially forms, in Stolz's view, the crucible of Yahweh War. The second element of the origins of Yahweh War is Near Eastern mythology, a point that he does not fully develop.

<sup>13</sup> Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*. Smend has argued for a separation of amphictyony,

these scholars take different perspectives on the theme of holy war in the Hebrew Bible, their primary focus has been on the historical question of holy war as event or myth and its relationship to a tribal confederation or to Israel's neighbors.

In addition to these issues, scholars also have examined the relationship of warfare and religious faith. Numerous important contributions have been made by ethicists,<sup>16</sup> especially those from pacifist Christian traditions.<sup>17</sup> A recent volume entitled

---

a sacral-cultic institution, from holy war, a political and military institution. Smend agrees with von Rad that holy war was the result of the spiritualizing of war traditions but believes that there were early events upon which the later theological interpretations were based. He understands this to reflect an ancient tension between a "Yahweh war" tradition arising from the Rachel-tribes with a covenant tradition arising from the Leah-tribes. The origins of the former is the Exodus event (participated in by the Rachel-tribes). The latter likewise arose from an event--the covenant at Sinai, participated in by the Leah-tribes but accepted eventually by all twelve tribes.

<sup>14</sup> Edgar W. Conrad, *Fear Not Warrior. A Study of 'al tira' Pericopes in the Hebrew Scriptures*, Brown Judaic Studies 75 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1985). Closely related to the topic of holy war is Edgar Conrad's recent rhetorical analysis of the formulary "fear not" in multiple contexts. Conrad argues that the phrase arises from historical warfare, either defensive or offensive. Conrad is primarily concerned with challenging the thesis of Joachim Begrich that "fear not" is a central element of the genre "Oracle of Salvation" by broadening the data base to uses of "fear not" beyond Second Isaiah. A secondary concern is to go beyond von Rad's association of the "fear not" formula with the Israelite amphictyony. Conrad argues this point by demonstrating that the formula is pervasive throughout the Hebrew Bible and cannot be limited to pre-monarchial institutions. In this regard he follows the position of Stolz.

<sup>15</sup> T.R. Hobbs, *A Time for War. A Study of Warfare in the Old Testament*, Old Testament Studies 3 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989). Hobbs attempts to analyze and contextualize the military history of warfare in the Hebrew Bible. Hobbs carefully avoids theological questions until the final chapter "Old Testament Warfare and New Testament", focusing instead on the men, material, and art of war. For Hobbs, the warfare of the Old Testament, though subjected to later interpretations by various biblical writers, is rooted in historical reality.

<sup>16</sup> Included among these are Patrick Miller, "God the Warrior: A Problem in Biblical Interpretation and Apologetics," *Int* 19 (1965) 39-46; Waldemar Janzen, "War in the Old Testament," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 46 (1972) 155-166; Jacob J. Enz, *The Christian and Warfare: The Roots of Pacifism in the Old Testament* (Scottsdale, Penn./Kitchener, Ont: Herald, 1972); John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) and *The Original Revolution* (Scottsdale, Penn./Kitchener, Ont: Herald, 1972); Vernard Eller, *War and Peace from Genesis to Revelation* (Scottsdale, Penn./Kitchener, Ont: Herald, 1981); Craigie, *The Problem of War in the Old Testament*.

<sup>17</sup> Millard C. Lind, *Yahweh is a Warrior* (Scottsdale, PA/Kitchener, ON: Herald, 1980). Lind argues that the theology of Yahweh as warrior centers on three major emphases. First, the Exodus provides the fundamental paradigm of divine intervention through a miracle of nature rather than ordinary human warfare. The central human figure here is not a warrior but a prophetic figure (Moses). Second, the prophetic political structure of Israel rejected kingship grounded in violence with the king as representative of divinity. Third, Yahweh warred against Israel when it became like other Near Eastern states (p. 34).

*Show Them No Mercy. 4 Views on God and Canaanite Genocide*<sup>18</sup> focuses on the historicity and theological and ethical implications of the genocidal texts of the Old Testament as they relate to the New Testament and the nature of God. I recommend this book for two reasons. First, it addresses a significant issue for today's world. Second, I am not above a shameless ploy for royalties!

Other scholars have undertaken studies of Hebrew Bible holy war in the context of divine war in the ancient Near East. These studies have ranged from the northwest Semitic context (especially the Mari archive)<sup>19</sup> to Hebrew Bible holy war in its relationship to Assyrian divine war in the first millennium B.C.<sup>20</sup> to Egyptian and Greek sources<sup>21</sup> to comprehensive studies of warfare in the Hebrew Bible and its ancient Near Eastern context.<sup>22</sup>

The "state of the question" is thus one of great interest and considerable disagreement. Debates abound about whether the texts are historical or spiritualizations, about tribal confederation or individual tribes and about whether the wars were defensive or offensive.

---

<sup>18</sup> C.S. Cowles, Eugene Merrill, Daniel L. Gard and Tremper Longman, *Show Them No Mercy. 4 Views on God and Canaanite Genocide*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003).

<sup>19</sup> A.E. Glock, *Warfare in Mari and Early Israel*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1968.

<sup>20</sup> Manfred Weippert, "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien" 460-93. Seven elements of divine warfare in the literature of Israel and other nations are (1) the stars fighting from heaven--Jud 5:20-22; (2) The fire and the cloud--Ex 14:24ff, Ps 97:2-3; (3) the annihilating divine forces and confusion of the enemy--2 Sam 22:12ff; (4) Stones from heaven--Isa 30:30; (5) Thunder--1 Sam 7:10; (6) The hiding cloud--Ex 14:19-20; (7) The sun and moon standing still--Josh 10:12. See also Peter C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 117-22.

<sup>21</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, "Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *History, Historiography and Interpretation* (ed. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld) 121-47. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983.

<sup>22</sup> Sa-Moon Kang, *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East*, BZAW 177 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989).

My intention is to go beyond these questions. I simply approach these texts as historical records. But more than history, they reveal something about God to us. To get at this, we can probe the concept of YHWH as God of War and God of Peace through the final books of the Old Testament, 1 and 2 Chronicles, as a window into the close of Old Testament revelation.

## II. The Context and Theological Function of War in Chronicles

In what context did the Chronicler write? This is an important question because the Chronicler, like all inspired writers, did not write in an historical vacuum. Events of his day shaped the message he brought.

First, what is the date of the Chronicler's work? Scholars have argued for a variety of dates for the work. The *terminus a quo* is generally set in the early Persian period, as early as 515 B.C.<sup>23</sup> At the other end of the spectrum, some have dated Chronicles potentially as late as 200 B.C.<sup>24</sup> Most, however, prefer a date in the fourth century.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> J. D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purpose," *JBL* 94 (1975) 201-17; David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* (1961) 436-42.

<sup>24</sup> Peter Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellungen in den Chronikbüchern* [WMANT Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Vorlag, 1973]199-200) suggests a date between 400 and 200 B.C., although he does favor the first half of the 3rd century. Both Martin Noth (*The Chronicler's History*, tr. H.G.M. Williamson [Sheffield: JSOT, 1987] 73) and Kurt Galling (*Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemiah*. [Das Alte Testament Deutsch 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954] 14-17) argue for a date between 300 and 200 B.C.

<sup>25</sup> c. 400 B.C. W.A.L. Elmslie "The First and Second Books of Chronicles," *The Interpreter's Bible*, 3:339-548 (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1954). Jacob M. Myers, *I Chronicles*, Anchor Bible 12 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965).  
c.400-350 W.F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler" *JBL* 40 (1921) 104-24.  
c.350 Peter Ackroyd. *I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*. Torch Bible  
Richard J. Coggins. *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles*. The Cambridge

A fundamental issue for the dating of Chronicles centers on the relationship of Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah. If Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah share common authorship, then the dating of Chronicles must be similar to that of Ezra-Nehemiah. Although the common authorship of the books was assumed since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>26</sup> Sara Japhet broke that consensus<sup>27</sup> in 1968.<sup>28</sup> While Japhet's work<sup>29</sup> has been followed by a majority of other scholars (H.G.M. Williamson,<sup>30</sup> Roddy Braun<sup>31</sup> and

---

	Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976).
	Otto Eissfeldt, <i>The Old Testament: An Introduction</i> (New York: Harper and Row, 1965) with a final redaction c. 190 B.C.
c.330-250	Frank Michaeli, <i>Les livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie</i> ,
c.325-300	Wilhelm Rudolph, <i>Chronikbücher</i> , HAT 1/21 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955).
c.300	E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles</i> , International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1910).

<sup>26</sup> Leopold A. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt. Ein Beitrag zur Alterthumskunde und biblischen Kritik, zur Literatur und Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin: A. Asher, 1832). Four arguments, as outlined by Sara Japhet ("The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 [1968] 331-2.) are commonly adduced for the unity of authorship:

1. The presence of the first verses of Ezr. at the end of Chr.
2. 1 Esdras begins with 2 Chr xxxv-xxxvi and continues through Ezr.
3. The linguistic resemblance between the books as revealed by common vocabulary, syntactic phenomena and stylistic peculiarities.
4. The alleged uniformity of theological conceptions, expressed both in the material and its selection.

<sup>27</sup> Adam C. Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism* (Edinburgh-London: Blackwood, 1935) dissented as early as 1935

<sup>28</sup> Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship." Japhet's research focuses upon vocabulary and the syntactic and stylistic differences of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. Based upon categories of linguistic opposition, specific literary terms, and stylistic peculiarities, Japhet argues that Chronicles comes from a different hand than Ezra-Nehemiah. Further, she argues that the language of Chronicles represents a later example of post-exilic Hebrew than does Ezra-Nehemiah.

<sup>29</sup> Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums* 9 (Frankfurt: Peter Land, 1989). Japhet herself followed up on her earlier work with this monograph which focusing on the ideological themes of Chronicles, originally published in 1977 in Hebrew but now available in English.

<sup>30</sup> H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, *The New Century Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) and *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* includes a critical examination of the older lists of vocabulary similarities of S.R Driver (*An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8th ed. [New York: Scribner's, 1898] 535-40) and Curtis and Madsen (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* 27-36). Beyond the linguistic evidence, Williamson also argues against the unity of Chronicles and Ezra/Nehemiah on the basis of the other three arguments outlined by Japhet but not

James Newsome<sup>32</sup>), not all scholars agree. The 1988 commentary by Joseph Blenkinsopp on Ezra-Nehemiah<sup>33</sup> has challenged the growing view begun by Japhet's study.

Given the wide range of proposed dates for the Chronicler, some decision regarding the time of writing must be reached in order to place the Chronicler's treatment of warfare within his social and political context. The weight of the evidence, in my opinion, favors the older view of common authorship.<sup>34</sup> If this is the case, a late fifth-century date may be tentatively accepted.

---

addressed by her.

<sup>31</sup> Roddy L. Braun, "Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History" *VTS* 30 (1979) 52-62.

<sup>32</sup> J. D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purpose" 201-17/

<sup>33</sup> Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah. A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988). Blenkinsopp states that "author.....may stand for a plurality or school rather than an individual, that is, a group sharing the same concerns, convictions, and idiom, perhaps active over several generations" (p. 48).

<sup>34</sup> The verbal and syntactical peculiarities of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles form one piece of evidence that supports common authorship. Curtis and Madsen (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* 28-36) list 116 words, 10 prepositions, and 10 syntactical peculiarities.

A parallel indication is the common religious interests and ideology of the books (Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah. A Commentary* 51-54),<sup>34</sup> including their warfare interests. Warfare is not a major theme in the Ezra-Nehemiah work, although a form of warfare narrative does appear in Neh 3:33-4:17 (4:1-23). There, the reassurance formula "Do not fear them," *Wrytla*, appears (4:8b). While this is common in the older warfare narratives (Exod 14:13; Deut 20:3; Josh 8:1; 10:8,25; 11:6; Judg 7:3; 1 Sam 23:16; 30:6; 2 Sam 10:12), it is also used by the Chronicler (1 Chr 22:13; 28:20; 2 Chr 20:17; 32:18). Similarly, Neh 4:14 makes use of the old holy war assistance formula that God fights for his people (cf. Exod 14:14; Deut 1:30; 3:22; 20:4; Josh 10:14,42; 23:10) as does the Chronicler in the warfare texts 2 Chr 13:12, 20:29, and 32:8. The stereotypical language of warfare, found both in the earliest warfare narratives and Chronicles as well as Nehemiah, does not permit firm conclusions regarding the question of common authorship. Themes of the holy war tradition are present in Neh 3:33-4:17, themes that also appear in the Chronicler's warfare narratives. Among these are the enemies uniting against Jerusalem, prayer, a lack of relative strength on the part of Israel, a conscript army being employed, the battle leader soliciting faith and courage, a trumpet signaling the beginning of the battle, and the enemy being discouraged. In the case of the Nehemiah warfare narrative, however, no battle actually takes place since the enemy is discouraged (Neh 4:9). The thematic evidence of Nehemiah's warfare narrative is inconclusive for or against common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah and the subsequent implications for the dating of Chronicles.

Additionally, Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are connected canonically to each another by the presence of the first verses of Ezra at the end of Chronicles.

The Davidic genealogy of 1 Chr 3:17-24 lists six generations after Zerubbabel (Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* X; Myers, *I Chronicles* LXXXIX; Curtis and Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* 5-6; Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler" 108-12; Williamson, *Israel in the*

That dating is significant because it tells us something about the Chronicler's context. Except for the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, little is known about the society and politics of post-exilic Judah. However, these sources speak more to the first century of Persian rule (538-438 B.C.) than to the late fifth-century. Nevertheless, we do know something of the time. We know the power of Persia<sup>35</sup> was in question and that Judah functioned as a semiautonomous commonwealth<sup>36</sup> that minted coins and levied taxes.<sup>37</sup> We know that internally, different groups contended for power, including the heads of ancestral houses or elders (e.g. Ezra 10:8), governors appointed by the king, and aristocrats or nobility (e.g. Neh 5:7). The Temple was especially contested since both the *golah* (or "returnees")<sup>38</sup> and the "people of the land"<sup>39</sup> had vested interests in the cult.<sup>40</sup>

---

*Books of Chronicles* 83) and the list of post-exilic high priests of Neh 12:10-11,22 (Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler" 112-2) provides a similar termination at slightly before 400 B.C.

<sup>35</sup> Under Darius II Nothus (423-404 B.C.), the Peloponnesian War, interrupted by the Peace of Nicias from 421-414 B.C., was brought to an end by the defeat of Athens in 404 B.C. But under Artaxerxes II Mnemon (404-358 B.C.), successor to Darius II, Egypt successfully rebelled against Persia (401 B.C.). The Elephantine community expressed allegiance to Artaxerxes at least through 402, indicating that the Egyptian rebellion did not take place immediately after the death of Darius II (John Bright, *A History of Israel* [3rd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981] 407). Other western satraps rebelled, even issuing their own coinage. Only a revolt within independent Egypt (ca. 360) forced Pharaoh Tachos to abandon his alliance with the rebelling satraps, thus postponing the inevitable disintegration of the Persian Empire.

<sup>36</sup>Blenkinsopp (*Ezra-Nehemiah. A Commentary* 51) states that politically the government of Judah in the Persian context "was superimposed on a social organization based on tribe and phratry."

<sup>37</sup> The coins of the era bear the inscription *Yehud* and seal impressions stamped on jar handles or walls, presumably used for taxation, have the words *Yehud* or *Yerushalem* (Bright, *A History of Israel* 410)

<sup>38</sup> This is attested in the *golah* lists of Ezra 2 and Neh 7, although the meaning and origin of the list has been contested. Opinions vary from (1) census list from the time of Nehemiah (W.F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra* [New York: Harper and Row, 1965] 110; Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah. A Commentary* 83); (2) a fictitious list (Charles C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1910] 250); (3) an authentic list of returnees reflecting official lists from 539-515 B.C. (Wilhelm Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia samt 3. Esra* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949] 17); (4) a tax list compiled by the Persians (G. Hölscher, *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia* . [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1923] 504); (5) Kurt Galling ("The Gola-List According to Ezra 2/Nehemiah 7" *JBL* 70 [1951] 153-4) sees this list as a legitimation list in connection with the rebuilding of the Temple and as such a register of the religious community which comprises the members of the amphictyonic **lhq**, headed by the twelve men leading the lists.

The Hebrew version of the edict of Cyrus (Ezra 1:2-4) specifically gives authority and responsibility for building the Temple to the returnees. Zerubbabel, in fact, declines the offer of the adversaries to help rebuild the Temple on this basis (Ezra 4:3). S. Talmon ("The Sectarian **dxv**- A Biblical Noun" *VT* 3 [1953]

It is in this context of political, social and religious uncertainty, so far removed from the time of David and Solomon, that the Chronicler wrote his narratives, including the warfare narratives, thereby shaping his prophetic presentation of a once glorious past. This is not unlike retelling the Missouri Synod's legendary past by exalting a former golden age to illustrate the present age.

With this context in mind, we can read the warfare narratives of Chronicles as carefully balanced and theologically loaded texts. For the Chronicler, the telling of history is far from a recitation of facts. It is a living lesson to his contemporaries. The warfare narratives in Chr thus can be understood as illustrations of the Chronicler's theological principles. For the Chronicler, the relationship between YHWH and Israel is a permanent one that is embodied in divinely mandated institutions. Warfare, whether in its absence, victory or defeat is the measure of Israel's fidelity to its God through these institutions.

---

133-140) has shown that the term **dx** is synonymous with **lhq**.

<sup>39</sup> The term **#rah** [occurs some 70 times in the Hebrew Bible with various meanings. It and its cognate **trah y** [are used in Ezra (e.g. Ezra 4:4) to designate those not part of the golah and who thus opposed the building of the Temple.

<sup>40</sup> The opposition appears to have included some within the returning exiles (Ezra 4:1), descendants of those settled by Esarhaddon in Palestine (Ezra 4:2), the "people of the land" (Ezra 4:4) and neighboring governors (Neh 3:33-4:17). The Samaritans certainly also were among the opposition. It is difficult to fix a date for the final break between the Jews and Samaritans, although a late second-century B.C. date has been proposed (J.D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1968] 80; R.J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1975] 148-55). The seeds of the eventual final separation were certainly present in the Chronicler's own day. That separation was both ethnic and cultic. That the Samaritans eventually built a Temple on Mt. Gerizim is established; the date of its beginning is not. Josephus (*Ant . XI, 7f.*) reports that the Mt. Gerizim Temple was built by Sanballat after his banishment from Jerusalem (Neh 13:28) but dates this event a century later to the time of Alexander the Great. If Josephus has confused Sanballat with Sanballat II (early fourth-century B.C.), it is possible that the Mt. Gerizim Temple was underway before Alexander (Bright, *A History of Israel* 410). At the least, the idea of a Samaritan Temple would likely have been present at the time of the Chronicler, even if construction had not yet begun. Non-Jerusalem Temples existed elsewhere, as the evidence of Elephantine with its highly syncretistic cult indicates (W.F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* [5th ed; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969] 162-8.).

Clearly the Chronicler is cognizant of and draws upon older holy war traditions.<sup>41</sup> He uses Samuel/Kings as a basic text and supplements that with other canonical texts (referred to as “synoptic texts”). Just as important theologically is the Chronicler’s omission of certain texts of Samuel/Kings. In still other cases, he draws narratives from non-canonical texts no longer extant (referred to as “non-synoptic” texts). Both the synoptic and non-synoptic warfare narratives reflect the ancient war rules of Israel,<sup>42</sup> now presented as theological lessons. Both the monergistic model of holy war (that is, YHWH alone fights the battle) and the synergistic model (that is, YHWH and humans fighting together) are present in his accounts.<sup>43</sup> By drawing on older holy war narratives,

---

<sup>41</sup> That the Chronicler is directly dependent upon the old holy war tradition can be seen in the correspondence of von Rad's twelve characteristics of the old holy war tradition to the Chronicler's non-synoptic warfare narratives. Several observations can be made:

1. The heaviest concentration of holy war themes is found in the three non-synoptic warfare narrative of 2 Chr 13 (Abijah), 2 Chr 14 (Asa) and 2 Chr 20 (Jehoshaphat).
2. Five characteristics (#2,3,6,7,11) appear in all three non-synoptic narratives.
3. Three characteristics (#5,9,12) appear in two non-synoptic narratives.
4. Four characteristics (#1,4,8,10) appear in one non-synoptic narrative.

The Chronicler is dependent upon the traditions of holy war in the non-synoptic warfare narratives of 2 Chr 13, 14 and 20. That there is a heavier concentration of holy war themes in these chapters is to be expected since they are his most extensive treatment of war.

In the synoptic warfare narratives, the Chronicler continues the elements of holy war as found in his *Vorlage* (especially David's war against the Philistines 2 Chr 14:8-17//2 Sam 5:17-25). Additionally, he adds holy war elements in two of the synoptic texts (Hezekiah and Amaziah).

<sup>42</sup> Here, reference can be made to the Deuteronomic laws concerning war which are, according to von Rad (Gerhard von Rad, "Deuteronomy and the Holy War," *Studies in Deuteronomy* [tr. David Stalker; London: SCM, 1953] 50-1):

1. laws concerning war, 20:1-9
2. investment of cities, 20:10-18
3. female prisoners of war, 21:10-14
4. the law concerning the camp, 23:10-14
5. exemption for the newly married, 24:5
6. the law concerning Amalek, 25:17-19.

<sup>43</sup> The synergistic model is rooted in ancient texts. These include:

the Chronicler constructs a theological system applicable to his own day. No matter how

---

For YHWH your God is he that goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to give you the victory. (Deut 20:4)

That all this assembly may know that YHWH saves not with sword and spear; for the battle is YHWH's and he will give you into our hand. (1 Sam 17:47)

Examples of this are found in the non-synoptic victories of Abijah (2 Chr 13) When Abijah did battle against Jeroboam, both YHWH and the army were involved on the battlefield:

(15b) And when the men of Judah shouted, God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel from before Abijah and Judah. (16) The men of Israel fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hand. (17) Abijah and his men slew them with great slaughter; so there fell slain of Israel five hundred thousand picked men. (13:15b-17)

It is God who defeated Jeroboam and all Israel, yet it is through the army of Judah that he accomplished this victory. YHWH gave the enemy into Judah's hand. Abijah's victory is so explained in the warfare narrative itself:

The men of Israel fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hand (13:16b)

The battle of Asa against Zerah displays a slight shift in emphasis concerning who does the fighting. In this battle, YHWH alone acts on the battlefield but Judah is still actively involved in pursuing and destroying the fleeing enemy:

(11) So YHWH defeated the Cushites before Asa and before Judah, and the Cushites fled. (12) Asa and the people that were with him pursued them as far as Gerar, and the Cushites fell until none remained alive; for they were broken before YHWH and his army. The men of Judah carried away a great quantity of booty. (14:11-12)

In this case, the warfare still involves human cooperation, although that cooperation is limited to off the battlefield. The victory of Asa is explained by the non-synoptic prophecy of Hanani:

Were not the Cushites and the Libyans a huge army with a vast number of chariots and horsemen? But you relied on YHWH, he gave them into your hand. (15:8)

Victory is credited to YHWH but human cooperation is maintained, albeit successful cooperation because YHWH has given the enemy into their hands.

However, the non-synoptic battle of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 20) is of a completely different nature. In this battle, the people of Judah do not fight on the battlefield (Abijah 2 Chr 13) nor do they participate in destroying a fleeing enemy (Asa, 2 Chr 14). (22) And when they began to sing and praise, YHWH set an ambush against the people of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, who had come against Judah, so that they were defeated. (23) The men of Ammon and Moab rose up against the inhabitants of Mount Seir, to annihilate and to destroy them, and when they had exterminated the inhabitants of Seir, they helped destroy one another. (24) When Judah came to the watchtower of the wilderness, they looked toward the horde; and behold, they were corpses lying on the ground; no one had escaped. (20:22-24)

Here, the Chronicler presents a battle which is closely related to that of the Exodus model:

(13) And Moses said to the people, "Fear not, stand firm, and see the salvation of YHWH, which he will work for you today; for the Egyptians whom you see today, you shall never see again. (14) YHWH will fight for you, and you have only to be still. (Exod 14:13-14)

YHWH fights for his people the important point is that YHWH will fight and Judah will prevail because YHWH is present on the battlefield. Nothing else matters. The sins of past generations need not determine the status of the current generation. The power of the enemy and the size of their armies are meaningless before YHWH.

### III. Kings, Prophets, Priests and Repentance

The lessons to be learned were intended for the post-exilic nation of Judah, now powerless in the world and far separated from their glorious past. But they also speak to each generation that follows, including our own. What lessons are there for the modern Church in the Chronicler's warfare narratives? What can we learn from the picture of YHWH as God of War and God of Peace?

#### *Lesson 1: The Davidic Kingship*

A first theological lesson for both post-exilic Judah and the modern Church centers on the identity of the reigning Davidic king. This theme predominates in the Chronicler's warfare narratives concerning David and his house. While the genealogies of 1 Chr 1-9 are unparalleled in Samuel/Kings, 1 Chr 10 virtually reproduces 1 Sam 31 (with some minor variations<sup>44</sup>) and introduces David. This is the account of battle of Gilboa and the

---

Neither the Israelites at the Red Sea nor the Judahites at the wilderness of Tekoa need to fight because YHWH monergistically fights for them.

<sup>44</sup> Some points of variation may be merely stylistic; others are not. For example, 1 Chr 10:1 reads "they fought," **Wkln** instead of the participle **~yik'ln** as in 1 Sam 31:1. When Saul was killed, he did not die alone:

death of Saul and his sons. This tragic defeat for Israel contrasts sharply with the coming reports of military victories of David. The final verses of chapter 10 (13-14) are unique to the Chronicler:

(13) So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to YHWH in that he did not keep the command of YHWH, and also consulted a medium, seeking guidance, (14) and did not seek guidance from YHWH (**hwhyB; vrd'-al w vArdl**).<sup>45</sup> Therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom over to David the son of Jesse. (1 Chr 10:13-14)

This explains the reason for the military defeat and death of Saul; it does not explain the cause of the war or interpret the war itself.

This is the only event in the life of Saul upon which the Chronicler reflects. Is Saul merely a foil for David, as von Rad suggested?<sup>46</sup> Or, as Rudolph Mosis suggests, is 1 Chr 10 a paradigm for the exile?<sup>47</sup> Several aspects of the text support Mosis. First, in the person of Saul and the removal of his head and armor to the Temple of Dagon in Philistia (2 Chr 10:10) rather than Beth-shan in Israelite territory (1 Sam 31:10), a type of the exile

---

1 Sam 31:6  
Thus Saul died,  
and his three sons,  
and his armor bearer, and all his men,  
  
on the same day together.

1 Chr 10:6  
Thus Saul died;  
he and his three sons  
  
and all his house  
died together.

Some have seen this as a careless oversight, because 1 Chr 8-9 names four sons of Saul and the Chronicler does not include Abner's attempt to place Saul's son Ish-bosheth (2 Sam 2-4) on the throne (Curtis, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* 181). Others find a strong suggestion of a different hand in the writing of 1 Chr 10 than that of 1 Chr 1-9 (Braun, *1 Chronicles* 150). It is most likely that, because of the later omissions of David's struggles with the house of Saul (2 Sam 2-4), that the Chronicler does not mention that all of the house of Saul at this point.

<sup>45</sup> **vArdl** is probably a dittography with **vrd'-al w** Peter Ackroyd ("The Chronicler as Exegete" *JSOT* 2 [1977] 8) calls this a gloss. Rudolph Mosis (*Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichteswerkes*, Freiburger Theologische Studien 92 [Freiburg: Herder, 1972] 28-41) shows that **vrd**, when used with **d** or **ta**, can have the general meaning "reverence" or "worship" (2 Chr 11"16; 12:14).

<sup>46</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, BWANT IV/3 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930) 79.

<sup>47</sup> Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichteswerkes* 17-43.

of unfaithful king and people is obtained. Additionally, although the reference to Transjordan is absent, the fleeing of the Israelites from their cities and the subsequent occupation by the Philistines is preserved.<sup>48</sup> Mosis theorizes that this is a paradigm for the later exile under Nebuchadnezzar where the people as well as the unfaithful king leave their cities. Most importantly, the verbal and conceptual parallels between the death of Saul (1 Chr 10) and the exile (2 Chr 36) connect the two texts as an *inclusio* of the narrative history.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>

1 Sam 31:7

And when the men of Israel who were on the other side of the valley and those beyond the Jordan saw that the men of Israel had fled and that Saul and his sons were dead, they forsook their cities and fled; and the Philistines came and dwelt in them.

1 Chr 10:7

And when all the men of Israel who were in the valley saw that they had fled and that Saul and his sons were dead, they forsook their cities and fled; and the Philistines came and dwelt in them.

<sup>49</sup>The Chronicler theologially explains the account of Saul's death by the addition of two verses unique to the Chronicles (1 Chr 10:13-14):

So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to YHWH because he did not obey the word of YHWH, and also consulted a medium, seeking guidance (**vArđj**), and did not seek guidance (**vrd'alf**) from YHWH. Therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom over to David, the son of Jesse.

In this striking composition, the Chronicler offers a critical insight into the themes that will dominate his history. Japhet (*I & II Chronicles* 229-30) insightfully notes that the elements of the Chronicler's composition in 10:13-14 are already contained in a different form and order in Samuel's prophecy to Saul (1 Sam 28).

Saul died for specific reasons: he was unfaithful because he did not obey the word of YHWH and he sought guidance from a medium rather than from YHWH. "Unfaithfulness" (root **lam**) is a term frequently used in Chronicles within passages not paralleled elsewhere in the Old Testament. (1 Chr 2:7; 5:25; 10 :13; 2 Chr 12:2; 26 :6, 18; 28:19 , 22; 29:6; 30:7; 36:14) Often this unfaithfulness is demonstrated in cultic matters and results in disastrous warfare and exile. The same term is used by the Chronicler in 2 Chr 36:14 in his explanation of the exile to Babylon:

All the leading priests and people likewise were exceedingly unfaithful (**lam**), following all the abominations of the nations; and they polluted the house of YHWH which he had hallowed in Jerusalem.

In what way had Saul been "unfaithful"? Here the Chronicler assumes familiarity with the history of 1 Sam. Certainly it was not in individual acts of unfaithfulness, although those did occur. It was in his overall life that he had proven to be unfaithful. Individual acts were symptomatic of an underlying disease in the life of Saul.

Through the prophet Samuel, the word of YHWH had come to Saul. Saul failed to heed that word,

If Saul is a type of the exile, then David, to whom YHWH gave the kingdom, becomes a type of the return. After his uncontested acclamation as king, David's first acts are to capture and rebuild Jerusalem (1 Chr 11:4-9)<sup>50</sup> and then to attempt to reclaim the

---

offered sacrifices (a cultic violation [1 Sam 13]), and refused to exterminate the Amalekites (1 Sam 15; 28:18). This is precisely another reason that the Chronicler later gives for the Babylonian exile (2 Chr 36:15):

YHWH, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them by his messengers, because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place; but they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets, till the wrath of YHWH rose up against his people, till there was no remedy.

Further, Saul had sought guidance from a medium (v. 13b). Again, the Chronicler does not cite particular examples of this charge but assumes familiarity with Saul's visit to the medium in Endor, immediately before that fateful battle at Mount Gilboa, and conjuring of the spirit of the recently departed Samuel (1 Sam 28).

The term "seek" (root *vrđ*) is another critical part of the Chronicler's theological vocabulary, (1 Chr 10:13, 14; 13:3; 15:13; 16:11; 21:30; 22:19; 28:8, 9; 2 Chr 1:5; 12:14; 14:3,6; 15:2, 12, 13; 16:12; 17:3,4; 18:4, 6, 7 ; 19:3; 20:3; 22:9; 24:6, 22; 25:15, 20; 26:5, 9; 30:10; 31:9, 21; 32:31; 34:3, 21, 26) with the meaning "seek" in a cultic sense, coming close to the idea of "reverence, worship." Mosis (*Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* 28-41) demonstrates that the term *vrđ* means "seek" in a cultic sense, coming close to the idea of "reverence, worship," whether used with the preposition *b* or the sign of the direct object *ta*.

Like the term *lam* the term *vrđ* has a relationship to worship of God. Moreover, both terms do not refer to isolated events in a nation's life, but to the overall patterns. Did Saul ever "seek" YHWH? 1 Sam 28:6 clearly states that he did, yet he received no answer. But this incident of seeking YHWH did not compensate for the overall pattern of his life.

For these reasons, the Chronicler states in unmistakable terms, that God slew Saul. This completes the exilic motifs of 1 Chr 10. Just as God in 2 Chr 36:17 brought up the king of Babylon as his instrument in destroying the nation, so in 1 Chr 10 the Philistines are his instruments in destroying Saul and his house. In the final analysis it was not the Philistines who so struck fear in Saul's heart that he committed suicide; it was YHWH himself.

<sup>50</sup> The destruction of Jerusalem is more extensive in the Chronicler than in 2 Sam as the Chronicler differs slightly from 2 Sam in the post-battle account but adopts 2 Sam in its evaluation of David:

2 Sam 5:9b-10

9b. And David built the city round  
about from the Millo  
inward.

10. And David became greater  
and greater, for YHWH  
the God of hosts was with him.

1 Chr 11:8-9

8. And he built the city round  
about from the Millo  
in complete circuit;  
and Joab repaired the rest  
of the city.

9. And David became greater  
and greater, for YHWH  
of hosts was with him.

There are several omissions from involving the references in the Jebusite's taunt of 2 Sam 5:6 to the blind and the lame warding off David's entrance to the city and the David's subsequent order to attack the lame and the blind (2 Sam 5:8). These are explained by the *Tendenz* of the Chronicler to idealize David, who could not be taunted and could not attack the lame and blind. Additionally, there are additions to the

ark from Kiriath-jearim (1 Chr 13). The resultant rebuilding anticipates the 6<sup>th</sup> century destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and the later rebuilding of city and Temple by the returned exiles.<sup>51</sup>

The Chronicler thus sets the stage for his presentation of David as the ideal king.<sup>52</sup> While the long synoptic account of David's successful foreign wars (2 Sam 8-12) is repeated almost verbatim (1 Chr 18-20:3), the Chronicler does not mention Samuel/Kings' narratives of the internal conflicts of David's kingship. Not mentioned are the struggles of David to claim the throne.<sup>53</sup> Also gone are David's adultery with

---

narrative that are more difficult to explain. The events of the battle in 1 Chr take a shape different from that of 2 Sam:

2 Sam 5:8  
And David said on that day,  
"Whoever would smite the  
Jebusites  
  
let him get up the water shaft to  
attack the lame and the blind,  
who are hated by David's soul."  
Therefore it is said, "The blind  
and the lame shall not come into  
the house."

1 Chr 11:6  
And David said,  
"Whoever shall smite the  
Jebusites  
first shall be chief and

And Joab the son of Zeruiah went  
up first, so he became chief.

Some scholars argue that 1 Chr is necessary to understand the text of 2 Sam and that the Chronicler had another source available to him to clarify the 2 Sam text (Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*, translated by M. Pearlman [New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963] 267-70). Others see this as an addition from the hand of the Chronicler himself (Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* 34ff). In either case, Joab's presence in this warfare narrative prepares the way for his later role as David's commander and his role in the rebuilding of the city after the capture (1 Chr 11:8).

<sup>51</sup> Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* 45-7.

<sup>52</sup> This does not mean that the Chronicler's David is without fault since he includes the census of Israel (2 Sam 24/1 Chr 21) and even adds the sentence, "But God was displeased with this thing, and he smote Israel" (1 Chr 21:7). It may be that "he tells the full story of the Numbering because it culminates in the providential choice of a site for the Temple (chap. xxii.1)" (Barnes, "The David of the Book of Samuel and the David of the Book of Chronicles" 49-59). Yet the connection between the census and the choice of a Temple site is not in the *Vorlage*, only in Chronicles. Further, David's rejection for a role in the actual building of the Temple is explained by the Chronicler because he has shed much blood (1 C 22:8) and is a man of war (1 C 28:3).

<sup>53</sup> The Chronicler acknowledges the war only in passing while enumerating David's army in 1 Chr 12:23.

Bathsheba and its resultant disasters: the murder of Uriah and the rebuke by Nathan the prophet.<sup>54</sup> Because these Jerusalem events are omitted, so is the civil war within David's house<sup>55</sup> and the revolt of the Benjaminite Sheba.<sup>56</sup>

Saul and David thus become types of judgment and restoration, respectively. According to 1 Chr 10, Saul is destroyed and his kingdom given by YHWH to David because of Saul's unfaithfulness. David, however, has the blessing of God. In concluding his account of the capture of Jerusalem, the Chronicler adapts the summary of his *Vorlage*, "And David became greater and greater, for YHWH of hosts (**tAabc. hwhy**)<sup>57</sup> was with him" (2 Sam 5:10/1 Chr 11:9). The destruction of Saul and the subsequent rise and glorious reign of David thus become a lesson to the post-exilic community concerning their own faithfulness and seeking of YHWH.

The Chronicler's emphasis on the Davidic covenant shapes his entire history of Israel and Judah. Except for the genealogies (1 Chr 1-9) and the death of Saul (1 Chr 10), the

---

Of the entire narrative of civil war (2 Sam 2-4), only 2 Sam 3:2-5, the sons of David born at Hebron, finds its way into the Chronicler's history and that by transposition to the genealogies in 1 Chr 3:1-4. In Chronicles, David's accession to the throne came without civil war as all Israel crowns him at Hebron (1 Chr 11:1-4). Unlike the earlier history, the long civil war between David and the house of Saul of 2 Sam 2-4 is not even mentioned in Chronicles.

<sup>54</sup> Even though the Chronicler faithfully transmits his *Vorlage's* statement that "David remained at Jerusalem" (2 Sam 11:1//1 Chr 20:1), he omits the events in Jerusalem

<sup>55</sup> Since the rebuke of Nathan the prophet is omitted, the disasters associated with Amnon and Absalom (2 Sam 13-18), directly linked by Nathan to their father David's sin against Uriah (2 Sam 12:11), are also omitted by the Chronicler. His throne could not be threatened from within his own house especially since the reason for the rebellion - David's murder of Uriah - was not mentioned.

<sup>56</sup> Another warfare narrative, 2 Sam 20, reports an abortive rebellion led by the Benjaminite Sheba, perhaps incited by Absalom's failed revolt. This, too, is omitted. Not even a revolt from outside David's house could threaten his throne.

<sup>57</sup> 2 Sam 5:10 has **tAabc. yhwh/hwhy** The title "YHWH of hosts" is a rare concession of the Chronicler to the use of the title, occurring only three times while following his source (here and at 1 Chr 17:7/ 1 Sam 17:8 and 1 Chr 17:24/ 2 Sam 17:26) and elsewhere removed from the text (1 Chr 13:6/ 2 Sam 6:2; 1 Chr 16:2/ 2 Sam 6:18; 1 Chr 17:25/ 2 Sam 7:27). Here the notation that YHWH of hosts was with him serves to explain the course of events and supports the Chronicler's picture of David.

remainder of 1 and 2 Chr focuses on David and his descendants. Only one king reigns more gloriously than did David. That king is his son Solomon. In his account of Solomon's reign, the Chronicler does not report the negative history. In the Chronicler's account, Solomon fights no battles to secure the throne. He engages in no warfare as king. He does not commit idolatry at the end of his life. Rather, he reigns in power, majesty and wealth. It is this that prompts Mosis to identify Solomon as the third type of reign. If Saul's reign was a type of judgment and David's a type of restoration, then Solomon's is a type of the final redemption where all warfare ceases and Israel enjoys unity, peace and glory.

However, the reign of Solomon was followed by his own son Rehoboam's disastrous loss of a United Kingdom. As David and Solomon's kingdom is split into two, the Chronicler loses interest in the affairs of the North and acknowledges the division of United Kingdom only as it relates to the events of the South. His exclusion of northern material, including warfare narratives, reflects this exclusive interest in the South. The history which the Chronicler wishes to convey is a history which is present only where the Davidic kingship and the Temple are present; that is, the South.<sup>58</sup>

Abijah, the Davidic king of Judah, before battle with Jeroboam, the illegitimate king of Israel, reminds the North:

Should you not know that YHWH has given kingship over Israel to David forever --to him and to his sons it is a covenant of salt. (2 Chr 13:5)

That covenant will weather the future failures of Davidic kings far removed from the

---

<sup>58</sup> Although a descendent of David sits upon the throne in the South, no Judahite king matches up to the model set by David, especially in military matters. Abijah (2 Chr 13) comes the closest insofar as neither David or Abijah meet defeat in battle. Abijah, however, is only a partial reflection of David since his army of 400,000 does not match David's 1,100,000. While David has a unified kingdom, Abijah fights a civil war between the divided kingdoms.

image of their ancestor. It is a permanent covenant and the continuity of the Davidic line beyond the exile and into the future is assured by the genealogy of David's descendants in 1 Chr 3. There the exilic and post-exilic generations are drawn through that most un-David-like king, Jehoiachin (3:17), the bearer of the Davidic line, and five generations beyond his descendant Zerubbabel (3:19-24).<sup>59</sup>

The David of the Chronicler's history was a victorious warrior. His descendants were victorious when they were most like him: faithful to YHWH in his cult<sup>60</sup> and receptive to the prophetic word.<sup>61</sup> Three successive non-synoptic warfare narratives form a trajectory of comparison between the reigning king's Davidic qualities and the degree of involvement of YHWH in their wars:

- A. Abijah, of whose own person nothing is said which is positive but who nevertheless confesses faith in YHWH, is victorious with divine help--but he must engage the enemy on the battle field (2 Chr 13).
- B. Asa, who is a cultic reformer but apostatized in the end, wins his battle against Zerah during the period of his reign most like David's--unlike Abijah, he does not fight on the battlefield but pursues the confused enemy and slaughters them (2 Chr 14).
- C. Jehoshaphat, who responded positively to the prophetic word of Jehu after his disastrous alliance with Ahab, is most like David, even in the number of troops he commanded. His battle in 2 Chr 20 is holy war *par excellence*; Judah does not even have to slaughter the fleeing enemy--YHWH fights monergistically.

The reappearance of the Davidic king is the hope of post-exilic Judah in the midst of the nations of the world. Though they are now powerless in that world, the God of their fathers is the God of history. Judah had faced tremendous political and military

---

<sup>59</sup> That Zerubbabel himself was seen as a messianic figure is attested in Zech 6:9-15, giving evidence that at least in the late sixth century B.C. a Davidic hope was alive among the post-exilic nation.

<sup>60</sup> See Appendix 1

<sup>61</sup> See Appendix 2

opposition before and won with YHWH's help. It can happen again.

Mosis saw the Chronicler's own age as a new Davidic age of restoration following the Saul-like age of judgment in the Babylonian exile. I would disagree. There is nothing Davidic about post-exilic Judah. On the contrary, it is an age lived in anticipation of the new David. Only the final Son of David brings restoration and a new age.

One other stage is yet to come from our perspective in time. In Chronicles, the reign of David is surpassed only by the reign of Solomon, who rises to power without civil war, enjoys complete peace, builds the Temple and dies without mention of apostasy. This is, in Mosis' terms, the final redemption. Just as the Chronicler's Davidic age of restoration is followed by a Solomonic age of redemption, so the eschatological Kingdom will usher in eternal peace for the people of God.

How does the theme of David and warfare narratives "echo in the life of the Church" during this Davidic age? Clearly, these are not applicable politically or militarily. The Church, unlike ancient Israel, is not both Church and state. The Church has no armies to fight with sword or spear, with aircraft carriers or weapons of mass destruction. She has no territory to conquer or lose.

Yet, as St. Paul wrote in regard to the Exodus, "All these things happened to them as examples, and they were written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the ages have come" (1 Cor 10:11). The Church does engage in a profound battle but it is against spiritual darkness. It is into that battle that the great and final son of David leads His people. Completing the genealogical line drawn by the Chronicler, He sits upon the throne of His father David, reuniting in His Person the divine Kingship and the human Davidic kingship. Even before the battle lines are drawn, however, the enemy has already

been defeated. At Calvary the final battle raged. On Easter the victory of Jesus was proclaimed. The day will come when every enemy will be forever and utterly destroyed as He returns as King of kings and Lord of lords and His Easter victory will be manifested throughout creation.<sup>62</sup>

Still the battle rages as an already defeated enemy continues to attack the people of God. The people of God on earth still hear the battle call to a serious and deadly war. This is, after all, the Church Militant. Satan as a roaring lion still seeks those whom he can devour. The Last Day has not yet come. Then and only then will be no war or threat of war for the Church.

How are the people of God doing? The great Davidic King rules His Church and leads her into battle, but the Church seems more intent on brother fighting brother than on following her Lord and seeing His victory over the world. All too often the warfare among the Church's children becomes a war of rhetoric and attack on persons. Theological discussion and persuasion is a lost art.

I suggest that this warfare arises in part from differing confessions about the incarnation of the Son of God. There seems to be some confusion as to who He is. The true God, it is said, can be approached without faith in or even acknowledgment of the Second Person, the incarnate Son of God and son of David. The very nature of Deity is questioned, as for some, the doctrine of the Trinity no longer appears to be a primary doctrine but at best a secondary doctrine. It is not necessary, some say, to know the Son of God, incarnated as the Son of David, in order to know God. Some claim that any confession of any other god is only an inadequate confession of the true God. This, it

---

<sup>62</sup> See Daniel L. Gard, "The Case for Eschatological Continuity" in *Show Them No Mercy. 4 Views on God and Canaanite Genocide*, 113-41.

seems to me, reduces the Athanasian Creed to an historical oddity, a museum piece to be trotted out when we want to see what Christian once narrow mindedly believed. Some ask, "There is only one God, right?" I would answer, "Yes, that is absolutely right. But there are as many false idols as there are fallen people to create them."

Thus the Church faces a great and devastating civil war as opposing forces gather within her, tearing her apart. In that weakened state, she fails to even see the battle in and around her. She knows no peace, only civil war and assaults from without. And she will find nothing but defeat and disaster.

### *Lesson 2: The Authoritative Prophetic Word*

A second theological lesson for both post-exilic Judah and the modern Church centers on the authority of the prophetic word. This is theme throughout Chronicles: how will the people respond to the word of the prophets?

The efficacy of the prophetic word is underscored in the Chronicler's history through the role of prophets in warfare. Victory is assured when the prophetic word is heard and acted upon:

Hear me, Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem. Believe in YHWH your God, and you will be established; believe his prophets, and you will succeed. (2 Chr 20:20)

If the word of the prophet is ignored, defeat in battle will come (2 Chr 16:10-12; 24:20-27; 25:15; 26:18). The Chronicler's non-synoptic explanation of the exile itself is related to Judah's reception of the prophetic word:

YHWH, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them by his messengers, because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place; but they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets, till the wrath of YHWH rose up against his people, till there was no remedy. (2 Chr 36:15)

Prophets are to be heard and believed--the lessons of the past make this clear to the Chronicler. But more important than the past is the Chronicler's own day. How will the people hear the message of the prophets? It is possible that the Chronicler understands himself to be the heir of those prophetic writers.<sup>63</sup> His own theological concerns are thereby presented to post-exilic Judah as authoritative. If they believe in YHWH their God and in his prophets, they will succeed, current political concerns notwithstanding.

So, how does the word of the prophet's echo in the life of the Church? In the 1970's, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod fought a great civil war over this very issue. Scripture as the inspired, inerrant Word of God was blatantly denied by some within her but, by the grace of God, Missouri was able to preserve her confession and emerged with the prophetic word, that is Holy Scripture, intact.

Or did we? On a surface level perhaps. Certainly this is the official doctrinal position of the Synod and it is taught in our seminaries. Most importantly, thousands of pastors faithfully proclaim the Gospel in biblically based sermons and classes in parishes throughout the world. Of course, that is the primary place for the prophetic word because there in the parish are the sheep over whom the Good Shepherd has placed pastors as undershepherds.

And yet, what role do the Scriptures actually play in the governance and life of the Synod? It is of no small importance that the larger Synod may appeal to the authority of constitutions, bylaws, convention resolutions, and elected and non-elected commissions

---

<sup>63</sup> An interesting variant of this same question is, "How will people hear the message of the Chronicler?" The Chronicler often cites as his sources the written records of prophets. It is from these prophetic sources that the Chronicler claims to have drawn material for his own work. What role does the Chronicler intend for his book? He clearly shares the interests of the Levites, who were closely associated with cultic prophecy. He promotes fidelity to YHWH through his Temple and his king. The Chronicler's work is of similar content to the prophetic works he cites.

and boards rather than to the word of God as the sole source and norm of the Church's life and practice. While formally acknowledging the word of the prophets, that divinely given Word is at times not even mentioned in some official decisions of the Synod.<sup>64</sup> Worse yet, those that do respond to current events from Scripture (that is the prophetic word) are answered with particular readings of convention resolutions and bylaws and then removed from their positions.

Moreover, even the congregations themselves are afflicted with this ongoing battle for Scripture within the Church. Nowhere is Biblical and theological training more important than in preaching. There, in the pulpit, that most difficult task of properly distinguishing the Law and Gospel weighs heavily on the preacher. Today we have men without theological training and without a regular call standing in our pulpits. Of course we would never think of having untrained teachers in our Day School classrooms; and rightly so, since we value the education of our young people. How can we claim to value the prophetic Word when we so undervalue theological education that it is not a prerequisite to preaching? Such a question is met only with a chilling silence and refusal to address the issue.

It seems to me that we are losing our ability to speak and think biblically. The very language of the Church, rooted in the theology of Scripture, is becoming a foreign tongue. When the Church does not live up to her confession about the nature of Scripture, something must fill the void. What does so is a new legalism that cites man-made rules as authoritative or insists on new program that are purpose driven, ignited with one kind or fire or another but always with strong pastoral leadership. This kind of glue, no matter

---

<sup>64</sup> See the analysis of a current case in David O. Berger and James W. Voelz "On Competence and Integrity in the Life of the Church," *CJ* 29 (2003) 370-3.

how well applied, cannot bring a shattered community back together.

Is it any wonder that the Synod is losing the war? Ancient Israel was warned about failure to hear and act upon the word of the prophets. It is imperative that the Church listens to that warning as it echoes from Scripture into the life of the Church. We may have drifted but the Word of God has not. It remains what it always was given to be: the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

### *Lesson 3: The Centrality of Worship*

A third theological lesson for both post-exilic Judah and the modern Church centers on matters of worship. The Chronicler details David's role in establishing the Levitical orders (1 Chr 23:2-32) include Temple musicians (1 Chr 25:1-8), priests<sup>65</sup> and others<sup>66</sup> whose duties involved prophecy. The institution of prophecy is thus closely connected not only with David but also with the cult. In Chronicles this third institution, the cult, helped to determine the fate of the nation. The fidelity of king and people to the Temple in Jerusalem is, in the Chronicler's view, a predictor of the fortunes of the nation in peace or war.

The presence of the Temple and its cultic personnel is central to the non-synoptic warfare narratives. Abijah's non-synoptic speech, before battle against the idolatrous North (2 Chr 13), has two foci: Davidic kingship and Temple. His son Asa is at peace during the times of cultic reform (2 Chr 14:2-7; 15:8-19) but involved in wars when Asa was unfaithful (2 Chr 16). The reign of Jehoshaphat, in an unparalleled manner,

---

<sup>65</sup> Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada the priest, prophesies (2 Chr 24:20).

reinforces the place of the cultic in warfare (2 Chr 20), where both the Temple building and its personnel play a central role in the fortunes of war.

Precisely this same pattern is found throughout the history. The only exception to the established pattern is the defeat of the cultically faithful Josiah. Yet Josiah's death is explained on the basis of his refusal to heed the prophetic word through Necho of Egypt (2 Chr 35:22). As we have already seen, the Chronicler emphasizes the role of prophet and the fortunes of war are determined in part by the response to the prophetic word.

The Chronicler's use of warfare narratives, set in the history of the pre-exilic past, affirms the centrality of the second, rebuilt Temple. Jehoshaphat's speech (2 Chr 20) is said by the Chronicler to have been delivered in the "new court", a feature of the Second Temple. Thus he indicates that the Second Temple which stood in his own time is to be viewed as the continuation of the First Temple that stood in Jehoshaphat's time. The Second Temple and the re-established worship of the community are to be exactly that of the pre-exilic community.

In this way the Chronicler condemns all syncretistic worship and all sanctuaries that compete against the Jerusalem Temple. Every member of the community is to have undivided loyalty to the cultic establishment in Jerusalem with its sanctuary and priesthood. Consistently, every king who either is disloyal to the Temple or permits disloyalty is defeated in war. Only loyalty to the Jerusalem cult will bring back the glory of the past. Disloyalty to the Temple can only result in the continuation of the political *status quo*.

---

<sup>66</sup> In one place, the Chronicler has simply substituted "Levites" for his *Vorlage's* "prophets" (2 Chr 34:30//2 Kgs 23:2). Elsewhere the Levite Jahaziel functions as a battle prophet (2 Chr 20:14-17), and Heman (1 Chr 25:3-5), Asaph (2 Chr 29:30) and Jeduthun (2 Chr 35:15) are referred to as seers.

In the Chronicler's non-synoptic warfare narratives, the Temple is not only the *locus* of worship and thanksgiving before and after battle, it has also replaced all older rules of sanctification. For example, the naming of the people as the army of God (von Rad's Characteristic 2) takes on new Temple related dimensions in Chronicles,<sup>67</sup> where the validity of any claim for the army being the people of YHWH is dependent upon the presence of the Temple. Nowhere does the Chronicler make direct mention of the law of holiness or sanctification within the camp as explicated in Deut 23:10-15. Rather, sanctification is seen as the possession of the people within their relationship to the Temple.<sup>68</sup> In other words, the army is already holy because of the Temple.<sup>69</sup>

- 
- <sup>67</sup> A. In Abijah's battle, the naming of the army as the "people of God," is indirectly attested in 13:10-11 ("YHWH is our God," ~~Wheh/ hwhy~~). This claim, equivalent to ~~hwhy~~~[; (Judg 5:11,13) and ~~~yhlah'~~~[ (Judg 20:2), is made within the context of Abijah's assertions concerning the Temple.
- B. Asa, in his battlefield prayer based upon Solomon's dedicatory prayer, twice refers to YHWH as "our God" (14:10). More explicitly, the claim is made that the Judahite army is the army of God through the use of the title ~~Wheh yfi l hwhy yfi~~ (14:12), a term used elsewhere by the Chronicler to mean the Temple (2 Chr 31:2).
- C. In Jehoshaphat's non-synoptic warfare narrative, the naming of the army as "the people of YHWH," is expressed by "your people Israel", ~~larfy ^M~~ [(20:7). In the historical review, Jehoshaphat expounds on their relationship of YHWH through Abraham, the conquest, the building of the Temple and its dedication, and the promises of YHWH given at the dedication. YHWH's help before the "vast horde" is predicated upon this historical relationship.

- <sup>68</sup> A. The existence of the Jerusalem cult forms one of two foci in Abijah's pre-battle speech (2 Chr 13:4-12), the other being the institution of Davidic kingship.
- B. Asa is a cultic reformer before (14:1-4) and after (15:8-18) his war with Zerah (14:8-14). Even his prayer to YHWH before battle (14:10) reflects the dedicatory Temple prayer of Solomon (2 Chr 6:34).
- C. Jehoshaphat, like his father Asa, was a religious reformer (17:6), whose non-synoptic battle begins at the Temple (20:5) and ends at the Temple (20:28). It includes not only explicit references to the Temple in the historical review (20:8-9), but the presence of cultic personnel on the battlefield (20:13-22).

- <sup>69</sup> Other examples include the proper cultic acts of sacrifice and/or the consultation of YHWH (von Rad's Characteristic 4) are also related to the Temple. Before Jehoshaphat's battle, YHWH is consulted in a pre-battle Temple ritual. There, YHWH is petitioned in prayer (20:5-12) and responds through Jahaziel the Asaphite (20:13-17) in a positive affirmation of divine help in warfare.

The centrality of the Temple in Jerusalem is affirmed in these warfare narratives. The Chronicler's own community is thereby called to faithfulness to the Temple in its midst. The Temple has become more than a site for sacrifice and worship; it is the very source of religious sanctification and success in the affairs of the world.

Once again, how is the divine instruction regarding worship understood in the Church today? Is there an echo of Scripture to be found in her life of worship?

Certainly the Church is not bound to the Temple in Jerusalem or anywhere else. The Great High Priest, who offered Himself as the final Sacrifice, also ripped open the Holy of Holies for all humanity. Our Temple is Christ Jesus himself and our holiness assured by his presence.

Nor does the New Testament itself provide explicit instructions for the Church's worship. Principles, however, abound throughout the Bible. In Scripture there are such things as sacred space, sacred time, and sacred personnel. The sacred and the profane are not equivalent to each other. Christian worship focuses on Jesus as the One who opens heaven itself to us. The preaching of His Word and the administration of His Sacraments are the very marks of the Church and are to be administered by those who have been called to the Office of the Holy Ministry.

Today, however, worship sometimes is reduced to entertainment. The humanness of the Church is exalted by applauding the "performance" of musicians, liturgical dancers and chancel dramas. People expect to feel like they did at a high school pep rally, and all too often that is the central principle of worship in these dark days. Gone is a sense of the

---

Another characteristic of holy war (von Rad's Characteristic 12) is adapted by the Chronicler to his concern for the Temple. In both Asa's war (14:14) and Jehoshaphat's (20:27-28) it is said that the victorious army returned to Jerusalem. Jehoshaphat's army is furthermore specified to have returned to the house of YHWH.

sacred, replaced with religious words encased in the style of the secular culture of death.

Even the Office of the Holy Ministry is “on the table” for guidance from “organizational gurus” from within Missouri, from other confessions and even from the secular, business world. We are told that “every one is a minister” which is, of course, a far different claim than the Lutheran doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. We even have “licensed lay ministers” presiding at parish altars. What does this say about our subscription to the biblical basis of Augustana XIV?

Each worshipping community, that is to say “parish”, then becomes an independent organism without relationship or responsibility to any other community. It is isolated, drawing identity only from its own time and place. The riches of the Church’s history and unity that is to be the inheritance of the children of God is replaced by the poverty of time- and space-bound self-reflection.

And so the civil war over worship tears the people of God apart. The rhetoric of some characterizes those that practice and argue for liturgies that actually point people to the Holy Trinity as divisive and “maintenance” ministers. Those that insist that there is a particular Office of the Holy Ministry distinct from that of a CEO are rhetorically denounced as “elitist” or as uninterested in the growth of the Church. And as we fight the internal battles, we do not see the battle for souls that is all around us.

#### *Lesson 4: War as Divine Call to Repentance*

A fourth theological lesson for both post-exilic Judah and the modern Church is that defeat in warfare is a divine call to repentance. A faithful Davidic king who leads the people in hearing the prophets and in the proper cult reigns in peace or, if war comes,

benefits from divine intervention and victory for Judah. However, when these things are not present, disastrous warfare confronts the people of God. Thus, the people of God, both ancient and modern, must heed this warning.

When Judah is defeated or engages in continual warfare, it is because God has so ordered the affairs of nations in order to chastise his people. In fact, a number of wars are specifically tied to divine retribution<sup>70</sup> when YHWH Himself brings warfare and defeat to an unfaithful king and nation.

The Chronicler's concept of war as divine retribution has points in common both with ancient Near Eastern thought<sup>71</sup> and with earlier texts of the Hebrew Bible. Like some non-Israelite texts, the Chronicler's narratives of defeat include improper cult, the god fighting against his or her people, and other nations being used by the offended god to bring destruction on his or her own people. But the differences are greater than the

---

<sup>70</sup> See Appendix 3

<sup>71</sup> Millard Lind cites, as the most comprehensive example, a Sumerian text which seeks to explain why the Gutu could defeat the kingdom of Akkad (Lind, *Yahweh is a Warrior* 10-1. Lind's text is that from Samuel N. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer* [Indian Hills, Col: The Falcon's Press, 1965] 267-70). According to this document, the fourth ruler of Akkad, Naram-Sin, had sacked Nippur, the city of Enlil, and desecrated his Temple, Ekur. In revenge for Naram-Sin's actions, Enlil brought the Gutu, a barbarous people, upon Akkad. Other gods, eight all together, forsook Akkad in solidarity with Enlil:

She who had lived there, left the city. Like a maiden forsaking her chamber, Holy Inanna forsook the shrine Agade. Like a warrior hastening to (his) weapon, she went forth against the city in battle (and) combat, she attacked as it were a foe (*ANETS* 648).

Akkad is city destroyed without hope. Lind summarizes the document's understanding of the relationship between gods and humans:

- (1) The invasion of Sumer was due to Naram-Sin's disobedience, his desecration of Enlil's city and Temple, Nippur and Ekur, resulting in the alienation of Enlil.
- (2) The destruction of Akkad was caused by Enlil and by the curses of eight important Sumerian gods who in this way tried to sooth Enlil's temper.
- (3) The goddess Inanna who dwelt in Akkad forsook her Temple and city to fight against it.
- (4) All action is regarded as that of the gods, except for Naram-Sin's ritualistic violation of Nippur. Even the Gutu are seen as the instruments of Enlil.
- (5) The punishment by the gods was not immediate but was deferred for several generations (cf. 2 Kings 23:26).

similarities. Unlike non-Israelite texts, divine retribution in Chronicles comes on the immediate offending generation, yet that retribution always holds out a hope for the future, a hope that is realized through repentance.

Literature from Israel also reflects on the meaning of defeat. Certainly the later prophets spoke of its meaning, both for Israel and for other nations. So, too, the earlier Biblical literature addresses this problem. Num 14:13-45 explains the defeat at Kadesh-barnea as the result of YHWH deserting Israel. Two narratives, Josh 7 (Israel's defeat at Ai) and 1 Sam 4 (capture of the ark by Philistia), explain defeat as YHWH giving Israel into the hands of their enemy and YHWH smiting Israel before the enemy, respectively. Israel is defeated because their God decreed and brought about their defeat.

In Chr, YHWH either sides with his faithful king and people or he fights against his unfaithful people. Saul died in battle because he was unfaithful to YHWH (1 Chr 10:13-14). Ahaziah, in his alliance with Joram of Israel, is defeated and killed because "it was ordained of God" (2 Chr 22:7). Joash, though he avoided defeat by the Syrian invaders in 2 Kgs 12:17-18, is ultimately defeated and killed by divine intervention (2 Chr 24:24).<sup>72</sup> YHWH delivers Ahaz, in two warfare narratives, into the hands of his enemies.<sup>73</sup> The

---

<sup>72</sup> Though the army of the Syrians had come with few men, YHWH delivered them into their hand a very great army, because they had forsaken YHWH, the God of their fathers. Thus they executed judgment on Joash. (2 Chr 24:24)

<sup>73</sup> The defeat by Syria and Israel is explained:

2 Kgs 16:5  
  
Then Rezin king of Syria the king of Syria  
  
was also given in to the hand of  
and Pekah the son of Remaliah,  
king of Israel,  
came up to wage war on Jerusalem,  
and they besieged Ahaz but could

2 Chr 28:5  
Therefore YHWH his God gave him  
into the hand of  
  
who defeated him and took captive  
  
the king of Israel,

same explanation is given for Manasseh's defeat and captivity at the hands of the king of Assyria.<sup>74</sup>

In the dramatic conclusion to the Chronicler's account of pre-exilic Judah, it is YHWH who decrees the fall of Jerusalem. Like the reign of his father Jehoiakim, the reign of Jehoiachin is severely truncated (2 Kgs 24:8-17/2 Chr 36:9-10).<sup>75</sup> And, like the reign of his father, the reign of Jehoiachin is evaluated with the words, "And he did what was evil in the sight of YHWH" (2 Kgs 24:9a/2 Chr 36:9b). Despite the fact he disappears from the Chronicler's history at this point,<sup>76</sup> Jehoiachin, who was replaced on the throne by his uncle Zedekiah<sup>77</sup> at the command of Nebuchadnezzar, is the legitimate Davidic king. Thus it is he, not Zedekiah, through whom the Chronicler traces the royal lineage in the genealogy of 1 Chr 3:16-24.

---

not conquer him.

who defeated him with great slaughter.

Ahaz's defeat by Assyria, the Edomites and the Philistines is similarly explained:

For YHWH brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of Israel, for he had dealt wantonly in Judah and had been faithless to YHWH. (2 Chr 28:19)

<sup>74</sup> Therefore YHWH brought upon them the commanders of the army of the king of Assyria, who took Manasseh with hooks and bound him with fetters of bronze and brought him to Babylon. (2 Chr 33:11)

<sup>75</sup> 2 Kgs 24:10-16 records a siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the surrender, capture and deportation of Jehoiachin, the Temple and palace treasures, and all but the poorest people of the land.

<sup>76</sup> Jehoiachin reappears in 2 Kgs 25:27-30 as the recipient of kindness by King Evil-merodach of Babylon during his thirty-seventh year of exile.

<sup>77</sup> Known as "Mattaniah" in 2 Kgs 24:17. 2 Chr refers to Zedekiah/Mattaniah as Jehoiakin's "brother" (**xa**) rather than "uncle" (**dwl**) as in 2 Kgs 24:17. Zedekiah is named as a son of Josiah in the Chronicler's genealogy in 1 Chr 3: 15. LXX, Vg and Syr attempt to harmonize this by the translation "brother of his father." However, **xa** has a wider range of meanings than "brother"; it may be used to mean merely "relative" (Dillard, *2 Chronicles* 296).

The Chronicler's brief account<sup>78</sup> of the final days of Judah notes that Zedekiah, just like Jehoiachim and Jehoiachin, "did what was evil in the sight of YHWH his God" (2 Chr 36:12a/2 Kgs 24:19a/Jer 52:2a) and that he failed to humble himself (**[rkd al]**) before YHWH's word spoken by Jeremiah (2 Chr 36:12b/no parallels). He rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar and refused to repent (2 Chr 36:13). Following the lead of their king, the people of Judah mocked and scoffed at the prophets "till the wrath of YHWH rose up against his people, till there was no remedy" (2 Chr 36:15).

The principle established in 1 Chr 10 when Saul died in battle because of his unfaithfulness is fulfilled by the nation in the final defeat by the Chaldeans:

All the leading priests and people likewise were exceedingly unfaithful, following all the abominations of the nations; and they polluted the house of YHWH which he had hallowed in Jerusalem (2 Chr 36:14).

It is for these reasons, rejection of the prophets and Temple, that YHWH "brought up against them the king of the Chaldeans" (2 Chr 36:17). The result is the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple and the deportation of those who escaped the sword (2 Chr 36:17-19).

---

<sup>78</sup> The Chronicler, whose short account summarizes the longer notices of 2 Kgs and Jer, briefly presents the final days of Judah:

	<u>2 Kgs</u>	<u>Jer</u>	<u>2 Chr</u>
Zedekiah's reign	24:18-20	52:1-3	36:11-13a
The Fall of Jerusalem			36:13b-21
Siege of Jerusalem	25:1-12	39:1-10/ 52:4-16	
Temple plundered	25:13-17	52:17-23	
Additional victims	25:18-21	52:24-27	
Gedaliah's Governorship	25: 22-26	40:5-41:3/ 52:28-30	
Jehoiachin's release	25:27-30	52:31-34	

By omitting information concerning details of the siege, the plundering of the Temple, the numbers of captives (Abraham Malamat, "The Twilight of Judah: In the Egyptian-Babylonian Maelstrom," *Congress Volume, Edinburgh, 1974. VTSup* 28 [Leiden: Brill, 1975] 133-4) and Gedaliah's governorship, the Chronicler has compressed the prior histories' longer accounts. Brevity of warfare narratives of defeat are characteristic of the Chronicler; in this case, the lack of detail highlights the reasons for the defeat

An important pattern is observed. The same YHWH who brings victory also brings defeat. He is the God of history who uses nations to bring about His redemptive purposes if His people have sinned. Nothing else matters: not the strength of Judah's armies, not Judah's political alliances, not Judah's arrogant reliance on themselves. Their God will bring them to repentance.

How does the idea of warfare as divine retribution echo in the life of the Church? Perhaps we are looking in the wrong places when we seek to explain for the Church's current combat with the world around her. In ancient days, YHWH caused enemies to rise up and defeat His people when they failed to be what He created and called them to be. Attacks on the Church today are a call to repentance for refusing to be what God created and called us to be.

We would do well to heed the warning. The enemies of the Church are arrayed against her. Seeking alliances with others will do no good. Relying upon our own strength in numbers or finances will not allow us to be victorious. The modern Church is in serious peril because she fails to confess clearly the Son of David as the only access to the only God, undervalues the authority of the prophetic word and has replaced worship with catering to the felt needs of the world. Perhaps both sides of our current civil war need to spend more time on our knees in humiliation and prayer and less time devoted to rhetoric against each other. May God grant us the wisdom to hear and obey His gracious call to repentance before a new Babylonian captivity of the Church comes about!

## Conclusion

Throughout the Chronicler's history, a careful symmetry between victory and defeat is maintained. This symmetry is more than a literary device: it is a theological statement. The warfare narratives, both synoptic and non-synoptic, form an integral part of that symmetry. For example, in the case of Asa, that symmetry is internal to the account. By placing non-synoptic material within the framework of 1 Kgs 15,<sup>79</sup> the Chronicler constructs two parts to Asa's reign.<sup>80</sup>

A symmetrical balance is also obtained between the reigns of individual kings. For

---

<sup>79</sup> The Chronicler uses the basic outline of Asa's reign according to his *Vorlage* but inserts the non-synoptic material of 2 Chr 14:5-15:15 and 16:7-10 to explain these very difficulties. As a result, the reign of Asa is divided into two symmetrical parts. First, the initial part of the reign of faithful Asa is a time of reform, rest, military victory, and prosperity. The second part is the very opposite: Asa, who no longer relies on YHWH, enters into a foreign alliance, has perpetual war, and dies of a foot disease.

That symmetry is seen in the structure of the two accounts:

<u>1 Kgs 15</u>		<u>2 Chr 14-16</u>	
8b	Succession formula	13:23b	Succession formula with report of peace
9-10	Synchronism with North; genealogical report		
11	Theological Review	14:1	Theological review
12	Religious reforms	14:2-4	Religious reforms
		14:5-6	Report of building
		14:7	Statement about Asa's
		14:8-14	War with Zerah
		15:1-7	Report of a prophetic
		15:8-15	Report of reforms and covenant celebration
13-15	Further religious reforms	15:16-19	Further religious
16-22	War with Baasha	16:1-6	War with Baasha
		16:7-10	Report of a prophetic
23-24	Regnal Resumé	16:11-14	Regnal Resumé

By inserting 14:5-15:15, the Chronicler associates with faithful Asa the prosperity, peace, victory, and religious fidelity which are the lot of a faithful king. This is balanced precisely by the insertion of 16:7-10 between the war of unfaithful Asa with Baasha, which explains both the perpetual wars of Asa and his disease, and the resumé.

<sup>80</sup> A similar balance was seen within the Chronicler's arrangement of the synoptic accounts of the reigns of Rehoboam (2 Chr 11-12//1 Kgs 12-14), Jehoram (2 Chr 21//2 Kgs 8:20-22), Joash (2 Chr 24//2 Kgs 12), Amaziah (2 Chr 25//1 Kgs 14), Uzziah (2 Chr 26//2 Kgs 14), Josiah (2 Chr 34-35//2 Kgs 22-23), and Manasseh (2 Chr 33//2 Kgs 21).

example, the son of Solomon, Rehoboam, was a military disaster but was balanced by the military success of his son Abijah. These patterns are repeated throughout the Chronicler's history.<sup>81</sup>

For the Chronicler, such a balance was necessary. Warfare must be explained whether that warfare ends in victory or defeat. A faithful king will be victorious, either consistently or during that part of his reign in which he is faithful. An unfaithful king will meet defeat; that defeat, however, can be either averted or reversed through repentance.

Yet there is more to this symmetry than merely explaining what the Chronicler found in his sources. A pattern is established which speaks to the Chronicler's own community. Each generation determines its own fate in the affairs of nations. The people need only be faithful to YHWH and his three institutions: they must look for the Davidic king, they must be loyal to the Jerusalem Temple, and they must listen to and obey his prophets. The fact that the Chronicler's Judah was not a world power did not preclude its potential for again becoming one any more than, for example, Ahaz's failure precluded Hezekiah's success. History is cyclical. Where one generation finds itself is dependent on its own relationship to YHWH through his institutions.

What does this mean for the Church? Can we hear its echo in her life? The history of

---

<sup>81</sup> The reigns of Asa and his son Jehoshaphat are likewise balanced by an intricate interweaving of synoptic and non-synoptic material. The same literary symmetry was seen in the Chronicler's synoptic arrangement of the reigns of Saul and David. The pattern continues throughout the Chronicler's history of Judah. Jehoram (2 Chr 21), a cultically unfaithful king, loses territories to the east and south--precisely the areas in which cultically faithful Asa and Jehoshaphat had been successful. Uzziah (2 Chr 26), in the initial phase of his reign, is successful militarily, in contrast to the defeat by Israel at the close of his father Amaziah's reign (2 Chr 25). Jotham (2 Chr 27) is successful in war; his son Ahaz (2 Chr 28) meets defeat at the hands of Syria, Israel, Edom, Philistia and Assyria. The disaster of Ahaz is then balanced by the cultically pure Hezekiah (2 Chr 29-32), for whom YHWH sends an angel to fight. Military defeat is ascribed to Hezekiah's son Manasseh (2 Chr 33:1-20), whose own son Amon (2 Chr 33:21-25) is cultically unfaithful. Josiah, though a religious reformer, fails to hear the word of YHWH through Necho and dies in battle (2 Chr 34-35) and is succeeded by a series of kings who are both evil and defeated in war (2 Chr 36).

the Church is not unlike that of ancient Israel. Periods of faithfulness have been followed by periods of unfaithfulness as God recalled and renewed His people. Even in her darkest days, the Church, like ancient Israel, has had a remnant. The symmetry continues from times past and will continue into the future.

Neither the past nor the present can prevent the Church from embracing the future. Perhaps we rely too much on conventions and political machinations to solve the Church's conflicts. Some seem to expect another Luther to rise up and reform the Church. Such a reformer has taken on an almost messianic character for some. This expectation misses a major point. The one and only Messiah has already come, remains with His Church on earth though He has ascended to the right hand of the Father, and will come again, finally ending the Church's warfare. No other messianic figure has existed, does exist or ever will exist.

Still others seek to find a way for differing theologies to co-exist in peace. Reconcilers are trained in the latest secular or American evangelical methodologies and all too often the goal is reconciled diversity. But let me be clear: truth can never be reconciled with error. True reconciliation can only occur when separated and warring brothers, all reconciled to God through the Blood of Christ, are brought to the same confession of the same faith.

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Church looks in every direction for solutions. But the only solution is already present in Christ. He is the Son of David. He is greater than the Temple and is the great and final sacrifice. He is the ultimate author of the prophetic word. He alone can bring rest to His war-weary Church and heal her self-inflicted wounds.

Ancient Israel found restoration through repentance; so the 21<sup>st</sup> century Church also

will find restoration. Under our great and final David, there is to be neither civil war nor defeat at the hands of the enemies of the Church. When these things happen as they do in these dark days, they are evidences of our failure and of God's amazingly gracious call to repentance. The attacks of those without and the confusion of warring brothers and sisters within, however, call us to remember that God is gracious and that ultimately there will be victory for the people of God. That victory is assured because YHWH has already fought for his people. We need only watch and see that the battle is the Lord's (1 Sam 17:47). There can be no doubt about the final outcome because an empty tomb stands in witness to YHWH's victory. On this side of the eschaton, warfare will always continue. On the other side of the eschaton, however, there will be no more war. The victory of Easter will be manifested. Even so, come Lord Jesus.

The Reverend Daniel L. Gard, Ph.D.  
Concordia Theological Seminary  
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Week of Epiphany II, 2004

Appendix 1  
Kings and Cult

The fortunes of war are directly linked to the cultic fidelity of king and people:

<u>King</u>	<u>Warfare Narrative</u>	<u>C's Evaluation of Cult</u>	<u>Enemy</u>	<u>Result in Chr (Victory/Defeat)</u>
Saul	1 Chr 10// 1 Sam 31	Unfavorable	Philistines	Defeat
David	1 Chr 11-29	Favorable	Various	Victory
Rehoboam	2 Chr 11// 1 Kgs 12	Neutral	Israel	Peace, cultic fidelity
Rehoboam	2 Chr 12// 1 Kgs 14	Unfavorable	Shishak	Partial defeat, temple defiled
Abijah	2 Chr 13	Favorable	Israel	Victory
Asa	2 Chr 14-15	Favorable	None	Peace
Asa	2 Chr 16	Unfavorable	Unnamed	Constant wars
Jehoshaphat	2 Chr 17	Favorable	None	Peace
Jehoshaphat	2 Chr 18// 1 Kgs 22	Neutral	Syria	Defeat
Jehoshaphat	2 Chr 19-20	Favorable	Coalition	Victory
Jehoram	2 Chr 21// 2 Kgs 8	Unfavorable	Edom, Libnah	Revolt
Jehoram	2 Chr 21	Unfavorable	Philistines, Arabs	Defeat
Ahaziah	2 Chr 22// 2 Kgs 8	Unfavorable	Syria	Defeat
Ahaziah	2 Chr 22//	Unfavorable	Jehu	Defeat

Gard

	2 Kgs 8			
Amaziah	2 Chr 25// 2 Kgs 14	Favorable	Edom	Victory
Joash	2 Chr 24// 2 Kgs 11	Favorable	None	Peace
Joash	2 Chr 24// 2 Kgs 11	Unfavorable	Syria	Defeat
Amaziah	2 Chr 25// 2 Kgs 14	Unfavorable	Israel	Defeat
Uzziah	2 Chr 26// 2 Kgs 15	Favorable	Phil- istines, Arabs, Meunites	Victory
Jotham	2 Chr 27// 2 Kgs 15	Favorable	Ammon	Victory
Ahaz	2 Chr 28// 2 Kgs 16	Unfavorable	Syria, Israel	Defeat
Ahaz	2 Chr 28// 2 Kgs 16	Unfavorable	Edom, Phil- istines, Assyria	Defeat
Hezekiah	2 Chr 18// 2 Kgs 18	Favorable	Assyria	Victory
Manasseh	2 Chr 33// 2 Kgs 21	Unfavorable	Assyria	Defeat
Josiah	2 Chr 35// 2 Kgs 23	Favorable	Egypt	Defeat

## Appendix 2

## Prophets

2 Chr 13-20 abounds with prophets, only one of which is found in the *Vorlage* (Micaiah). Every prophet, except for one (Eliezer), is directly tied to the events of the warfare narratives; even Eliezer's prophecy, however, is ultimately fulfilled in the warfare narrative of Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram (2 Chr 21// 2 Kgs 8).

Some are non-synoptic prophets who speak favorably to Judah prior to battle (Abijah the king, 13:4-12; Azariah, 14:1-7; Jahaziel, 20:14-17). Two non-synoptic prophets rebuke kings after battle when alliances were formed: Hanani to Asa (16:7-9) and Jehu to Jehoshaphat (19:1-3). One prophet who delivered a pre-battle message of condemnation is taken substantially from C's *Vorlage*: Micaiah (2 Chr 18//1 Kgs 22). One non-synoptic prophet, Eliezer, condemns Jehoshaphat (20:37) but the fulfillment in war does not come until the reign of Jehoram.

<u>Non-Synoptic Battle Prophet</u>	<u>Judahite King</u>	<u>Enemy</u>	<u>Text</u>	<u>Character of the Message</u>
Abijah	Abijah	Israel	13:4-12	Pre-battle Encouragement
Azariah	Asa	Zerah	14:1-7	Pre-battle Encouragement
Hanani	Asa	Baasha	16:7-9	Post-battle Rebuke
Jehu	Jehoshaphat	Syria	19:1-3	Post-battle Rebuke
Jahaziel	Jehoshaphat	Jahaziel	20:14-17	Pre-battle Encouragement

Synoptic <u>Battle Prophet</u> Micaiah	Judahite <u>King</u> Jehoshaphat	<u>Enemy</u> Syria	<u>Text</u> 18:12-27	<u>Character of the Message</u> Pre-battle Condemnation
--	--	-----------------------	-------------------------	---

Non-Synoptic <u>Prophet</u> Eliezer	Judahite <u>King</u> Jehoshaphat	<u>Setting</u> Ship building	<u>Text</u> 20:37	<u>Character of the Message</u> Rebuke
---	--	---------------------------------	----------------------	---

A similar use of prophetic messages is found in the Chronicler's adaptation of synoptic prophets or addition of non-synoptic in other warfare narratives:

Synoptic <u>Battle Prophet</u> Shemaiah	Judahite <u>King</u> Rehoboam	Synoptic <u>Enemy</u> Israel	<u>Text</u> 2 Chr 11:2-4// 1 Kgs 12:22-24	<u>Character of the Message</u> Rebuke
---	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---	---

Non-synoptic <u>Battle Prophet</u> Shemaiah	Judahite <u>King</u> Rehoboam	Synoptic <u>Enemy</u> Shishak	<u>Text</u> 12:5-8	<u>Character of the Message</u> Pre-battle condemnation mitigate by repentance
---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------	--

Zechariah	Joash	Syria	24:20-22	Pre-battle condemnation
-----------	-------	-------	----------	----------------------------

Man of God (unnamed)	Amaziah	Edom	25:7-10	Pre-battle consultation
-------------------------	---------	------	---------	----------------------------

Prophet (unnamed)	Amaziah	Israel	25:15-16	Pre-battle condemnation
----------------------	---------	--------	----------	----------------------------

Oded	Ahaz	Syria/ Israel	28:8-15	Post-battle explanation of defeat
------	------	------------------	---------	---

Gard

Necho of Egypt

Josiah

Egypt

35:21-22

Pre-battle  
warning

Non-synoptic  
Battle Prophet  
Elijah

Judahite  
King  
Jehoram

Non-synoptic  
Enemy  
Philistines and  
Arabs

Character  
Text  
21:12-15

of the Message  
Pre-battle  
condemnation

## Appendix 3

## Divine Retribution

<u>King</u>	<u>Warfare Narrative</u>	<u>Enemy</u>	<u>Attribution of Defeat</u>
Rehoboam	2 Chr 12	Shishak	12:2b Unfaithfulness to YHWH 12:5 Abandonment by YHWH because of abandonment by Rehoboam 12:7 Mitigation of defeat "I will not destroy...."
Asa	2 Chr 16	Unnamed	16:9 Prophetic rebuke after alliance with Syria
Jehoram	2 Chr 21	Philistines	21:16 YHWH stirred up the enemy Arabs
Ahaziah	2 Chr 22	Jehu	22:7 Ordained of God because of alliance with Joram
Joash	2 Chr 24	Syria	24:24 YHWH delivered them because they had forsaken YHWH
Amaziah	2 Chr 25	Israel	25:16 God determined to destroy Amaziah
Ahaz	2 Chr 28 Israel	Syria;	28:5 God gave him into the enemies hands
Ahaz	2 Chr 28	Assyria; Edom; Philistines	28:19 YHWH brought Judah low because of unfaithfulness
Manasseh	2 Chr 33	Assyria	33:11 YHWH brought the enemy

Gard