

4

## Judaism on Violence and Reconciliation: An Examination of Key Sources

*Reuven Firestone*

Christians have sometimes claimed that Judaism is a violent religion and the God of Israel is a violent God. The accusation tends to be made in relation to Christianity as a religion of peace and the God of Christianity as expressing only love.<sup>1</sup> As a student of religion in general as well as Judaism in particular, I must admit that I know of no criteria through which one can judge a religion as violent or merciful, cruel or compassionate, just or perverse. Such judgments of religion tend to be made on the basis of only a few, carefully chosen scriptural sources.

Then again, some Jewish scriptural sources certainly seem incriminating. God is even named explicitly in the famous “Song of the Sea” as the God of war: “YHW<sup>2</sup> is a man of war; YHW is His name” (Ex. 15:3).<sup>3</sup>

Some scriptural texts boast that the Israelites destroyed every man, woman, and child of enemy communities that they encountered. In Deuteronomy 3:3–6, for example, we read: “So the Lord our God also delivered into our power King Og of Bashan, with all his men, and we dealt them such a blow that no survivor was left . . . we captured all his towns; there was not a town that we did not take from them: sixty towns. . . . We doomed them as we had done in the case of King Sihon of Heshbon; we doomed every town—men, women, and children—and retained as booty all the cattle and the spoil.”

God himself is depicted in Deuteronomy as commanding the Israelites to commit genocide against the Canaanites (Deut. 7: 1–2): “When Adonai your God brings you to the land that you are about to enter and possess, and He dislodges many nations before you—Hittites, Girgashites, Amorites . . . seven nations much larger than you—and Adonai your God delivers them to you and you defeat them, you must doom them to total destruction; grant them no terms and show them no mercy.”

These difficult verses have been explained in a variety of ways to lessen their horror. Some attempts to make sense of them are nothing more than apologetics. Some explanations, however, have real substance. Perhaps the most revealing is the very act of placing the text in its rhetorical context. Take this citation about genocide against the Canaanites, for example. A famous rabbinic admonition is said to have been uttered by a Talmudic sage in a different context when engaged in an argument over the meaning of a biblical text. The sage, a woman named Beruria, is cited as saying “Shatya! Shefeyl leseyfa!” which means, “Fool, read to the end of the passage!” (Berakhot 10a). In the Deuteronomy passage just cited, the very next verse after our command to annihilate the Canaanites reads: “. . . and don’t marry them!” If God’s command had been annihilation there would have been no reason for the admonition not to intermarry with them, an observation that seems to fit what we know of the historical context of Deuteronomy. In seventh century B.C.E. Judah, where this text most likely emerged, Israelite religious culture was seriously threatened by the cultural and material superiority of the Canaanites. Rhetorically, therefore, the text at hand seems to read back into an earlier period of history, some five or six centuries before, when Israel was understood to have engaged in a “conquest” of the Land of Canaan.<sup>4</sup> The message therefore seems to have been that since Israel *should* have annihilated its Canaanite enemies but did not, it should most certainly not intermarry with them.

Contextualization is complex and is not always accurate. Indeed, it can be quite confusing and there remains disagreement among biblical scholars over the context of Deuteronomy. But as a colleague of mine is fond of saying, “My job is to complexify the situation!” First we shall complexify a bit. Then, I hope, we shall clarify.

Most readers do not resonate with these difficult verses. Another set of biblical messages is generally cited and preferred by bibli-cists, and clearly, verses teaching peace and reconciliation are also a part of the biblical tradition. Psalm 34, for example, which is recited in daily Jewish prayers, teaches a radically different approach from what we have just heard. The Psalmist writes: "Come, my children, listen to me; I will teach you what it is to be in awe of the Lord. Who is one who lusts for life, who desires (long) years of good fortune? Guard your tongue from evil, your lips from deceitful speech. Shun evil and do good. Seek shalom and pursue it" (Ps. 34:12–15).

This is indeed a lovely verse. It should be noted here that bibli-cal scholars and linguists of ancient Hebrew generally do not consider the word *shalom* in this context to mean peace as cessation from war. They tend to use a word such as *amity* or *friendship*.<sup>5</sup> This verse may have intended to teach that reconciliation is one of the highest expressions of love for God.

Somewhat different, the famous verses from Isaiah 11 express deep longing for a safe world: "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard lie down with the kid. The calf, the beast of prey shall feed together, with a little boy to herd them. The cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together; and the lion, like the ox, shall eat straw. A babe shall play over a viper's hole, and an infant pass his hand over an adder's den. In all of My sacred mount nothing evil or vile shall be done; for the earth shall be filled with devotion to the Lord as water covers the sea" (Isaiah 11:6–9).

But the method expressed in this passage for achieving safety might be objectionable. In this case we need to read the previous verse, which informs us of the means for achieving such safety: "[God] shall strike down the land with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips." While it is true it is God and not humans who are engaging in the violence and killing, the passage is problematic from the perspectives of both ethics and theology.

Perhaps the most often-cited classic verses on reconciliation and peacemaking are the parallel statements in Isaiah and Micah that express longing for a future when all peoples will be unified under one God, and the nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not take up sword against nation. They shall never again know war."<sup>6</sup> This message not

only sounds like a wonderful poetic plea for a peaceful world, but it is said twice, suggesting its deep and lasting importance in the biblical worldview. But if we shift to the prophet Joel (4:9–10), we observe a different use of the same idiom: "Proclaim this among the nations: Prepare for battle! Arouse the warriors! Let all the fighters come and draw near! Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears."

It is extremely difficult in scriptural texts to separate metaphor from law and image from reality, and I should add here that this is a problem in every scripture of every religion. In the Hebrew Bible, it seems as if God represents peace and reconciliation one moment, while in the next, God represents violence and war. The Hebrew Bible may not be the best source for finding an unambiguous and commanding divine authority requiring acts of reconciliation and forbidding war as a means of response to conflict between peoples.

It would seem, therefore, that Judaism does not provide a positive role model for what we are seeking to accomplish in a conference the purpose of which is to move beyond violence. We might wish the Hebrew Bible to be consistent about peace and the elimination of violence, but we are confronted with the (sometimes) ugly problem of reality. Historically, the Hebrew Bible emerged out of a real-life environment in which there was no universal legal system for arbitrating disputes and aggression. Violence between peoples was a common and normal fact of life. All the evidence suggests that at least at certain times, the biblical people of Israel had to fight, perhaps even to the death, simply in order to survive as a distinct religious community. Fighting is therefore required at times in the Hebrew Bible because the alternative was perceived as destruction and therefore the inability to carry out the divine will.

But the Hebrew Bible is not Judaism, and Judaism is not the Hebrew Bible. In fact, what we generally call Judaism today is referred to by scholars of religion as *rabbinic* Judaism—the Judaism of the rabbis.

Rabbinic Judaism did not appear until after the period of the Bible. It emerged out of the ashes of the destroyed Jerusalem Temple, the center of biblical Judaism and the symbol of God's power and might. Current scholarship has noted the many parallels between

the emergence of rabbinic Judaism and emerging Christianity, both of which grew up in an intellectual and religious environment that combined the great civilizations of the biblical and Greco-Roman worlds.<sup>7</sup>

The great compendium of rabbinic Jewish literature is the Talmud,<sup>8</sup> commonly referred to by rabbinic Jews (that is, virtually the entire Jewish world today) as the "oral Torah." Many outsiders are unaware that for Judaism, the oral Torah parallels in sanctity and importance the written Torah that Jews also call the Hebrew Bible and that Christians know as the Old Testament. Representations of God and the role of humanity found in the Talmud tend to be more consistently quietist, though not pacifist, and exactly as in the case of Christianity, there is a cogent historical reason for this. Both Christianity and rabbinic Judaism emerged after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. They materialized as politically and militarily powerless religious/spiritual movements in a world that was under the complete control of the Roman Empire.

While God appears in the Hebrew Bible as a national hero or hero-emperor that saves the nation on the field of battle, rabbinic depictions contrast God with the image of the national hero current at that time.<sup>9</sup>

The strength of a national hero at the age of 40 is not like what he has at age 50, nor is his strength at 50 like what he has at age 60, nor is it of 60 like 70, for the older he gets the more his strength decreases. But this is not so with the One-Who-Spoke-And-The-World-Came-Into-Being. Rather, "I am the Lord, I do not change" (Malakhi 3:6) . . . When the arrow leaves the hand of a national hero he cannot call it back. Not so the Holy One. Rather, when Israel goes against His will, He issues an edict, as it were, as it is written (Deut. 32:43) "My sword is lightning."<sup>10</sup> When they repent, He immediately withdraws it, as it is written (ibid.), "My hand holds onto judgment." When a human king goes to war and nearby provinces come to him petitioning him for their needs, they are told: "He is troubled; he is going to war. When he is victorious in war and returns, then you can come back and petition your needs from him." But the Holy One is not so. Rather, "YHV is a man of war" when he wars against Egypt, and "YHV is His name" when he hears the cry of all humankind, as it is written (Ps. 65:3): "You are the Hearer of prayer whenever anyone comes [and petitions You]."<sup>11</sup>

The greatness of God is contrasted in this text with what only appears as the strength of a human hero. This is exemplified by the old rabbinic legend of the death of the Roman Emperor Titus, the general that destroyed Jerusalem. God appoints the smallest creation, a gnat, to enter through the nose of the great Caesar to imbed itself into his brain and kill him.<sup>12</sup>

It is quite true that in this story of the gnat, vengeance against the destroyer of Jerusalem is at issue. In fact, God is portrayed repeatedly in rabbinic literature as one who would eventually avenge the enemies of Israel, a clear parallel with biblical theologies. But these representations do not occur in "real time." God's vengeance on behalf of Israel is fantasy and occurs in some vague future. The stories are carefully constructed so as not to appear as if Jews themselves can take up arms against their enemies as had the great warrior chiefs known in the Bible as the Judges, or the warrior kings of Israel such as David.

In the Talmud, the countless biblical references to Israel's seemingly ubiquitous sacred wars fought with God, by God, and always for God, are melted down into one paragraph, which, given the Talmudic rhetorical tendency, is an extraordinary feat. Because of the particular nature of the Talmud, there is a visual and chronological break between two parts in the tractate called *Sota*, but they are constructed as one.

In Mishnah *Sota* 8:7, dated to approximately 200 C.E., a long discussion can be found that treats the military deferments listed in the Bible in Deuteronomy 20. The very last paragraph of the discussion ends with: "To what does all the above refer? To discretionary wars, but everyone must go out [to fight] in commanded wars, even a bridegroom from his chamber and a bride from her wedding canopy."

The discussion continues in the second part of the Talmud, called the Gemara and redacted some two or more centuries after the Mishnah. The Gemara continues the discussion as a commentary on the Mishnah sentence "To what does all the above refer?"

Raba said: The wars of Joshua to conquer [Canaan] were considered required (or commanded) according to everybody. The wars of the House of David for territorial expansion were considered discretionary according to everybody. Where they differ is with regard to [preemptive wars to] reduce the number of idolaters so that they

would not march against them. One calls these commanded, while the other calls them discretionary. What is the conclusion [from this difference of opinion]? Whoever is engaged in the performance of a divine commandment is exempt from the performance of another divine commandment.<sup>13</sup>

In this remarkable passage, the rabbinic authorities (and it is clear that this can be safely considered the consensus of the rabbis) catalogued the extraordinarily varied and complex biblical expressions of war into two simple categories. They then put them in the deep freeze. First, in the Mishnah they applied a simple taxonomy of A/B: divinely commanded wars (which we would call “holy war” in our language) and discretionary wars. Only centuries later in the Gemara did they feel the need to supply an example of each type and a third category. They could have done much more, and indeed did “complexify” a huge number of other less pronounced biblical institutions. But war they seem desperately to have wished to leave alone.

Why they did so appears simple enough: too dangerous. It was too terribly dangerous for a community with no hope of gaining power over its enemies in “real time” to contemplate actually going to war. It was too terrifying to contemplate another war after two famously futile and disastrous attempts to rebel against Rome—acts that were determined by most of the survivors in retrospect to have been foolhardy fantasies resulting in death and destruction that could find precedent only in the prophetic laments over the bloody massacres perpetrated in the Babylonian destruction of the first Jerusalem Temple.

As a result of this rabbinic consensus in combination with the *realpolitik* of Jewish history, Judaism remained a quietist religious civilization from the end of the second century onward for nearly two thousand years. Judaism has had quite a consistent record. The rabbis’ exegetical management of scripture succeeded in keeping divinely sanctioned war out of the repertoire of rabbinic Judaism aside from the realm of fantasy.

There are exceptions to every rule, and some Jewish expressions did indeed include a militaristic-messianic component, but these were not mainstream, and almost always not rabbinic forms of Judaism. The military exploits of Abu Isa al-Isfahani and the Isawiyya movement, for example, were exceptions and quite rare.<sup>14</sup>

Messianism is indeed a central element of rabbinic Judaism, but Jewish messianism tended to be seen as an imminent yet future phenomenon that could not be activated by human volition, and certainly not through militarism. This point is best exemplified by the famous interpretation of the biblical *Song of Songs* found in the Talmudic tractate *Ketubot*. The key phrase is “do not wake or rouse love until it is wished.” “Waking or rousing love” is a code for the rabbis of the Talmud to refer to engaging in acts of Jewish political and military self-determination. “Until it is wished” refers to the indecipherable time when God will decide to send the messiah. According to this authoritative rabbinic interpretation, Jews are forbidden to attempt to gain sovereignty through their own actions. God will decide when it is right to send the redemptive messiah, a messiah who will redeem the Jews from the pain and suffering of exile and bring the Jewish people back to their land, the Land of Israel.

To summarize, biblical Judaism appears to have quite a bloody military record. Rabbinic Judaism has virtually none. Simple historical contextualization suggests a simple and logical reason for this great about-face in Judaism. Rabbinic Judaism remained quietist and innocent because it was rendered absolutely incapable of being militant. Today, as a whole, Jews appear to be no less and no more militant religionists than Muslims or Christians. Historically and until only recently, Jews simply could not engage effectively in militant activism.

While today Muslims are perceived and condemned in the West as the most problematic among the three Abrahamic religions on the scale of violence and warring, Professor Fathi Osman has written elsewhere in this volume a persuasive chapter discussing the issues behind this perception. I wish only to add that Islam, like biblical Judaism, emerged out of an environment in which it was required to fight in order to survive.<sup>15</sup> Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity, on the other hand, emerged out of an environment in which they were required to *refrain* from fighting in order to survive.

From the perspective of the academic study of religion and war, one of the most interesting phenomena to observe is the success of certain Christian religious thinkers, after Christianity’s spectacular accession to political and military power in the fourth century,

in subverting the mostly quietist material of the New Testament in order to justify Christian militarism.<sup>16</sup> My purpose here, however, is to discuss and critique Judaism rather than Islam and Christianity, and I will conclude with an examination of the way in which *Jewish* religious thinkers were able to subvert the largely quietist and antimilitant material of the Talmud in order to justify modern Jewish militarism.

Jews and Judaism lived mostly unempowered and quietist for nearly two thousand years. Without a this-worldly protective power, the deepest piety could not protect the Jews from the will and the willfulness of the powers under which they lived. The one and only time that a community of Jews attained actual self-rule since the Roman destruction of the Jerusalem Temple is the present time in the Jewish state of Israel.

The modern nation-state of Israel is a product of a nexus of forces: historical, political, secular, and religious.<sup>17</sup> Its real founders were secular, not religious, Jews,<sup>18</sup> who did not consider themselves bound by either the Bible or the Talmud. A few Orthodox Jews followed along, but they were not the fathers and mothers of modern Israel. However, once they considered themselves and were considered by the state to be its citizens, they needed to decide whether they could break the 1,900-year ban on the military. There was a great need for their participation in the Israeli army, and there was a great desire among many of them to participate in it.

Even after the establishment of the state, the issue was hardly debated in the small Orthodox Jewish community of Israel. Some Orthodox Jews agreed to join the Israeli forces. Most did not. But something happened after the June 1967 war that signaled a paradigm shift for traditional Jews throughout the world. Whatever the actual intent behind Egyptian president Nasser's very public threats to destroy Israel in May 1967 and massacre its Jewish citizens only two decades after the Holocaust, the Jewish world was terrified that it would actually happen. Communal fasting was called for in the ultra-Orthodox communities. Some wore sackcloth and ashes. The entire Jewish world trembled. And then "redemption" came.

Miraculously, all would say, the Israeli air force destroyed the combined air forces of all five belligerent nations on Israel's borders. And in six days, Israel not only doubled its territory—and this is a key

issue—but it captured almost all the villages, cities, and valleys that are mentioned in the Bible. Prior to 1967, Israel was confined largely to the area of ancient Philistia and had little physical connection with the ancient Israelite lands of the Bible. In six days, it regained its biblical patrimony.

All considered it miraculous. But many in the traditional Jewish world believed beyond the idiom. They considered it truly a divine miracle. Was this God rousing the divine love? Was the Holocaust destined to be the last of the great sufferings of the Jewish people? Many considered this to be the case. The 1967 June War became a watershed that, for the first time, enabled the religious Orthodox Jewish world to become outwardly supportive of Zionism—Jewish nationalism. Its impact was immediate, as can be witnessed by the lead article in the main mouthpiece of the community of Orthodox religious nationalists living in Israel.

Everyone who reads the newspapers today, everyone who listens today to the radio . . . is witness to the powerful eruption of faith in the Rock of Israel and its Redeemer. . . . Rabbi Shelomo Goren,<sup>19</sup> the "anointed [priest] of battle"<sup>20</sup> who went before his armies in the conquest of the city of Gaza, who burst into the Ancient City [of Jerusalem] with a Torah scroll in his hand while the bullets were still splitting the air, who announced the good news of the redemption of the Land of Israel with a blast of the shofar. . . . And none of the enemy could stand against them (the Israel Defense Forces). All of their enemies [God] put in their hand. Not one of all the good words that God had spoken to the Children of Israel has failed. Everything is coming to be! And so all the human accounting over the State of Israel according to its 1948 borders has been demolished. Indeed, we have succeeded, but not by our own merit, to witness another stage on the way to Redemption. The way to true Redemption—and not merely the "Beginnings of Redemption." Indeed, every single thing that was written about the words of our prophets is true and enduring, and everything that has not come about by our day will come about before our eyes, before the eyes of all Israel. On the condition: if we are fitting for it "today if you will heed My voice."<sup>21</sup> The Land of Israel is Ours<sup>22</sup> And if we consider all the events [of the past weeks] as revelation of the will of God, then we are not free to return even one handful of land, for we have a legal promissory document regarding it in the Torah and [books of] the Prophets. . . . It was not only

the Israel Defense Forces that established the State and not only the conquerors of Canaan that prepared the way. . . . "For You have given us power to succeed greatly."<sup>23</sup> . . . We have merited living in this epoch in which God has returned to His people and has fulfilled His word, redeeming His people from the hand of those who are stronger. And He will redeem us again before the eyes of all the living, to be our God. And our eyes have seen it!<sup>24</sup>

The writer of these words was neither violent nor militant. Nor were most of his readers, though over the years many of their children did become increasingly militant over what they considered the divine promise of the land. Articles and analyses followed in newspapers, magazines, religious journals, and journals of Jewish religious law. Deeply religious people tried to make sense of the miracle in theological terms and then drew the necessary policy conclusions. There was no single answer, and there continues to be much discussion and debate even today in the Orthodox world. It is important to understand that militant neomessianism is not the only view among Israeli Jews. In fact, it is a minority view, but the power of neomessianism extends far beyond the nationalist Orthodox communities, both within and outside the borders of the State of Israel. As you can imagine, it resonates deeply, especially among the religious and observant. Although not by any means a universal position, even among the Orthodox, a general consensus has long been reached by a highly invigorated sector of the Orthodox religious nationalist establishment.

According to this line of thinking, the 1967 June War (and in retrospect, also the 1948 War of Independence) proves that the gift of enabling the Israeli army's conquest of Israel's biblical patrimony is God's one and only offer to the Jewish people to fulfill the divine promise of Redemption. The result is a new test. The people of Israel will be redeemed now only if they demonstrate their love of God by obeying the divine command: the command of reconquest. To those who believe this, their engagement in violence against Palestinians is not random or cynical acts of human violence. It is part of *milchemet mitzvah*—divinely commanded war as learned from the Bible and Talmud—and it has cosmic significance. Success will bring no less than divine redemption. But failure will bring on God's anger and yet another destruction.

What has been narrated here is the story of a religious civilization's transition from a position of relative power to powerlessness, and then a return to relative power. From the standpoint of the student of religion, the story is a fascinating example of how scriptural interpretation responds to the realities of history. Like all scriptures, the Hebrew Bible consists of a wide variety of texts that can be rallied to support a range of positions on many subjects. Interpretive political conclusions can and have ranged from radical militancy to radical quietism.

But from the standpoint of the religious person—not the academic—the story raises very difficult questions about religion. Is everything relative in religion? Even the taking of human life? Does this mean that we must abandon religion altogether in order to be ethical?

Are we as human beings, whether religious or not, destined to abandon nonviolent means of solving pressing political problems the moment we possess power? And are we destined to become a target when we do possess some power?

Despite the range of texts and interpretations on the issue, there is one ultimate message, according to Judaism, that God teaches about war and peace. That message is always "seek peace (or amity) and pursue it." But Judaism recognizes the need to balance between ultimate and competing goods. The need to balance results in a certain relativization of the ultimate requirement of peace. This is both a weakness and a strength in the Jewish way of doing business. It makes arriving at single ultimate and universal conclusions almost impossible. It forces a distinct and individual evaluation of every situation. It tends to "complexify" issues, recognizing that, because life is not simple, our responses to the vicissitudes of life must not be simple either.

There always remains the possibility of error. There is always the option of retreat from responsibility. Judaism recognizes that human error and human nature may render a wrong decision. It nevertheless requires that humans take responsibility to struggle with difficult issues and be accountable for the results of human action.

The story of Jacob struggling with the angel, or according to some, metaphorically, with God herself, reflects this view. Jacob's name, according to the Bible, was changed to Israel as a result of his

struggle, and the new name of Israel became the official name for the Jewish people. In the very midst of the struggle, the divine being says to Jacob: "Your name will no longer be Jacob, but rather *Yisra' El* [he struggles with God], because you struggled with God and with humans and you have prevailed."<sup>25</sup>

The greatest struggle for Jews today is reflected in the moral challenge set before us all, Jew and non-Jew alike, in the twenty-first century. It is easy to cry out for peace and justice when excluded from authority. The real challenge is this: when we are in a position of power, can we carry out the vision of peace?

#### NOTES

1. "Judaism" in this simplistic binary equation usually means the militant expressions of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. Marcion seems to be the source of the wrath/love dichotomy (see G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995], 207–21). Although Marcion's official stance regarding the total rejection of the Hebrew Bible was not accepted by establishment Christianity, his binary sentiments have remained in various forms and expressions of Christianity to the present. (I am grateful to Professor Mary C. Boys for our e-mail conversation on this topic.)

2. Out of respect and awe associated with the name of God in Jewish tradition, the actual Hebrew four-letter name, sometime referred to as the tetragrammaton and written throughout Jewish Scripture, is neither casually written out nor articulated orally. A number of conventions may be used as a substitute. "YHW" is one of these. Although I take responsibility for all translations here, I am guided by the New Jewish Publication Society translation.

3. And God has his armies (Ex. 12:41, 7:4; 1Sam. 17:26, etc.). The epithet "Lord of Hosts" is found in the Hebrew Bible 246 times.

4. R. Firestone, "Conceptions of Holy War in Biblical and Qur'anic Tradition," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 24 (1996): 801–24.

5. Jewish Publication Society, 1985.

6. Isaiah 2:4, Micah 4:3.

7. James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (New York: Atheneum, 1979); John Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Oxford, 1985); Marcel Simon, *Versus Israel* (London: Littman Library, 1996); Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999).

8. The authoritative Rabbinic literature transcends the bounded texts of what is officially named "The Talmud," and includes the genre known as Midrash.

9. E. Urbach, *The Sages*, 89–90.

10. Or, "when my sword is wet. . ."

11. *Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalah, Shira*.

12. BR 10:7; ARN (2) 7; Urbach, *The Sages*, 92; and Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. 5, 60 n.191. Similar gnat legends turn up in different guises also in Christian and Muslim literatures.

13. *Sota* 44b.

14. Steven Wasserstrom, *Between Muslim and Jew* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 68–82.

15. Reuven Firestone, *Jihad: The Origin of Holy War in Islam* (New York: Oxford, 1999), 9–41.

16. But not entirely quietist. See Stroumsa article.

17. Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea* (New York: Atheneum, 1971), 15–100; Israel Bartal, "Responses to Modernity: Haskalah, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism in Eastern Europe," in Shmuel Almog, Jehuda Reinharz, and Anita Shapira, eds., *Zionism and Religion* (Hanover, N.H.: Brandeis University Press, 1998), 13–24; Zalman Abramov, *Perpetual Dilemma* (Jerusalem: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1976), 55–81.

18. Ehud Luz, *Parallels Meet: Religion and Nationalism in the Early Zionist Movement* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1988).

19. The chief rabbi and chaplain of the Israeli armed forces at the time, and later the Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi of the State of Israel.

20. Mishnah *Sotah* 8:1, Deuteronomy 20:2.

21. Cf. *Shir Rabbah* 5:2, *Pesiqta deRav Kahana* 24:12, *Midrash Tehillim* 95:2, Psalm 95:7, probably with a typo and not intentional.

22. This is a section title in the article.

23. Cf. Deuteronomy 8:18.

24. *Amudim* 256 (June 1967), mouthpiece of the Orthodox Religious Kibbutz Movement, B'nai Akiva, and Torah Ve'avodah, the primary expressions of Zionist Orthodox Jews.

25. Genesis 32:29.