

THE ACQUISITION OF PROPHECY

A study based upon R. Jochanan's assertion: "The Holy One Blessed be He will not cause His Shechinah to rest upon anyone unless he be strong, wealthy, wise, and meek." (Bab. Talmud, Nedarim 38a)

Arthur I. Baseman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and
Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1964

Referee, Prof. Eugene Mihaly

DEDICATION

TO MY WIFE
who typed each draft and final type-
script, and who made this endeavor a
labor of love, I dedicate this thesis

השקטת דברי תורה

Gen. Rabbah 17:7

DIGEST

The purpose of this study was to obtain an appreciation of the manner with which the Rabbis would explain an individual's acquisition of the prophetic Word. To this end, the statement attributed to Rabbi Jochanan in Nedarim 38a--"The Holy One Blessed be He will not cause His Shechinah to rest upon anyone unless he be strong, wealthy, wise, and meek"--was carefully explored. Our purpose was to gain a comprehension of what the four qualities (*חֵזק*, *עוֹשֶׁה*, *אֲדָמָה*, and *אֵלֶּם*) entailed; to ascertain the sense in which the Rabbinic literature applied them; to determine why they were important for the prophet; and to indicate, wherever possible, whether prophecy was indeed acquired because of them. Such an analysis, it was hoped, would reflect a basic Rabbinic tendenz.

The *חֵזק* initially had to be definable so as to justify Jochanan's sweeping assertion that all prophets, even the physically tender, were to be *חֵזק*. We discovered that, according to the Rabbis, the *חֵזק* is an individual who demonstrates either physical or spiritual prowess or both. Spiritual vibrancy as well as physical competency was designated as *חֵזק*. We then dealt in separate sub-sections with three most vital areas which the Rabbinic narratives associate with the role of the prophet--"The Ability to Undergo Tests", "The Ability to Listen", and "The Willingness to Sacrifice in Behalf of Israel". In each sub-section, we demonstrated the prophet's certain involvement with the function under discussion; determined that the prophet had to be a *חֵזק*, had to exhibit either

physical or spiritual stamina, or both, to respond successfully in each of these areas; and indicated that such a successful response gained or retained for him the prophetic Word.

Just as the term *נפח* had to undergo a transformation from a strict connotation of physical virility to one inclusive of spiritual vigor, so the term *עושר* had to be expanded to make allowance for potential prophetic personalities who were not necessarily affluent, and yet "wealthy". It was discovered that the *עושר* is one who rejoices in and is content with his "lot". To have a "lot" is indeed important, for its source is God; because an act of great merit and excellence which revealed one's commitment and obligation to God predicated the grant; because of the goals toward which wealth could be channelled; and because of the personal consequences, physical and psychological, for the one who possesses it. However, the criterion of wealth is the attitude displayed towards it, rather than the amount acquired. The *עושר*, then, is one who measures his wealth in spiritual as well as materialistic terms. We thus could conclude that the prophet was to be such an *עושר* because, by being able to rejoice in that which he has, he would be more completely dedicated to the service of God without materialistic distraction. More important, however, it would attest to the fact that he was the possessor of a vastly noble quality, humility, which manifests itself as an acceptance of self and of others.

Our analysis of "The Wise Man" revealed the Rabbinic iden-

tification of Wisdom with Torah, Torah being the very expression of God's Wisdom. In drawing the logical deduction that the study of Torah was a means by which to attain Wisdom, we discovered still another, won by such effort--that of God's patronage and favor. Thus, study, and the reciprocal relationship with God which it fostered, led to Wisdom. Wisdom's importance for the prophet was acknowledged by the recognition that it not only underlay the qualities of *נִפְלָא*, *נִבְרָא*, and *נִשְׂרָא*, but that it also endowed one with the attitudes, the principles, and the ethical ideals for proper conduct and behavior. Midrashic narratives were then cited indicating the close association between prophecy and Wisdom, including, in one instance, the portrayal of the *פֶּסֶח* as an embryonic *חֶסֶד*, and in another, the receipt of the prophetic spirit after the attainment of Wisdom.

Our analysis of the *נִשְׂרָא* disclosed him as one who possesses a sense of self-authenticity. He accepts himself, confident that he is living a maximal life. Our contention, then, that to be *נִבְרָא*, rejoicing in his lot, one must first be *נִשְׂרָא*, accepting of himself and thus of his lot, was substantiated. The source of this attitude of self-authenticity was discovered in the possession of Wisdom, in a knowledge of God's desires and dictates which fosters a positive relationship with Him. The *נִשְׂרָא* manifests his sense of authenticity in his contact with others. Because of his faith in and approval of himself, he need not quest for self-aggrandizement, nor need he project resentment, based upon personal lack, onto others. The

relevance of ~~any~~ for the prophet, then, is unquestioned. Because he bears no ill-will towards himself, he will direct none towards others. He will display a social benevolence which will enable him to fulfill God's decrees, designed to improve the lot of His people. Rabbinic accounts not only indicated that such humility was rewarded by the receipt of prophetic power, but also record the loss of same, due to the effect of humility's antithesis, arrogance.

After such analysis, we could formulate a basic Rabbinic tendenz. The Rabbis depicted the receipt of prophecy by the prophet in terms of a reward earned and a goal fulfilled. Each term which Jochanan employed afforded evidence of this phenomenon. Each term manifested process, reflected the Rabbinic conception that prophecy was the product of a process predicated upon the possession of merit and desert.

PREFACE

That which immediately enters the consciousness of one who probes primary sources to investigate an issue as ambitious as the Rabbis and their conception of prophecy is a recognition of the vastness of material, the diversity of opinion, and the variety of topic which must be confronted. Such recognition compels the imposition of realistic limitations.

This paper is the result of such an experience. Having consulted anthologies such as *אוצר באוצר* by Gross, *אוצר באוצר* by Frenkel, *אוצר באוצר* by Eisenstein, and the *אוצר באוצר* by H.N. Bialik and J.H. Rawnitzky under the headings *אב"א*, *אב"א*, *אב"א*, and the indices of the Soncino Talmud and Midrash translations for any citations bearing relationship to prophecy, prophet, Shechinah, Holy Spirit; and having pursued the passages compiled, it was obvious that the original thesis subject, "The Rabbinic Conception of Prophecy", must be qualified. After reading relevant sections dealing with prophecy in *אוצר באוצר* by Chaim Tchernowitz, and *אוצר באוצר*, *אוצר באוצר*, and especially *אוצר באוצר* by *אוצר באוצר* an engaging question, seemingly implicit in these writings, presented itself--how would the Rabbis explain an individual's acquisition of the prophetic Word? This subject was attractive, since, having savoured a large percentage of the passages dealing with the prophetic experience, the prescription of Rabbi Jochanan, *אוצר באוצר* *אוצר באוצר* "The Holy One Blessed be He will not

cause His Shechinah to rest upon anyone unless he be strong, wealthy, wise and meek"¹, appeared to serve admirably as a frame within which to operate and integrate my discoveries. Why Jochanan said the above, and what he meant by it, became paramount issues.

Such a change in plan required an adjustment in procedure. The terms *נִזְקָה*, *נִזְקָה*, *נִזְקָה*, *נִזְקָה*, and their nominal forms, were to be explored and their meaning determined. This was achieved with recourse to the anthologies, the primary sources, and secondary readings. Kohut's *מגן עמו* reinforced the anthology phase of this search.

Hyman's *מגן עמו* was also consulted with regard to Scriptural passages having reference to the prophets' commission.

Primary sources, Midrashic and Talmudic, were used throughout the survey, and variants and parallels were checked.

As to the organization, each chapter enjoyed independent treatment, dictated by the available material; therefore, analysis was not constricted within an artificial mold. The *נִזְקָה* initially had to be defined to justify Jochanan's assertion that all prophets were to be *נִזְקָה*. The *נִזְקָה* had his own unique problem. The examples which Jochanan provided were basically materialistic in orientation, whereas definitions of wealth which the literature offered were more of a spiritual nature, such as Ben Zoma's "He who delights in his portion."² A reconciliation had to be achieved.

Both *נִזְקָה* and *נִזְקָה*, conceptions which the Rabbis em-

ployed in a consistent manner, required diverse rubrics to accomodate the salient elements necessary for complete comprehension.

I wish to acknowledge the patient and understanding manner with which my advisor, Dr. Eugene Mihaly, supervised the progress of this study. His advice was both valuable and enlightening.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
I--The Strong Man.....	5
The Physical <i>7/17</i>	5
The Spiritual <i>7/17</i>	6
The Two <i>7/17</i>	7
Summary.....	13
The Ability to Undergo Tests.....	14
The Prophet and Tests.....	14
The Need for the <i>7/17</i>	18
Were Tests Rewarded?.....	20
Summary.....	23
The Ability to Listen.....	24
The Prophet and "Listening".....	24
The Need for the <i>7/17</i>	26
If He Does Not Listen.....	32
Was Listening Rewarded?.....	39
Summary.....	44
The Willingness to Sacrifice in Behalf of Israel...46	
The Prophet and Sacrifice.....	46
The Need for the <i>7/17</i>	54
Was Sacrifice Rewarded?.....	57
Summary.....	61

II--The Wealthy Man.....	63
The Prophet and Wealth.....	63
Why Wealth's Esteem?.....	65
Who Is "Wealthy"?.....	77
Summary.....	85
III--The Wise Man.....	86
What Is חכמה ?.....	86
The Attainment of Wisdom.....	92
Why Is Wisdom Important?.....	97
Was חכמה Rewarded?.....	104
Summary.....	110
IV--The Humble Man.....	112
What Is גולה ?.....	112
Its Source.....	119
The Ladder of Perfection.....	122
Was Humility Rewarded?.....	125
Its Antithesis--Arrogance.....	129
Summary.....	133
Conclusion.....	135
Footnotes.....	138
Bibliography.....	144

INTRODUCTION

A passage which immediately comes to mind whenever consideration is given to the Rabbinic explanation of an individual's acquisition of the prophetic commission is that attributed to Rabbi Jochanan: *אין עקרה אדם שנתנו אלוהים עליו*

אין עקרה אדם שנתנו אלוהים עליו "The Holy One Blessed be He will not cause His Shechinah¹ to rest upon anyone unless he be strong, wealthy, wise and meek."²

Such a passage is striking, and rich with significance. What does Jochanan intend by this assertion, and what do the qualifications *חזק, עשיר, חכם, ענוה*, mean and represent? These questions will be the major concerns of our study. Before we begin a careful analysis of each of the terms, however, a brief and general evaluation of the total passage is in order.

Jochanan, himself, derives all of the above characteristics from Moses, the paragon of the prophetic functionary. The fact that Moses was strong is deduced from "And he spread the tent over the tabernacle" (Ex. 40:19). Lest one indulge himself with the thought that the ten-cubit boards (Ex. 26:16) were long and thin and thus would not require much strength to manipulate, Jochanan reminds us of a previous description of Moses' strength. He cites Deuteronomy 9:17 in which Moses relates, "I took the two tables, and heaved them out of my two hands, and broke them." Jochanan then calls our attention to *Beva Bathra* 14a where the size of the tablets was determined as six handbreadths in length, six in breadth, and three in

thickness.

The fact that Moses was wealthy is deduced from Rabbi Hama b. Hanina's interpretation of "Hew thee two tablets of stone like unto the first" (Ex. 34:1). *ק"ל לך* to R. Hama indicates *ק"ל מלך* "Their chippings shall be yours",³ and R. Jochanan adopts this interpretation--Moses became wealthy from the chippings of the tablets.

Moses was also wise, Jochanan asserts, for Rab and Samuel maintained that of the fifty gates of understanding which had been created in the world, all but one had been given to Moses. As proof-text of this, the Rabbis cite Psalm 8:6, and read

מ'לך לך ע"מ יו"ט וכו' as "for you have made him a little lower than God", a strict literal translation which they apply to Moses.⁴

Finally, Moses is meek from the manifest description, "Now the man Moses was very meek" (Num. 12:3).

There is a variant reading of which we must take account in which the Shechinah actively, rather than passively, operates. Here, a Master declares: "The Shechinah does not rest on any-one unless he be a wise man, a strong man, a wealthy man, and a tall man."⁵ In addition to a minor transfer in order there is a major variation in the substitution of *א"ל לך* for *לך*. We shall observe when we focus on *לך* that this quality was indeed an important element in the framework of the prophet, whereas *א"ל לך* is rarely if ever alluded to. One can, therefore, regard the substitution as dictated by the context of the passage in which it is found, a passage dealing with the allowable height an article may be raised above street level

when carried. After the Rabbis fail to deduce the height of ten-handbreadths from the carrying of the altar or of the Ark they attempt to trace it from Moses. The passage thus concludes:

כָּל־מִנְיָן שֶׁנֶּחֱדָשׁ
לְמִנְיָן שֶׁנֶּחֱדָשׁ לְמִנְיָן שֶׁנֶּחֱדָשׁ

The substitution of *מִנְיָן* for *מִנְיָן* is therefore in consonance with the intent of the passage, that of justifying the allowable height of ten-handbreadths above street level for a carried article.

Bearing affinity to our Nedarim passage is one which deals with the selection of the Seventy Elders. Moses is told by God, after his request for aid, to gather 70 men who will serve as his assistants. These, the 70 Elders, will be the recipients of prophetic power. The description of the 70 is pertinent:

...וְהָיוּ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲנָשִׁים חֲכָמִים וְגִבּוֹרִים

"Seventy men who are men of wisdom, men of strength..."⁶ The ascription of characteristics reminiscent of those outlined in Nedarim 38a to the 70 Elders who will soon be endowed with the power of the prophetic spirit, justifies Jochanan's selection of those qualities.

A Rabbinic exposition of "Now the children of Reuben and the children of Gad had a very great multitude of cattle" (Num. 32:1) openly attests to the great importance of these qualities:

Three gifts were created in the world.
If a man is worthy to have one of them,
he can take the delights of the entire
world. If he is worthy of wisdom, he
merits all; if strength, he merits all;

if wealth, he merits all.⁷

The qualities of wisdom, strength, and wealth, then, are wonderful gifts, gifts which merit much.

There is a second Rabbinic statement which indicates the primacy of these qualities. Focusing upon the Scriptural verse, "And the priest who is highest among his brethren..." (Lev. 21:10), the Rabbis explain: "who is greatest among his brethren in...strength, wisdom, and wealth."⁸

From the foregoing, then, we are able to endorse Jochanan's assertion. Strength, wealth, and wisdom are of the most precious gifts of this world, and humility, though not mentioned in the latter citations, will be more than adequately represented in the course of our analysis.

Having established the importance of these qualities in a general fashion, we are now able to focus upon each of them individually. Our purpose in such an investigation will be to obtain a comprehension of what these four qualities entail, to ascertain the sense in which the Rabbinic literature applied them, to determine why they were important for the prophet, and to indicate, wherever possible, whether prophecy was indeed acquired because of them. From such an analysis we will be able to conclude with a formulation of the Rabbinic tendency which these qualities and Jochanan's prescription reflect.

I--THE STRONG MAN

The initial prerequisite for the prophet according to Jochanan is that he is to be *גבור*. What is meant by this description? Who is the *גבור*?

The Physical גי'לל

The term's obvious denotation is physical capability. A Tannaitic passage demonstrates this conclusively.

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל יוֹשׁוּעַ קַח לָנוּ אֲנָשִׁים וְצֵא
לִמְלָחָם בְּאַמְלֵקִי. וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹשׁוּעַ וְיָבוֹא
אִתָּנוּ קָהָל מִלְּאֲנָשִׁים. אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה כְּכֹחַ
כִּי אֶלְדַּע בְּמִלְחָמָה אֲלֵינוּ קָהָל לָנוּ יֵאָמֵר
כֹּחַ. אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה כְּכֹחַ אֲנָשִׁים מְבַרְכִּים.

"And Moses said unto Joshua: 'Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek...' (Ex. 17:9). Rabbi Joshua says, "Choose us out" refers to strong men and "men" refers to fearers of sin. R. Eleazar of Modi'im says, "Choose us out" refers to fearers of sin and "men" refers to "strong men" *גבורים*.¹

In this passage two mutually antagonistic ideologies are expressed. The war with Amalek is imminent; some defense must be prepared. Rabbi Eleazar of Modi'im is of a pietistic bent; he prefers the way of the fearer of sin above that of the strong man. Rabbi Joshua, on the other hand, is more activist and practical. He favors the strong man rather than the fearer of sin. The *גבור* of Rabbi Joshua, therefore, is characterized by physical prowess, by muscle and brawn. Amalek is to be defeated; the *גבור* will do battle against him. Whereas the *לוי* of Eleazar would but pray, the *גבור* would arm himself.

The Spiritual נִיחָא

Is this to imply, then, that נִיחָא is a designation applicable exclusively to one who demonstrates brute force? Such a conclusion would be vehemently challenged by Ben Zoma.

וְהַיֵּשׁוּבִי מִן־הַבַּיִת
וְהַיֵּשׁוּבִי מִן־הַבַּיִת
וְהַיֵּשׁוּבִי מִן־הַבַּיִת
וְהַיֵּשׁוּבִי מִן־הַבַּיִת

Who is he that is the נִיחָא? One who subdues his inclination, as it is said, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that captures a city." (Prov. 16:32)²

So does Ben Zoma describe the נִיחָא. Here, it is not muscle fibre that is featured, though muscle fibre may be present, but moral fibre. This is a spiritual נִיחָא, one who is able to master his spirit and control it.

The Two גִּיבּוֹרִים

An interesting variation of the above passage indicates graphically the dual use of the title גִּיבּוֹרִים. Here the question is asked, "Who is it that is the mightiest among the mighty גִּיבּוֹרִים גִּיבּוֹרִים גִּיבּוֹרִים?" The answer and proof text is identical with the Mishnah text, "One who subdues his inclination, as it is said,..." (Prov. 16:32). The Fathers then proceed to state: *וְכָל הַכּוֹנֵן אֶת יָדָיו מִלְּפָנֵי הַיָּדָיו* "He who subdues his inclination is accounted as one who conquered a city full of mighty men."³

In this passage, the Rabbis assert that *כָּל הַכּוֹנֵן*, he who overcomes his instinctual impulses is a גִּיבּוֹרִים, and that such a spiritual גִּיבּוֹרִים is mightier than a city filled with warriors. Note, however, that he is *כּוֹנֵן מִלְּפָנֵי הַיָּדָיו*. Those warriors of muscle and brawn are also גִּיבּוֹרִים. If this were not so, the Rabbis could have employed *גִּבּוֹרִים* or *גִּבּוֹרִים* or *גִּבּוֹרִים* to indicate these others. The term *גִּיבּוֹרִים* thus refers to both the physically, as well as the spiritually strong. To eliminate either realm in comprehending the term גִּיבּוֹרִים is unjustified.

Indeed, in spite of the theoretical partisanship expressed above that the spiritual גִּיבּוֹרִים is to some degree superior to his physical counterpart, the Rabbis, in application, seldom draw any formal distinction between them. This is demonstrated by the Rabbinic commentary upon "Behold thy days approach that thou must die..." (Dt. 31:14). The passage depicts Moses questioning the justification of his

death after he had experienced such strength and honor. The Rabbis have God play with Psalm 89:49, interpreting *וְיָמֶיךָ* in terms of *וְיָמֶיךָ*, and asserting "What mighty man (rather than 'man') is he that liveth and shall not see death...?" The Midrash then launches a series of... *וְיָמֶיךָ*, citing Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: Who was as strong as Abraham who descended to the fiery furnace and was saved, yet he died (Gen. 25:8). Who was as heroic as Isaac who stretched forth his neck on the altar, yet he died (Gen. 27:2). Who so strong as Jacob who wrestled with the angel, yet he died (Gen. 47:29). Who so strong as Moses who spoke to his Creator face to face, yet he died (Dt. 31:14).⁴ The spiritual *וְיָמֶיךָ* of an Isaac and a Moses is here linked to the ^{courage, faith, merit} physical *וְיָמֶיךָ* of an Abraham ? and a Jacob without any hint of preference or precedence.

Elaborating upon "And the Lord called unto Moses" (Lev. 1:1), the Rabbis give further evidence of this phenomenon. In an attempt to diagnose the reason for communication between God and Moses, the Rabbis employ as their *תנא* verse Psalm 89:20, "Then Thou spakest in vision to Thy godly ones,/ And saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty;/ I have exalted one chosen out of the people."

אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיָמֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיָמֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
בְּיָמֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיָמֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

and apply it to Abraham, David, and Moses.

Of prime interest to us is the treatment of the above personalities in light of *וְיָמֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיָמֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ*

"And saidst: I have laid help upon one that is mighty."

According to Rabbi Abin in the name of Berekiah the Elder, Abraham is a *גיבור* because "he slew four kings in one night, 'And he divided himself against them by night... and smote them.'" (Gen. 14:15). To Abba bar Cahana, David is a *גיבור*, because "thirteen wars David made." The Rabbis disagree by counting eighteen. "There is no dispute. He who says thirteen, counts in terms of those in behalf of Israel; and they who assert eighteen include five for David's personal need and the thirteen in behalf of Israel." Finally, the verse is applied to Moses, for as Rabbi Tanchum b. Hanilai stated:

Usually, a burden heavy for one is light for two, and a burden heavy for two is light for four; can a burden unbearable for 60 myriads be overcome by one? All Israel had stood before Mt. Sinai and had said "If we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, then we shall die" (Dt. 5:22), whereas Moses heard the sound of the Divine Word itself and lived. You know that this is so, for of all of them, the Divine Word spoke only to Moses, as it is said, "And the Lord called unto Moses."⁵

In this passage we witness the non-critical listing of physical with spiritual strength. Abraham and David were *גיבורים* because of their physical prowess in war. Moses was *גיבור* more in the spiritual than physical sense, because he, master of his spirit, was able to listen to God. All three, however, are equally *גיבורים*.

The absence of any practical distinction between the

spiritual *נפש* and his lesser-graded physical brother becomes even more apparent in those passages in which spiritual *נפש* underlies successful encounters with adversity or feats of strength which superficially appear physical.

The Rabbinic commentary upon "Thy neck is like the tower of David/ Built with turrets,/ Whereon there hang a thousand shields,/ All the armour of the mighty men."

(Song of Songs 4:4) indicates this. The Rabbis interpret

כל אשר נשאר ונשאר as *כל אשר נשאר ונשאר*

כל אשר נשאר ונשאר "Whoever resists and governs and overcomes his inclination is called a *נפש*," the similarity of which to *נפש* and spiritual *נפש* is manifest. Who are such? *כמו משה ביום קרבן נחל, כמו דוד ביום קרבן גת, כמו עזרא ביום קרבן נהר*

"Such as Moses in his day, David in his, and Ezra in his. All their respective generations depended upon them." As illustrative of this theme, the Rabbis maintain that the victory over Midian and the crossing of the Jordan, performed respectively by the *נפש* Moses and Pinchas, and Joshua and Elazar, were feats achieved because each was able to govern his inclination.⁶ Their accomplishments, requiring vast physical vigor, were attained by means of a fundamental, spiritual *נפש*.

A convincing demonstration of this is acquired by a review of the reasoning through which Jochanan derives "a strong man" from Moses.

We recall that Moses' strength was deduced from the statement in Ex. 40:19, "And he spread the tent over the

tabernacle." This, in and of itself, would imply physical prowess.

The Rabbinic comment upon "And the Lord uttereth His voice before His army;/ For His camp is very great,/ For he is mighty that executeth His word..." (Joel 2:11) provides us, however, with another perspective. Focusing upon *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ* *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ*, the Rabbis decide that this phrase refers to the *ק'צ'צ'* who fulfills God's word. "And who is he?" they ask. "Moses to whom it was said, Make a tabernacle, and he was zealous and did." Thus, *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ ק'צ'צ' הוּא הוֹדִיעַ* *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ* "Intense is the strength of the righteous ones who are able to hear His voice."⁷

The very same act, the making of a tabernacle, which Jochanan employed to denote strength in Nedarim 38a, and which, in that context, seemed solely physical, is in the Yalkut, shown to be a spiritual *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ*, the ability to listen. Because Moses had this spiritual vigor, he was enabled to perform so heroically.

The reverse is also detectable. Not only could spiritual *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ* reflect itself in terms of muscle and brawn, but physical *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ* could make itself present in acts requiring spiritual virility. Joseph is an example of this.

Investigating "And this is it that their father spoke unto them and blessed them," (Gen. 49:28), the Rabbis make much of the plural number of the direct object "them", and embark upon a series of recipients of Jacob's blessing, among whom is Joseph whose blessing was *וְהוּא הוֹדִיעַ* --

Joseph's strength was like that of an ox.⁸ But how is this strength expressed?

Focusing upon

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אָמַר כֹּחַ יִשְׁכָּל עָלַי וְיִשְׁכָּל עָלַי

"And Israel said: It is enough; Joseph my son is yet alive," (Gen. 45:28), the Rabbis provide an answer. They interpret the verse as "And Israel said, It is much; Joseph is more..." and they paraphrase Jacob's statement as:

Great (*גָּדוֹל*) is the strength (*כֹּחַ*) of Joseph my son, for many misfortunes (*רַע*) overtook him and yet he remains in his righteousness (*צְדִיקָה*) *וְיִשְׁכָּל עָלַי* more than I who sinned, for I said, "My way is hid from the Lord" (Isaiah 40:27).⁹

The physical strength of Joseph, therefore, was expressed as a spiritual one, enabling him to remain steadfast in his devotion to God.

SUMMARY

According to the Rabbis, the *naḥbi* was an individual who demonstrated either physical or spiritual prowess, or both. The two *naḥbi* were not mutually exclusive of each other. An individual, such as Moses or Joseph, could partake of both currents of strength.

What is of especial significance is that this usage of the term justifies Jochanan's sweeping demand that the prophet is to be a *naḥbi*. It allows for the possibility that one who was physically tender and sensitive could merit the prophetic call nonetheless, because of spiritual vibrancy. Inasmuch as the prophet was to be the instrument of the Divine Plan, and, as the agent of God, was to negate his own being in surrender to God's Will, such spiritual strength *naḥbi* would serve well to prepare the prophet-*naḥbi* to function as the matrix upon which God's pleasure was to be etched.

Having determined the sense in which Jochanan's *naḥbi* is to be understood, let us ask why Jochanan required the prophet to be a *naḥbi*. In the narratives dealing with the prophetic personalities, we shall discover that the role of the prophet necessitated either physical or spiritual stamina, or both, in three fundamental areas. The prophet had to be a *naḥbi* to undergo tests; to listen to the Word of God, and to sacrifice himself in behalf of Israel.

The Ability to Undergo Tests

The Prophet and Tests

In order to appreciate the relationship of the prophet to the phenomenon of testing, it is essential that we first understand the purpose of these tests. Why does God test an individual?

*ה' בן ימינו אף על פי שיש בו
משהו מן המלכות והוא נבון ונאמן
אשר לא יאמר שווא ויחזק דבריו*

The Holy One Blessed be He does not elevate a man to high office until He tests and examines him first. And when he stands in his trial, He raises him to high office.¹

Dovetailing beautifully with this, for it likewise deals with *מלכות*, is a statement from a narrative which we will examine more fully later.² *הוא נבון ונאמן*

אשר לא יאמר שווא ויחזק דבריו

This admirably supplements the preceding Rabbinic message: "You should not accept upon yourself office if you are unworthy of office."³ (Therefore) "The Holy One Blessed be He does not elevate a man...until He tests and examines him first."

These declarations clearly present the premise upon which the Rabbinic emphasis on testing rests. God tests in order to estimate one's worth and thus determine whether an individual merited *מלכות*.

That the prophet was required to undergo such initi-

ation is a logical conclusion. God does not bestow His Word upon one for no reason; rather, He assays the character of the individual first. The individual must earn the right to receive the Word.

This is graphically depicted by the Rabbinic exegesis of "Moses was a shepherd..." (Ex. 3:1). Having quoted "The Lord trieth the righteous..." (Psalm 11:5) as the ~~verse~~ verse, Rabbi Isaac asks:

By what means does God test the righteous? By pasturage. David was tested by pasturage, "From following the ewes that give suck He brought him/ To be shepherd over Jacob His people, and Israel His inheritance." (Psalm 78:71). Amos was tested by pasturage, as it says, "And the Lord took me from following the flock..." (Amos 7:15). Even Moses was tested by pasturage, as it says,⁴ "Moses was a shepherd..." (Ex. 3:1).

In connection with the final illustration, we recall the lovely Midrashic narration of Moses and the thirsty lamb, because of which experience God declares: "You (Moses) displayed much mercy in tending the flock of man (Jethro). Therefore, by your life, you will shepherd My sheep, Israel."⁵ We can readily acknowledge, then, that the prior passage indicates that Moses, as well as David and Amos, underwent trials to prepare them for the vast responsibility of tending the Israelite people ~~for~~. Before they were deemed worthy to assume the high office of prophet, David, Amos, and Moses were judged.

Such testing was by no means an exceptional occurrence. All the prophetic personalities were focal points of God's scrutiny. In their exegesis of "And it came to pass after these things..." (Gen. 39:7), the Rabbis portray a meditating Joseph:

When I was at the home of my father,
if my father saw any nice portion he
was accustomed to give it to me, which
made my brothers jealous. Now that I
am here I give thanks to You (God) that
I have respite."

The Rabbis have God reply:

Empty words! By thy life I will incite
the she-bear after thee. (An allusion
to Potiphar's wife and a major test for
Joseph.)

The passage then continues in the words of Joseph: *וַיֹּאמֶר אֲבִי*

וַיִּכְּלוּ אֵלָיו "My father was tried, and
my grandfather was tried, but I am not tested." To which God
replies: *וְאֵלֶיךָ אֲנִי מִתְּבַלֵּל*

"By thy life, I will try thee more than them."⁶

This passage indicates the general prevalence of the testing-situation. Joseph and the Patriarchs, prophetic personalities in their own right, also endured ordeals. They had to merit their eminence, just as Moses, David, and Amos.

To the Rabbis, then, God's bestowal of His Word upon an individual was not a grant of special privilege; it inherently contained the demand for service, taxing service.

One had to be equal to the task, and tests assisted in
guaging one's capabilities. Neither charisma nor mystery
was in evidence; man as an agent who deserved this gift,
this distinction, was the underlying motif. The prophet
was his own ambassador of merit.

Does testing
and being
determined
deny the
presence of
"charisma or
mystery"

in triumph and to achieve this had to be *possible*.

Were Tests Rewarded?

Thus far we have demonstrated that testing does play an essential role in understanding the fullness of the prophet-~~ship~~ aspect of Jochanan's formulation. However, we have established the theory that a man does receive prophecy because of successful performance in tests solely by implication, by circumstantial evidence. We have cited individuals whom we know as prophets; we witness them undergoing tests and experiencing trials; and we provide our own element of causation. Is this, however, the only linkage possible? Is there any evidence that one does receive the Holy Word as a consequence of the effective completion of a trial?

One such instance is found in the Rabbinic exposition of "And it came to pass that when Isaac was old and his eyes were dim from seeing..." (Gen. 27:11). The Rabbis attempt to explain why this misfortune occurred to Isaac by interpreting the *N* of ~~וְיָרָא~~ not as a negative prefix ("so that he could not see"), but as a preposition, "from" or "through". One report reads:

"Through seeing"--because of the power of that spectacle. For when Abraham bound Isaac on the altar (Isaac) lifted up his eyes heavenward and beheld the Shechinah.¹⁰

Because Isaac allowed himself to be bound, thereby completing his test, he was rewarded with a glance at the source of prophetic power.

A variant conveys this more conclusively. Commenting upon "And this is the blessing..." (Dt. 33:1), the Rabbis draw as a ~~law~~ verse "Many daughters have done valiantly, but thou excellest them all." (Proverbs 31:29). To the Rabbis, the b part of that verse refers to Moses, and this great leader is compared to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the comparison always concluding in Moses' favor. That with Isaac is of interest to us:

Isaac said to Moses: I am greater than you are, for I stretched forth my neck on the altar and I saw the Shechinah. Moses replied: I am greater than you, for you saw the Shechinah and your eyes became dim, as it is written, "And it came to pass that when Isaac was old and his eyes were dim from seeing...." What is ~~with~~ ^{the}? From seeing the Shechinah. Whereas I was accustomed to speak with the Shechinah face to face, and yet my eyes did not become dim.¹¹

It is obvious that this passage presupposes the existence of Gen. Rab. 65:10, and seems to more graphically delineate the idea that Isaac beheld the Shechinah because of his performance under duress. *in the sense, as seen in also the fact that* The fact that Isaac's experience is comparable to Moses' dialogue with the Shechinah buttresses our theory that his was a prophetic experience demonstrating merit and earning reward.

Still another example is provided by Abraham.

The Satan came and pushed the hand of Abraham and the knife fell from his hand. And when he stretched forth his

hand to take it, a Bat Kol went forth
and said to him from the heavens: "Don't
set forth your hand against the lad."
Otherwise, he would have already slain
him.¹²

The Bat Kol is God's prophetic Word. Abraham, successful
in his test, merited the receipt of a prophetic call.

SUMMARY

The prophet is tried by tests which assist God in determining one's worth and ascertaining whether an individual is meritorious enough to receive the prophetic Word, as is manifest in all the cases cited. Testing also serves to prepare the prophet for his mission unto Israel, as in the case of Moses, David, and Amos, a mission which will necessitate fortitude, courage, and care.

These tests, to be successfully undergone, require a **7177**, demand great strength and endurance.

A successful response to the trials by the individual could earn for him the prophetic call.

of "The Prophet and Listening". However, since this topic contains much relevance for "The Need for the ~~IIA~~", further comment will be reserved for that section.⁵

The Need For The *וְיִלְלֵהוּ*

That such "listening" as described above entails strength and requires Jochanan's *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* is dramatically demonstrated by the Rabbinic exegesis of "And the Lord called unto Moses..." (Lev. 1:1), which intends, in the course of its development, to indicate and thus justify the reason why it was Moses who was called.⁶ To achieve this, the Rabbis initially must enter into an analysis of "the call".

By a chain of association, one link of which must have been the liturgical call to worship *שְׂמַח וְשִׂמְחָה*, Rabbi Tanchum b. Hanilai introduces as the ~~verse~~ verse "Bless the Lord ye, His *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* / Ye mighty in strength that fulfilleth His Word, / Harkening unto the voice of His Word." (Psalm 103:20). The word *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* poses a problem for the Rabbis. Of whom does this word speak? they ask. There are obviously only two possibilities: either angels or messengers.

As to the first, if *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* is to be translated as "Angels", the verse would speak of celestial beings. Scripture, however, speaks of them in the next Psalm verse: "Bless the Lord all ye His Hosts, *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* / Ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure." (Psalm 103:21). This latter verse, containing a term *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* commonly associated with angels, thus negates the first alternative, since redundancy in Scripture is an impossibility for the Rabbinic mind. *וְיִלְלֵהוּ* of verse 20, therefore, must refer to the "messengers" of God, the terrestrial beings.

Further justification for this conclusion is provided by the Rabbinic insight that verse 21, speaking as it does of "all" ye His Host, must have reference to celestial beings, for only they are able to accomplish without qualification the charges of the Holy One, *ה' יצאנו*. As for the terrestrial beings, the messengers, however, the Rabbis state that only a select few have this capability. Thus, verse 20 simply states, "Ye messengers of His"--that is, those who can qualify, rather than, "All ye messengers of His."

This Rabbinic analysis which views the adjacent Psalm verses as mutually exclusive of each other, indicates quite conclusively that to receive God's call, "to listen", requires a very special individual. The call does not produce an automatic response. God calls, but the *malak*, the messenger, may not be able to acknowledge. An element of uncertainty is introduced.

As to why it was Moses who was called, the capstone of the argument looms forth in the final section of this passage where the Rabbis focus upon, "Hearkening upon the voice of His Word", *שמעו קול דבר ה'* (Psalm 103:20). R. Tanchum b. Hanilai reasons that this is applicable to Moses, for when Israel stood at Sinai, they said, "If we hear the voice of the Lord...any more, then we shall die," (Dt. 5:22), whereas, "Moses heard the voice of the Word by himself and lived." The passage then concludes, "You know that this is so, for to all others God did not call, except to Moses, thus it says, 'And the Lord called unto Moses.'"⁶

The Rabbis have thus accomplished their end. They have indicated why it was Moses alone who was called. Let us retrace the sequence of their thought. The Rabbis declared in their analysis of the call that not all "messengers" are able to listen, *lo yishma kol*. They then proceed to imply that because of this factor of doubt inherent in the relationship of the *mal'ach* and the call, and because Moses was able to listen at Sinai, he was called. Moses was called because he was one of the *mal'achim* who was able to listen, to hearken unto the voice of His Word *le-shema*.

There is a question, however, which is logically forthcoming, and with which the Rabbis do not concern themselves in this passage. Why was Moses able to listen at Sinai, whereas the rest of Israel could not? In answering this question, we will realize our intent--that of validating our contention that to listen falls within the realm of *de'ot*, and that Moses was able to listen because he was a *mal'ach*.

Our task is facilitated by simply referring once again to the passage dealing with *mal'ach* *le-shema*, and recalling that this phrase was applied to Moses' listening at Sinai.⁷ Moses was a *mal'ach* from whom God sought help when he listened at Sinai. This evinced his *de'ot*.

More dramatic, however, is a variant of our present passage which has Rabbi Tanchum bar Hamilai attach the same anecdote of Moses' listening at Sinai to the phrase *shema* (Psalm 103:20):

"Mighty in strength"--this is Moses, for there is no mighty man as Moses, for Israel stood before Mt. Sinai and were not able to listen to all the word, as it says, "If we hear the voice of the Lord...any more..." and as for Moses, he was not injured.⁸

We can now formulate the progression of Moses' attainment: Moses, because he was able to listen, received the call; and he was able to listen only because he was a *na'ar* . . .

We gain a keener awareness of the indispensability of the prophet-*na'ar* when we resume our investigation of "The Prophet and Listening". Why is listening important for one who is to be a prophet?

One reason is supplied by Rab Aha in the name of R. Eliezer b. Halafta:

Whatever the Holy One intends to do and to innovate in His world in the time to come, He has already introduced and accomplished in part by means of His righteous prophets in this world.⁹

The prophets are Divine Delegates; they are harbingers of the other world and play an important role in the Divine Plan. They cannot afford to fail.

There is yet a second reason to motivate the prophet to pay strict attention.

"Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against My servant, against Moses?" (Num. 12:8). Scripture does

not say *שמעו* except (to indicate) because of your speaking against My servant, you speak against Me. To what does this compare? To a King (Sifré adds "of flesh and blood") who had a steward (Sifré *שמעו*; Yalkut *שמעו*) in a province and the denizens were speaking against him. The King said to them, "You're not speaking against my servant; you're speaking against me. And should you say (Yalkut-- 'I am not aware of his deeds; Sifré-- 'He is not aware of his deeds'), this is a more serious offense than the first."¹⁰

By thus extrapolating the seemingly superfluous *שמעו* of *שמעו* into *שמעו* to indicate God, the Rabbis demonstrate that God and His prophet are as one; they mutually reflect each other.

The Rabbinic considerations involving "And they believed in the Lord and in His servant Moses" (Ex. 14:31) buttress this claim.

If you say they believed in Moses, how much the more so in God? But this is to teach you that he who has faith in the shepherd of Israel is as one who has faith in Him who spoke and the world came into being. Similarly, you may say concerning, "And the people spoke against God, and against Moses" (Num. 21:5), if they spoke against God, how much the more did they speak against Moses? However, this comes to teach you that he who speaks against the shepherd of Israel is as one who speaks against Him who spoke and the world came into being.¹¹

When the prophet remains true to that which he has heard,

when he goes on the mission, God makes him, as it were, an integral component of His own Being. The prophet must be aware of this extreme responsibility, and totally commit himself; he must listen. Cognizant of this, we can value even more the need for a prophet- ~~not~~ to accept such severe accountability.

If He Does Not Listen

And should the prophet not listen? Should he not heed the Word of God; or should he hear, but fail to execute the charge given him, what will result?

One answer is provided by the Rabbinic exposition of "What man soever there be of the house of Israel that kills an ox or lamb or goat" (Lev. 17:3). At the outset the Rabbis attempt to demonstrate the sanctity of life implicit in the Biblical verse. They call upon Ecclesiastes 5:8, and translate *Yokh pash*, "The profit of a land", as "the superfluities of the land". They then maintain:

Things which you consider as superfluous in the world such as flies, fleas, and gnats, are also included in the plan of creation of the world, as it is written, "And the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them." (Gen. 2:1)¹²

To the Rabbis, "host" implies all other things, such as flies, fleas, gnats.

This interpretation of *Yokh pash* "the superfluities of the land", by which all things are esteemed as having a purpose, is now applied to the realm of prophecy. God is portrayed as informing the prophets, "If you will not fulfill My mission, I have other messengers." The Rabbis then extend the portion of the Koheleth verse under analysis by one word,

Le Yokh pash, translating, "And as for the superfluities of the land, with all"--"with all *Le* I will accomplish My Mission." Rabbi Aha summarizes: "'With all' God fulfills

His Mission, even by means of a serpent, a frog, a scorpion, and even by a mosquito."¹³ Thus we have one answer--God has at His call other messengers.

The Scriptural verse "And the Lord spoke unto Moses: Go in unto Pharaoh...and if you refuse to let them go, behold, I will smite all thy borders with frogs," (Ex. 7:26,27) motivates the rendering of the same Midrash, including a reference to the original passage in Lev. Rab. This recounting does not add anything of significance to God's message to the prophets, but it does emphasize the drama of God's words,

*What do you think if you do not go on My Mission? Is it possible I do not have a messenger?"*¹⁴ The passage then provides the answers to these questions, focusing on *for the world* as Lev. Rab. had done.

This development is brought to its logical climax by the Rabbinic commentary upon "Yonder sea, great and wide, (Psalm 104:25) therein are creeping things innumerable." To this the Rabbis respond, "All this comes to teach you that in any case God fulfills His Mission, and has not created anything in vain."¹⁵ The Midrash then proceeds to illustrate this by means of the frog, the scorpion, and the mosquito.

This theme of *for the world* we discover again with regard to Jonah's attempt to escape from listening to God. Despite the slight variations in the Lauterbach (L), Horovitz (H) and Weiss (W) versions, the message is identical. Jonah had said:

I will take myself (will go-W) outside the land, a place where the Shechinah does not (rest and-W) reveal itself, for the Gentiles are near to repentance (are ones who are near to repentance-H) lest I make Israel culpable.

The Rabbis then devise a parable to illustrate this.

This is comparable to a servant of a priest who fled from his master. He said, "I will take myself to the cemetery, a place where my master can not follow me." His master said to him: ("I have substitutes *אנשי* such as you."-H) ("I have Canaanite slaves such as you are."-L) ("I have similar to you."-W).

Now the *Sefer* is presented.

Thus said Jonah, "I will take myself outside the land, to a place where the Shechinah does not reveal itself, for the Gentiles are near to repentance (are ones who are near to repentance-H) in order not to condemn Israel." God says to him: "I have messengers similar to you."¹⁶

Thus, should the prophet fail to heed God's Word, God has recourse to other agencies.

There is a passage in the same source, again featuring Jonah, which indicates a second method with which God reacted to a prophet's recalcitrance.

Jonah insisted upon the honor due the son, but not the honor due the father as it says, "And Jonah arose to flee" (Jonah 1:3). What is further written? "And the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying..." (Jonah 3:1). He spoke

with him a second time, but did not speak with him a third time. (The ~~use of the word~~ is understood by the Rabbis to indicate specificity.)¹⁷

A variant replaces the ~~use of the~~ of the Mechilta with ~~an example of the~~, an example of the Shechinah as the divine medium for prophetic communication.

"And the word of the Lord came to Jonah a second time saying:" (Jonah 3:1). Only a second time did the Shechinah speak unto him; a third time it did not speak to him.¹⁸

This then is the second method--God simply refuses to speak to the prophet.

God combined these two responses when reacting to the unwillingness of Moses to listen, for even this paragon who was considered ~~the most~~ par excellence could fail in his responsibility--he too was only a ~~man~~.

This is conveyed in the Rabbinic attempt to elucidate the inclusion of Aaron in the Scriptural verse, "And the Lord spoke unto Moses and unto Aaron, and gave them a charge unto the children of Israel..." (Ex. 6:13), although the original decree had been directed to Moses alone (Ex. 6:10). To achieve this, the Rabbis utilize the theme, "But the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury." (Proverbs 14:23b). After initially indicating that "at first Moses was worthy enough that the Word should attach itself only upon him", the passage cites two instances in which Moses' refusal resulted in the removal of the prophetic call from him exclusively, and

introduced another messenger. The first occurred when he had said, "Send I pray thee, by the hand of him whom you will send" (Ex. 4:13), thus rejecting his commission from God. To this God replies in anger, "Is there not Aaron thy brother, the Levite?" (Ex. 4:14).

The Rabbis now proceed to realize their primary intention of reconciling the original Scriptural verse "And the Lord spoke unto Moses and Aaron..." (Ex. 6:13), with "And the Lord spoke unto Moses saying:" (Ex. 6:10), and thus afford the foregoing incident deeper meaning. Why did "Moses" (Ex. 6:10) become "Moses and Aaron" (Ex. 6:13)? The Rabbinic explanation is, once again, "...the talk of the lips tendeth to penury" (Proverbs 14:23b). Had not Moses said in the intervening verse, "Behold the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me; how then shall Pharoah hear me?" (Ex. 6:12). Thus the Midrash concludes:

Indeed Moses was worthy enough to have had all the miracles performed by him alone. But because of this (verse 12 "...have not hearkened... how then") the Word attached itself to him and Aaron. As it says, "And the Lord spoke unto Moses and Aaron." (Ex. 6:13).¹⁹

Moses' reluctance and its ultimate consequence is elaborated in another endeavor to explain Exodus 6:13. Here the Rabbis cite, "Lo these things doth God work, twice, yea thrice with a man" (Job 33:29).

Three times God waits for a man; should he repent, fine. But if he does not, God rolls upon him (punishments) for even the first. Thus you find in the case of Moses, when God said, "Come now therefore and I will send thee unto Pharoah," (Ex. 3:10), he firstly said, "They will not believe me" (Ex. 4:1); then he said, "I am not a man of words" (Ex. 4:10); and then, "Send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom you will send" (Ex. 4:13). Thus were three times. And when he did not return from his words and said, "Behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me," the Word attached itself to Aaron with him. Thus, "And the Lord spoke unto Moses and Aaron" (Ex. 6:13).²⁰

The ideology of this Midrash flows from the Book of Amos:

R. Jose b. Judah said: "If a man commits a transgression the first, second and third time he is forgiven; the fourth time he is not forgiven, as it is said, 'For three transgressions of Israel, yea for four, I will not reverse it....' (Amos 2:6)."²¹

A final example dealing with Moses is an offshoot of "And Moses hid his face," (Ex. 3:6). Rabbi Joshua b. Korcha said that Moses did not do well in hiding his face. Had he not done so, God would have revealed to him what is above and what is below, what has happened and what will happen. Therefore, when Moses subsequently wished to behold God, "Show me I pray Thee Thy glory" (Ex. 23:18), God replied: "I had come to show thee, but you hid your face; now I tell you, 'Man shall not see Me and live', (Ex. 23:20), for when I wanted to, you did not."²² A variant concludes the trun-

cated thought--"now that you want to, I do not want."²³

Was Listening Rewarded?

Having substantiated the theory that to listen requires *שמיעה*, and having obtained a deeper appreciation of the significance of "listening", let us now consider the question whether "to listen" was truly rewarded? Did the prophetic personalities actually receive prophecy because of their ability to listen? We begin our investigation with the Rabbinic exposition of "That they may stand there with thee" (Num. 11: 16). The passage speaks of the Seventy Elders to whom will be vouchsafed the Holy Spirit:

Cause them to enter with you into the Tent of Meeting and let all of Israel direct unto them dread and fear and honor as they show unto you. And let it be said: "Beloved are these who have entered with Moses *שמעו ושמעו* to hear the Word from the mouth of the Holy One Blessed be He."²⁴

The Seventy Elders in this passage were willing and able to listen, and thus were given prophetic power.

Abraham was another who listened. In an oft-repeated passage, Rabbi Jochanan relates:

And God said, Take now thy son, thine only son.
 Abraham: Each is an only child to his mother.
 God: Whom you love.
 Abraham: Are there bounds in affection?
 God: Isaac.

The passage then asks:

And why did not God reveal to him
(directly)? In order to make (Isaac)
more beloved in Abraham's eyes, and
to give him reward on each and every
word.²⁵

Abraham garnered further merit with each syllable of God's utterance.

It is worthwhile to note that a variant passage makes a significant contribution to our prior survey of the relationship of the *שמע* to "to listen". Here we discover a Rabbinic parable based on *לשמע* which speaks of the task which God is about to thrust upon Abraham as a battle, and Abraham as a soldier.

A parable about a King of flesh and blood against whom were many wars. And he had one warrior who was victorious in all battles. Eventually, a serious war confronted the King. The King said to that very warrior, "Please, stand for me in this battle so that the officers of my soldiers shall not say that the prior wars were unreal." So God said to Abraham: "Now stand for me in this...."²⁶

Abraham must stand and listen, and to do this, must be a

שמע.

We have already witnessed the ability of Moses to listen. Two related passages supply us with an elaboration of this theme.

(Moses) separated himself from his wife because, said Rabbi Simon b. Yochai, Moses expounded and said, "If concerning Mt. Sinai, which was hallowed only temporarily we are told, 'Come not near a woman' (Ex. 19:15), then how much more shall I, *וזה שמע*

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל
 to whom He speaks at all times,
 separate myself from my wife."²⁷

If to the Israelites, with whom the
וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל
 spoke only for a while and for
 whom a definite time was fixed, the
 Torah said, "Come not near a woman"
 (Ex. 19:15) *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל*
וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל
 how much more so to me (does this
 verse apply) who am designated to
 be spoken to at any moment and for
 whom no time has been fixed.²⁸

Moses was intensely committed, and God requited him with responses of unparalleled intimacy.

Of significance is the manner with which the Rabbis express the phenomenon that will occur. Exodus Rabbah employs *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל*, whereas Yevamoth uses *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל*. We thus have another instance of the word *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקוֹל* in its frequent indication of prophecy.

A study which serves beautifully as an epilogue to our analysis is one which focuses upon the experience of Israel, the people.

Of what significance, one may argue, is "Israel" for our survey? We are supposedly investigating the manner in which the individual prophet merited prophecy. Of what relevance is a citation about Israel, the intent of which, as we shall see, is obviously to aggrandize its role at Mt. Sinai? What has this to do with prophecy?

To reject Israel as an object of our study is unjustified, for Israel the people, according to Rabbinic ideology,

at one time possessed prophecy. Furthermore, the literature and testimony concerning the prophetic experiences of Israel parallel that which we actually witness in the case of prophetic individuals.

The Rabbis, focusing upon "Who is as the wise man?/ And who knoweth the interpretation of a thing?" (Eccl. 8:1), attribute the a part of the verse to Israel, using as proof-text, "Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people" (Dt. 4:6), and explain the b part of the verse in terms of Israel's ability *וְיָדָעוּ אֶת הַתּוֹרָה*. Then, seemingly in explanation of this competence, they relate:

You find that when Israel stood at Mt. Sinai and said, "All that the Lord hath spoken will we do and hear" (Ex. 24:7) *וְיָדָעוּ אֶת הַתּוֹרָה* there was given to them of the splendor of the Shechinah of the Most High.²⁹

A variant, by citing the c part of Ecclesiastes 8:1, "A man's wisdom maketh his face to shine..." indicates the textual source of the conclusion drawn by our first passage and reiterates, in the name of Rabbi Haggai in the name of Rab Samuel bar Nachman:

You find that when Israel stood at Mt. Sinai and said, "All that the Lord hath spoken will we do and hear" (Ex. 24:7) *וְיָדָעוּ אֶת הַתּוֹרָה* He gave them of the splendor of the Shechinah.³⁰

Despite the slight variation in the expression of the reward, we clearly see that the response of Exodus 24:7

which had as one of its aspects a "listening", is that which earns the Shechinah, a term which we have already noted in prophetic contexts. Because of Israel's listening; then, they are awarded prophecy.

Israel, however, did not retain this prophetic power. Rabbi Pinchas, the Priest, son of Rav Hama, commenting upon "And fall like one of the princes", (Psalm 82:7), adverse introduced to interpret "Behold I send an angel before thee" (Ex. 23:20), states:

The Holy One said to them, "You have lowered yourselves. In the past you made use of the Holy Spirit *הַקֹּדֶם הַיְיָ מְלָאכָה אֲנִי*
Now you will make use of nothing but an angel."³¹

We realize from context that this loss was due to the Golden Calf incident, an event through which Israel failed to listen to God. One can thus reason that the reward - *הַשְּׂכָרָה*

הַשְּׂכָרָה earned and won by *הַשְּׂכָרָה* in Exodus 24, is lost by the subsequent *הַשְּׂכָרָה* which occurred in Exodus 32.

Further evidence for Israel's prophecy is provided by the Rabbinic assertion that before Israel sinned concerning the calf, the Shechinah rested on every one of them.³²

Thus the prophetic experience of Israel serves as a carbon copy of our findings concerning the individual prophetic personality. One must listen to gain or retain or prophetic power. If he does not, God will either seek another messenger, or discontinue speaking altogether. Failure to heed the Word of God, in any case, results in its loss.

SUMMARY

The ability to "listen" for the prophet entails not only audition, but reaction as well. The prophet is to respond as the representative of God's declared will. After receiving the Word of God, he is to proceed to fulfill it.

That "listening" requires a *שומע* is proven by the Rabbinic assertion that Moses, as a *נביא*, was alone able to confront God at Sinai. Additional evidence is discovered when surveying the reasons which made "listening" most essential for the prophet. One consideration was that the prophet functions as a Divine Delegate and plays an integral role in the fulfillment of the Divine Plan. A second, that the prophet and God are as one, mutually reflecting upon each other and affirming each other. The assumption of such responsibility, in and of itself, would surely require a *שומע*.

If the prophet did not listen, God has at his call other messengers and has recourse to them, "for in any case God fulfills His mission" (Num. Rab. 18:22), or He simply refuses to speak, as in the case of Jonah. His inclusion of Aaron in the charge which He had formerly directed solely to Moses evinces both methods.

There is much evidence in narratives centering about Moses, Abraham, and the Elders, for example, which indicates that "listening" was rewarded by the prophetic call.

The experience of the people Israel, in that they lost

the prophetic power won by *Yahweh*, because of a lack of obedience to God's Word *Sever*, is a striking duplication of the individual prophet's experience.

The Willingness to Sacrifice in Behalf of Israel

The Prophet And Sacrifice

There is a passage in the Mechilta which warrants our attention at this time.

Thus you find that there were three types of prophets. One demanded the honor due the Father as well as the honor due the son; one demanded the honor due the Father without demanding the honor due the son; and one demanded the honor due the son without demanding the honor due the Father. Jeremiah made demands for both the honor due the Father and the honor due the son. For thus it is said: "We have transgressed and have rebelled; Thou hast not pardoned" (Lam. 3:42). Therefore his prophecy was doubled, as it is said: "And there were added besides unto them many like words" (Jer. 36:32). Elijah made demands for the honor due the Father, but did not make demands for the honor due the son, as it is said: "And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord, the God of Hosts" (I Kings 19:10). And therefore what is said? "And the Lord said unto him: Go return on thy way...and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy stead" (I Kings 19:15-16). Scripture does not say (Weiss' text adds "to a prophet") "in thy stead" except to indicate: "I am not pleased with your prophecy." Jonah made demands for the honor due the son, but did not make demands for the honor due the Father, as it is said: "But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord" (Jonah 1:3). What is now written? "And the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time saying..." (Jonah 3:1). He spoke with him a second time, but did not speak to him a third time.¹

We have already encountered Jonah's dilemma and punishment.^{1a} Unwilling to condemn his people, he had favored Israel, the son, over God, the Father, and fled. Because of this, God immediately denied him further prophetic communication. Elijah, on the other hand, according to our Midrash, was his counter-part but also to a fault--he respected the demands of God and neglected those of Israel, and was also punished. It is Jeremiah who blends both the claims of God and those of Israel into a perfect whole, and his reward is to have his prophecy doubled.

We cite this passage at this juncture for two reasons. Firstly, it primarily reflects the activity of a prophet, and of the four descriptions offered by Jochanan, 2/24 is by far its most suitable category. Furthermore, it affords us guidance in the continuation of our survey. Thus far in our probe of the prophet, we have discovered two areas of critical concern--testing and listening. These two prophetic roles, however, seem to have reference to but one component of the blend fashioned by the ideal prophet, Jeremiah. The model prophet, as this Midrash depicted him, was champion of Israel as well as of God. The areas of testing and of listening fall within the province of championing demands and claims in behalf of God. They are to be undergone for God's sake. The prophet is tested by God for God's ultimate purpose; and the prophet is to listen to fulfill God's will.

What about the second component of the blend, however? How was the prophet to champion Israel? Jeremiah provides

us with our answer--the prophet was to champion Israel by his willingness to sacrifice in its behalf, to give of himself unselfishly.

The illustration provided by Jeremiah, "Thou hast not pardoned", indicates the degree of unselfish commitment he must have possessed towards Israel the people to have uttered such words to God. Without any solicitude for his own person, he was willing to endure God's wrath in an attempt to defend Israel and insure its welfare. Sacrifice for the people Israel, then, is the element which completes the ideal prophetic image which Jeremiah represented.

The frequency with which the Rabbinic literature depicts a prophetic personality's willingness to sacrifice, warrants its inclusion as an aspect of the prophetic function.

We have already touched upon two such instances. Moses separates himself from his wife in order to be all the more worthy to hear the word of God², and Jonah flees from God *שָׁמַע יְהוָה בְּיֹנָתָן וַיִּפְּצֵהוּ וַיֵּצֵא אוֹתוֹ מִבֶּטֶן הַדָּג*.³

There are, however, more cogent exemplifications of this facet of the prophetic personality. The Rabbinic report upon "And He gave them (Moses and Aaron) a charge concerning the children of Israel" (Ex. 6:13), is one:

God said to them, "My children are stubborn, illtempered and trouble-makers. *וְעַתָּה אֵלֶיךָ מֵעַתָּה אֵלֶיךָ מֵעַתָּה*
וְעַתָּה אֵלֶיךָ מֵעַתָּה אֵלֶיךָ מֵעַתָּה
On this condition you receive for

yourselves (authority) namely, that they will curse you, that they will bombard you with stones."⁴

Two variants begin God's statement with *וְאַתָּה יָדָעְתָּ*

וְאַתָּה יָדָעְתָּ "You are aware that, cognizant that..."⁵

This version emphasizes the keen consciousness of the act on the part of Moses and Aaron. They are apprized of the situation, and nevertheless accept the charge.

The Midrashic exposition of "and bring them (the Elders) unto the Tent of Meeting" (Num. 11:16) seems to be a further elaboration of the prophetic charge in regard to Israel.

God said to Moses: Take them with words at first. Speak to them words of praise--Happy are you who have been appointed. And then go and say to them words of hurt--Know, be aware of the fact, that they are trouble-makers and obstinate. On this condition you will receive for yourselves (authority), Namely, that they will curse you and bombard you with stones.⁶

And the Midrash concludes with God seemingly whispering in Moses' ear

וְאַתָּה יָדָעְתָּ

"that which I stipulated with you, I stipulate with them."

The Elders, as Moses and Aaron, are to ready themselves for their self-effacement, their sacrifice--they must be willing.

Perhaps the most dramatic narration deals with the figure of Isaiah. Rabbi Azariah in the name of R. Judah b. Simon, refers the verse, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness,/ Therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed thee/ With the oil of gladness above thy fellows." (Psalm 45:8).to

Isaiah.

Isaiah said: "I was at leisure in my house of study, and I heard the voice of the Holy One saying: 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' (Is. 6:8) 'I have sent Micah, and they smote him on the cheek--They smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek' (Micah 4:14); 'I sent Amos and they called him a stammerer.'" As R. Phinehas said: Why was he called Amos? Because he was heavy of tongue. "Now, whom shall I send and who will go for us?" Then I said, "Here am I; send me" (Is. 6:8). The Holy One Blessed be He continued, "Isaiah, my children are trouble-makers and stubborn. If you accept upon yourself to be disparaged and to be beaten by My children, you can go on My Mission; and if not, you cannot go on My Mission." Isaiah said: "With that condition (in mind), 'I gave my back to the smiters, And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair' (Is. 50:6). Am I not then fit to go on the Mission to Your children?"⁷

A variant passage treats the dialogue between God and Isaiah differently. It portrays God as saying, "Isaiah, My children are stubborn, are troublesome. Do you take it upon yourself to be beaten and disparaged by them?" Isaiah responds, "With this condition in mind, 'I gave my back...' (Is. 50:6). Am I not then worthy to go on Your Mission to Your children?"⁸ The intent of both is the same, to be sure, that of underscoring the willingness of Isaiah to sacrifice.

Both passages now focus directly on Psalm 45:8, and we follow the Leviticus Rabbah text:

"Thou hast loved righteousness"--
 you love to justify My children.
 (PK--"my creatures"). "And hate
 wickedness", in that you hate to
 condemn them. "Therefore God...
 hath anointed thee...above thy
 fellows." "Above thy fellows" in-
 dicates that God said to him, "By
 thy life, all the prophets received
 prophecy prophet from prophet (PK--
 "prophesied as prophet from the
 mouth of prophet")--"And he took
 of the spirit that was upon him,
 and put it upon the Seventy Elders"
 (Num. 11:17), and "the spirit of
 Elijah doth rest on Elisha" (II
 Kings 2:15) (PK-reverses the order
 of the proof-texts), but you re-
 ceive prophecy from the mouth of
 the Holy One Blessed be He (PK--
 "prophecy from the mouth of the
אדני, the Mighty One")--"The
 spirit of the Lord God is upon me;
 Because the Lord hath anointed me..."
 (Is. 61:1).⁷

Thus, by employing the word *דבן* as the link for a *דיל דבן*
 between the Psalm verse (45:8) and the Isaiah verse (61:1),
 the Rabbis maintain that both verses refer to the same in-
 cident, the anointment of Isaiah as prophet.

Still another variant has a more emotional description
 of the confrontation between God and Isaiah. This passage
 attributes Psalm 45:8 to Isaiah because of his response "at
 the time that Isaiah heard (God) crying and saying, 'Whom
 shall I send?'" The Rabbis assert that the Holy One, *אדני*,
 was crying and lamenting to Himself, "Whom shall I send; Who
 will accept upon himself now, and respond, 'Here am I, send
 me?'"⁹ It is Isaiah who answers his plea. The rather stoic
 characterization of God in the previous passages is greatly

altered. God needs someone to fulfill His Mission. He is, *שׂוֹכֵן*, beside Himself with grief and anxiety in search of an agent, a messenger. He requires one to make sacrifice.

Just as Isaiah, Ezekiel and Jeremiah also sacrificed. The Holy One Blessed be He chastised Ezekiel ("lie down on thy left side...on thy right side..." Ez. 4:4, 6) in order to cleanse Israel of its iniquities.¹⁰ For this reason, the Rabbis, in this passage call Ezekiel one of the *גְּדוּלְיוֹת*, the great ones, the leaders.

Jeremiah also is featured in this light. Replying to the question as to why Lamentations 1:2 *אֲנִי בְּכִינָה וּבְדִמְעָה* has two verbal forms *בְּכִינָה*, the passage declares:

*וְיִרְמְיָהוּ בְּכִינָה וּבְדִמְעָה
וְיִרְמְיָהוּ בְּכִינָה וּבְדִמְעָה*

(Jerusalem) cried concerning itself (its plight) and it cried over the fact that Jeremiah was separated from it. Why? For he lightened the yoke from off of them.¹¹

וְיִרְמְיָהוּ בְּכִינָה וּבְדִמְעָה certainly parallels the description of the Elders as *אֲנִי בְּכִינָה וּבְדִמְעָה* in a passage which speaks of their receipt of prophetic power, which we will soon note.¹²

A final example, once again focusing on Jonah, is of special significance in that it introduces a general rule describing the relationship of the prophet to sacrifice. Lauterbach's Mechilta reads:

Jonah made his voyage only in order to drown himself in the sea, for thus it is said: "And he said unto them: Take me up and cast me forth into the

sea" (Jonah 1:12). And so you also find that the patriarchs and the prophets *these in your land* offered their lives in behalf of Israel.

After illustrating this with reference to Moses (Ex. 32:32, Num. 11:15) and David (II Sam. 24:17), the passage concludes with the general statement *וְכָל הַיְּהוּדִים וְכָל הַלְוִיִּם וְכָל הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִים*

הָיוּ נִתְּנִים לַיהוָה

"And thus you find everywhere that the patriarchs and the prophets gave up their souls for Israel."¹³

The Need For The *7/28*

That the prophet must be a *7/28* in order to attain such a level of personal consecration is revealed by a passage which we briefly cited earlier.¹⁴ At that time we noted it in our analysis of testing, for it clearly proclaimed that one should deserve office before assuming same. The presentation of this theme is, to be sure, the passage's primary intent, but the illustrative material casts much light upon the relationship between sacrifice and the *7/28*.

At the outset, Rabbi Zeara, focusing upon the verse *לֹא תִשָּׂא שְׁמִי בַּוָּד* "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" (Ex. 20:7) exhibits surprise. If Scripture speaks here concerning vain oaths it would be a redundant and thus superfluous verse. To Zeara, Scripture has already dealt with that subject, "And ye shall not swear by My Name falsely" (Lev. 19:12). The Rabbi, therefore, suggests as the translation for Exodus 20:7: "Don't carry (bear) the name of 'Lord' your God in vain", and proceeds to paraphrase: "You should not accept upon yourself office if you are unworthy for office." The custom of addressing a person who holds high office as *7/28*, Lord, seems to lie behind Zeara's reasoning and thus clarifies his intentions. He maintains that one should not accept high office and bear the name *7/28* unless he can conduct himself in a manner which befits his title. He should not bear the Lord's name in vain.

This lesson is now traced from two other sources. Firstly,

Rabbi Menachman in the name of Rabbi Jacob¹⁵ cites *למה ימהר אדם ללכת לכהן* (Prov. 25:8), and skillfully renders it as *למה ימהר אדם ללכת לכהן* -- "Don't rush out quickly to office", don't be too ambitious. Why? The answer is provided by the b part of the verse, "Lest thou know not what to do in the end when thy neighbor has put you to shame," by asking you questions which you cannot answer.

Subsequently, Rabbi Mani in the name of Rabbi Jose bar Zebada¹⁶ interprets "He that committeth adultery with a woman lacketh understanding..." (Prov. 6:32a) as, "Behold one who accepts upon himself an office in order to profit thereby is naught else but as the adulteror who profits from the body of a woman." The b part of this verse, rather than viewed as an explanatory gloss as was done in the preceding paragraph, is now used as a foil to the a part: *למה ימהר אדם ללכת לכהן* *למה ימהר אדם ללכת לכהן* "He doeth it--that would destroy his own soul", signifying for the Rabbis that he that would be willing to destroy his own soul should be the one to do it, to seek office.¹⁷

This basic message is summarized by a prescription of Rabbi Abihu which hearkens back to Ze'ara's original statement concerning Exodus 20:7, "Don't bear the name of 'Lord' your God in vain." Abihu remarks, "I (God) am called Holy, and should you be called Holy? If you do not have the attributes that I have, don't accept office." The passage's message is obvious and recalls the conclusion we reached after our analysis of testing--an honor gained, is an honor earned.

Of immediate significance for us, however, is the exemplification of *נָסִיבְהוּ אֶת־עוֹנֵת הָעָם*

As Moses who said, "Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin-; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written." (Ex. 32:32)
 As Joshua who said *יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* (the literal translation of which, "Oh, Lord" (Joshua 7:8) not being relevant. The significant factor for the Rabbi is that Joshua employs *אֲנִי* rather than *אֲנִי* --thus assuming the onus personally.) As David who said, "...let Thy hand, I pray Thee, O Lord my God, be against me, and against my father's house, but not against Thy people, that they should be plagued." (I Ch. 21:17).

Moses, Joshua, David--these are the examples the Rabbis employ to demonstrate the individual who is willing *לְהַקְדִּישׁ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ*, to sacrifice himself for Israel, to dedicate himself without any self-interest. This is the calibre of the man of whom it is said, *וְעָשָׂה כְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר־יֹאמַר*, "he shall do it", he will assume authority and leadership. These prophets, then, because of their willingness to sacrifice for Israel, deserved office, earned prophecy.

We are indeed justified, then, in our inclusion of sacrifice as an aspect of the prophetic figure, and we can assert with certainty that to sacrifice, *לְהַקְדִּישׁ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ*, as these prophets had done, required great mettle and strength--required a *נִסְיָאן*.

Was Sacrifice Rewarded?

Having substantiated our claim that sacrifice was an element of the prophetic function and demanded "strength", let us question its importance. How significant was it? Is there any evidence that prophecy was granted because of it?

A narrative dealing with the Seventy Elders is instructive. Focusing upon, "And the officers of the Children of Israel, whom Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them were beaten..." (Ex. 5:14), the Rabbis state:

We learn from this that they were fit men who sacrificed themselves ^{for Israel} because of Israel ^{and endured blows in order} to make light their (Israel's) task from off of them. Therefore they merited the Holy Spirit, as it says, "Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them" (Num. 11:16). God said, "They were smitten for the sake of Israel, therefore they will merit the Holy Spirit and be appointed as prophets over them".¹⁸

The fact that the ^{verses} of Exodus 5:14 are equated with ^{the verses} of Numbers 11:16 is made more explicit in the parallel passages. Here we read concerning, "And the officers of the children of Israel...were beaten" (Ex. 5:14):

The officers were beaten for the rest of the people and did not hand them over to the hands of the taskmasters, and thought, "It is better

that we be smitten and that the rest of the people should not stumble." Therefore when the Holy One Blessed be He said, "Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel" (Num. 11:16), Moses replied: "Sovereign of the Universe, I don't know who is worthy and who is not worthy." God responded: "Whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them" (Num. 11:16), those very elders and officers who handed themselves over to be smitten for their (Israel's) sakes in Egypt concerning the quota of bricks; let them come and take of this greatness."¹⁹

The Rabbis thus identify the *anavim* of Exodus 5:14 with the *anavim* of Numbers 11:16.

The parallels now contend that because these individuals sacrificed themselves for the community, an insight drawn from "...And they shall bear the burden of the people with thee..." (Num. 11:17),

וְהָיוּ אֲנָשִׁים יְהוּדִים

they are comparable to Moses. In conclusion, the Rabbis formulate a general rule:

לְכָל אֲנָשִׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַדּוּ בְּעַד יִשְׂרָאֵל

וְהָיוּ אֲנָשִׁים יְהוּדִים

"Whoever hands himself over in behalf of Israel merits honor, greatness, and the Holy Spirit."¹⁹

The Elders, therefore, because they had sacrificed themselves in behalf of Israel, merit prophecy. And should we recall that these very same elders were pictured as *anavim* *le'Israel* *le'atza* *le'atza* *le'atza*²⁰, we can additionally justify the relationship we devised between sacrifice and the *anavim*. They are *anavim* *le'Israel* for they sacrifice in behalf of Israel.

A second example in which the Rabbis attribute the

reception of prophecy to the act of sacrifice centers about the heroine, Esther.

וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁמַר אֶת עַמּוּנוֹ וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת הַמִּלְכָּה אֶסְתֵּר וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת הָאָרֶץ וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת הַיָּם וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת כָּל הַבְּרִיּוֹת וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת כָּל הַמַּלְאָכִים וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת כָּל הַמַּשְׁכָּל וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת כָּל הַמַּשְׁכָּל וְיִשְׁמַר אֶת כָּל הַמַּשְׁכָּל

The Rabbis in this passage focus on the word *וְעַתָּה* of Esther 5:1. They assert that the text should read *וְעַתָּה יְהוָה* in this fashion: "Now it came to pass on the third day that Esther clothed herself in royal apparel", rather than "royalty". In explanation of the curious verbiage, they maintain: "This shows that the Holy Spirit clothed her", a conclusion deduced by a *מִלְכָּה* based on *וְעַתָּה*. "Here it is written *וְעַתָּה* 'and she clothed' (Est. 5:1), and in another place, it is written, 'Then the spirit clothed *וְעַתָּה* Amasai.'" (I Ch. 12:19)²¹

We can, therefore, conclude that Esther's preparation to sacrifice herself for Israel earned her reward. As she prepared to go to the King without being summoned, an act contrary to his edict and deserving of death, she was visited by the Holy Spirit, the agency of prophetic power.

One final example of the receipt of prophetic power after sacrifice concerns the prophet Obadiah:

Rabbi Isaac said: How did Obadiah merit prophecy: Because he hid 100 prophets in a cave, as it says, "for it was so, when Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord, that Obadiah took 100 prophets, and hid them 50 in a cave..." (I Kings 18:4)²².

Obadiah, because of his sacrifice in spite of the threat of

death, merited prophecy. The Word of God, therefore, was indeed granted in return for sacrifice, a factor which delineates the importance of sacrifice for the prophetic personality.

SUMMARY

A willingness to sacrifice in behalf of Israel fully recreates the ideal image of the prophet as manifested by Jeremiah--one who possesses concern for both God, the Father, and Israel, the son. Whereas the elements of "testing" and "listening" have reference to his commitment to God, the element of sacrifice without regard to personal danger relates to his dedication toward Israel.

The Rabbinic literature overflows with recitals of such sacrifice, as in the case of Moses, Aaron, the Elders, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, thus vindicating its incorporation as a vital, prophetic function.

That this act of sacrifice required a *qorban* is apparent in the stirring phrase which the Rabbis employ as descriptive of one who is deserving of office--*qorban* *ha'elohim*. One may deserve office, in this case prophecy, as Moses, Joshua, and David, only if he is willing to destroy his soul. Such an act of consecration would require a *qorban*.

Narratives focusing upon the Elders, Esther, and Obadiah present evidence that sacrifice was indeed rewarded by the receipt of prophetic power.

Our total survey has enabled us to appreciate more fully Jochanan's inclusion of *qorban* as one of the essential attributes of the prophet. Firstly, we discovered that the prophet's function included three most vital areas--Testing, Listening, and Sacrifice. We then determined that the prophet

had to be a *712C* to respond successfully in each of these areas. Finally, we indicated that such a successful response gained or retained for him the prophetic Word.

II--THE WEALTHY MAN

The Prophet and Wealth

The second attribute which Jochanan cites is *רַבִּי* a rich man, and our author ingeniously provides evidence for its possession by prophetic personalities.

ל'וּ רַבִּי רַבִּי ל'וּ "All the prophets were wealthy" asserts Jochanan, and he proceeds to derive his statement from Moses, Samuel, Amos, and Jonah.¹ His illustration for Moses is adopted from the interpretation of *רַבִּי ל'וּ* (Ex. 34:1) by Rabbi Hama b. R. Hanina -- *רַבִּי ל'וּ רַבִּי ל'וּ*, "their chippings shall be yours." The wealth of Samuel is deduced from R. Jochanan's analysis of *וְרַבִּי רַבִּי ל'וּ רַבִּי ל'וּ* "And his return was to Ramah, for there was his house" (I Sam. 7:17), which is originally found in Berochot 10b. In the Berochot passage, the content of which deals with hospitality, R. Jochanan construes *רַבִּי* as referring to all locations previously mentioned in I Sam. 7, and concludes that Samuel was so wealthy that he was not compelled to avail himself of the hospitality of anyone -- *וְרַבִּי רַבִּי ל'וּ* "For everywhere he went, his household was with him," a luxury which entailed much expense.

The wealth of Amos is drawn by R. Jochanan from the Targum translation of "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit" (Amos 7:14). R. Jochanan ascribes to R. Joseph the translation, "Behold I am the owner of flocks

and possess sycamore trees in the valley," adequate proof that Amos was far from need.

Jonah is considered a wealthy man by means of "and he found a ship going to Tarshish so he paid the fare thereof and went down into it," (Jonah 1:3). R. Jochanan maintains that Jonah *אֵלֶּיָּהוּ שָׁלַח לְכָל הַיָּם* "paid the fare for the entire ship," and Rabbi Romanus² adds that the rental price for the ship was 4000 golden denarii.

Although this stands as the primary passage demonstrating wealth as a characteristic of the prophet, it is by no means the only one. For example, Jacob, the third of the Patriarchs, is also described as enjoying abundant resources. Commenting upon the verse *וַיָּבֹא יַעֲקֹב בְּשָׁלוֹם* "And Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem..." (Gen. 33:18), the Rabbis literally render it "And Jacob arrived at the city of Shechem complete...."⁴ They illustrate this thesis by asserting that upon his arrival in Shechem, Jacob was complete in body, in spite of "...and he limped upon his thigh" (Gen. 32:32); complete in children, in spite of his decision to split his camp so that "if Esau come to the one camp and smite it, then the camp which is left shall escape" (Gen. 32:9); and complete, in the sense of full, in money in spite of the comment of R. Abun in the name of Rav Aha that Jacob honored Esau for nine years by means of his gift to his brother (Gen. 32:14-16). Jacob nevertheless was complete in money.

Why Wealth's Esteem?

Having observed evidence that the prophet was wealthy, we may now justly seek reasons for the high regard directed toward wealth. Why do we find the Rabbinic mind attributing wealth not only to prophet, but to priest and ruler as well

וְנָאֵל מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְנָאֵל מִלְּפָנֵי הַכֹּהֵן "A ruler and an anointed priest... can never be reduced to poverty."⁵ Why do the Rabbis interpret "Bless, Lord, his (Levi's) substance..." (Dt. 33:11) as referring to נְכָסִים "property," and hence conclude מִכָּאן שֶׁכָּהֳנָנִים רַבִּים הָיוּ עֲשִׂירִים רַבִּים "from this one says the majority of priests are wealthy."⁶ Why should priest and wealth be so identified that Rabbi Jochanan can maintain: מִי שֶׁיֵּשֶׁה שְׂמִינִי שֶׁל אֶהְרֹן "He who desires to become wealthy, let him cleave to the seed of Aaron."⁷ What underlies the acquisition and possession of wealth which makes it a necessary and exalted characteristic of prophet as well as priest?

A primary reason for the glorification of wealth is its agreed upon source.

R. Meir said: One should always teach his son a clean and easy craft

וְהָיָה שֶׁיִּשְׁלַח בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעֵשֶׂת וְלִשְׁמֵרָה וְלִשְׁמֵרָה וְלִשְׁמֵרָה וְלִשְׁמֵרָה

and earnestly pray to Him to Whom all wealth and property belong, for neither poverty nor wealth comes from one's calling, but from Him to Whom wealth and property belong, "The silver is Mine, and the gold is Mine, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Haggai 2:8).⁸

God, then, is the source of wealth.

This theme is beautifully elaborated by the Rabbinic exposition of "For neither from the east, nor from the west, nor yet from the wilderness cometh lifting up *שׁוֹמֵר*. For God is judge; He putteth down one, and lifteth up another" (Psalm 75:7-8).

What does the text "For neither from the east (*מִמֶּזְרָח*) nor from the west" mean? It is not due to the fact that a man goes out *מִמֶּזְרָח* and works at his trade, going from east to west, that he becomes rich. Even if he sails away in ships and travels from east to west, going backwards and forwards in the deserts and on the mountains *בְּרִי* he does not become rich. What is the meaning of "Nor yet from the wilderness *בְּרִי*?" R. Abba explained: All instances in Scripture of the word *בְּרִי* denotes "mountains" except here which signifies exaltation; for *אֵל מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל* man is not exalted by means of these things. For what does God do? He takes away property from one and gives it to another, as it says, "God is Judge; He putteth down one, and lifteth up another." Property is *בְּרִי* for it is concealed *בְּרִי* from one and revealed to another. Certain coins are called *בְּרִי* for they are removed *בְּרִי* from one and given to another. Money is called *בְּרִי* as if to say *אֵל מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל* what are you counting? It is nothing. Small coins are *בְּרִי* signifying *אֵל מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל* what of the future time?...

A certain lady asked R. Simeon b. Halaftha: In how many days did God create the world? He answered her, In six, as it says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth" (Ex. 20:11). She said to him, From that hour until now, what has He been doing? He replied: He sits and constructs ladders, whereby He elevates one and puts down another, "For God is judge; He putteth down one, and lifteth up another."

God's influence upon the dispensation of wealth, though not immediately apparent or recognizable in a particular case, will eventually make itself felt. The misfortunes of

"A time to cast away stones..." --
 "And Moses' anger waxed hot, and he
 cast the tables out of his hands,
 and broke them beneath the mount."
 (Ex. 32:19) "And a time to gather
 stones together" -- "Hew thee two
 tables of stone..." (Which the Rabbis
 interpret as) the chips shall be thine
~~לוא = ללוא~~ From this
 source Moses became rich. The Holy
 One, Blessed be He, said: It is only
 logical that Moses should take the
 chips. Why? For Israel who did not
 engage themselves in the commandments
 I gave all the good of Egypt, "And the
 Lord gave the people favor in the sight
 of the Egyptians, so that they let them
 have what they asked" (Ex. 12:36); and
 should Moses, who occupied himself with
 the bones of Joseph be poor? I will
 give him the chips that he may be rich.¹²

Moses, because of his deed of kindness toward Joseph's memory and honor, earned for himself wealth.

A Tannaitic passage portrays R. Ishmael son of R. Jose reacting to questions concerning the wealthy:

The wealthy in Palestine, whereby do they merit wealth? Because they give tithes, he replied, as it is written, ~~תן תן~~ ("Thou shalt surely tithe," Dt. 14:22), which Ishmael renders, give tithes ~~תן~~ so that thou may become wealthy ~~תעש~~. Those in Babylon, wherewith do they merit it? Because they honor the Torah, he answered. Those in other countries? Because they honor the Sabbath.¹³

An Amoraic passage presents R. Nachman b. Isaac offering still another method:

~~תעש~~ ~~לוא~~ ~~לוא~~ (לוא) ~~לוא~~ ~~לוא~~
 If he does give (his holy articles),
 he will eventually become rich, as it
 says, "Whatever a man giveth the priest,

he shall have" (Num. 5:10). ["It shall be his" --- J.P.S.] -- He shall have much wealth.¹⁶

Finally, the Rabbinic attempt to reconcile the disparate messages of "However, there shall be no needy among you" (Dt. 15:4)

וְאֵין עָנִי בְּכֶן אֶרֶץ

and "For the poor shall never cease out of the land" (Dt. 15:11)

וְאֵין עָנִי מִן הָאָרֶץ

leads to the generalized formulation:

*בְּעֵת שֶׁתִּשְׁמַע אֶת צֶדֶק אֱלֹהִים
וְהָיָה עָנִי בְּכֶן אֶרֶץ
וּבְעֵת שֶׁלֹּא תִשְׁמַע אֶת צֶדֶק אֱלֹהִים
וְהָיָה עָנִי בְּכֶן אֶרֶץ*

At the time when you (Israel) perform the will of God, the needy will be among others; and at the time that you do not perform the will of God, the needy will be among you.¹⁷

Wealth, then, is to be associated with the performance of good deeds manifesting one's loyalty and dedication to God.

There is yet a third reason to explain the favorable sanctions given to wealth, and this involves a consideration of the ends toward which wealth's potentiality may be directed.

Launching us into this realm is the Rabbinic exposition of "If thou lend money to any of My people" (Ex. 22:24). Utilizing "There is a grievous evil which I have seen under the sun, namely, riches kept by the owner thereof to his hurt; and those riches perish by evil adventure" (Eccl. 5:12) as the ~~verse~~ verse, the Rabbis maintain:

Happy is the man who can withstand his

test, for there is no creature whom God does not test. He tries the rich man to see if his hand will be opened unto the poor.... If the rich man withstands his test and does charitable things, then he will enjoy his wealth in this world, and the capital will be preserved for him in the World to Come, and God will redeem him from the judgement of Gehinnom, as it says, "Happy is he that considers the poor; the Lord will deliver him in the day of evil" (Ps. 41:2).... The rich man, however, who grudges to give, perishes with his wealth from this world, as it says, "And those riches perish by evil adventure," for he is uncharitable towards those who collect charity. Why is all this? Because there is a rotating wheel in this world, and he who is rich today may not be tomorrow, and also he who is poor today may not be tomorrow. Rather, one He casts down, and the other He raises up, "For God is judge; He putteth down one, and lifteth up another" (Ps. 75:8). Come and see-- there is wealth that does harm to its possessors and there is wealth that does good for them. Wealth that does harm, that is the wealth of Korach who was richer than all Israel and of whom it is written, "So they, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit" (Num. 16:33). Another example: Such was the wealth of the wicked Haman of whom it says, "And Haman recounted unto them the glory of his riches" (Esther 5:11), "And that he and his sons should be hanged on the gallows" (Esther 9:25). Wealth that benefits its owners is like that of Jehoshaphat had riches and honor in abundance" (II Chr. 18:1). What happened to him? "But Jehoshaphat cried out, and the Lord helped him." (II Chr. 18:31).¹⁸

The image of the wheel of fortune emphasizes the influence God exerts upon the dispensation of wealth, and the inclusion of Korach and Haman reiterates that which we al-

ready discovered in another context:

So also two rich men arose in the world, one in Israel and one among the nations of the world--Korach in Israel and Haman among the nations of the world--and both of them were destroyed from the world. Why? Because *לפי שהם לא נתנו את מתנותיהם לאלהים* their gifts were not from the Holy One, Blessed be He, but they snatched it for themselves.¹⁹

Of utmost relevance, however, is the rediscovery of the universality of testing. As we had detected in our investigation of the *דיל*, all men must undergo trials initiated by God to determine their worth. The rich man is assayed by an appraisal of the manner with which and the uses toward which he conducts his opulence. He is not to restrict his wealth to his own exclusive enjoyment, but rather is to channel it in spiritually creative as well as altruistic ventures. This will only be realized if the individual remains aware of his commitment to God and God's will.

גם רשעים ופסולי דעה ופסולי שם
Our Rabbis taught: The poor, the rich, and the wicked come before the heavenly court. They say to the poor: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he says: I was poor and concerned for my sustenance, they would say to him: Were you poorer than Hillel?
ענין אבנן לו חסד' אלא עסקא קריבין?
אם אומר ענין חסד' אלא עסקא קריבין?
אבנן לו חסד' אלא עסקא קריבין?
To the rich they say: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he said: I was rich and preoccu-

pied with my possessions, they would say to him: Were you perchance richer than R. Elazar? It was reported about R. Elazar b. Harsom that his father left him 1000 cities on the continent and over against that 1000 boats on the sea. Every day he would take a sack of flour on his shoulder and go from city to city and province to province to study the Torah. One day his servants found him and seized him for public service. He said to them, I beg of you, let me go to study the Torah. They said: By the life of R. Elazar b. Harsom, we shall not let you go. (He gave them much money so that they would let him go). He had never seen them, for he was sitting all day and night, occupying himself with the Torah....

וְעַתָּה אֵין מִי שֶׁיִּשְׁמַח בְּכֶסֶף וּבְעַלְמִיּוֹת
Thus we see... R. Elazar b. Harsom
condemns the rich.²⁰

The familiar passage concerning, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart with all thy soul and with all *your* substance" (Dt. 6:5), gives additional cogency to this fundamental requirement of subserviency.

R. Eliezer says, If it says with all thy soul, why does it say with all thy substance (wealth)? And if it says with all your substance, why does it say with all thy soul? It is for this reason: If you know of a man whose physical existence is more beloved to him than his money, to him it says with all thy soul. And if you know of one whose money is more beloved to him than his physical existence, to such it says, with all thy substance.²¹

He who has wealth, therefore, is to make such use of it that it will reflect his commitment and loyalty to God and to Torah.

The latter is indicated in the Rabbinic exposition of "Do good in Thy favour unto Zion/ Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem./ Then wilt Thou delight in the sacrifices of righteousness, in burnt-offering and whole offering./ Then will they offer bullocks upon Thine altar" (Ps. 51:20-1). The Rabbis view these verses as having reference to *שְׂכָרָה* and they assert:

Happy is the man who engages in Torah and gives his money to teach Torah to his son. Because for the sake of the money which he gives to learn (Torah) he merits the life of the world-to-come, as it says, "For that is thy life and the length of thy days." (Dt. 30:20).²²

Wealth, thus employed, enables man to engage in the study of Torah.

It also permits him to dedicate himself to the service of God through service to man, to subsidize his loyalty to God-given ideals.

Rabbi showed respect to rich men, and R. Akiba also showed respect to rich men, in agreement with an exposition made by Raba b. Mari. "May he be enthroned before God forever. Appoint mercy and truth that they may preserve him" (Ps. 61:8). When "may he be enthroned before God forever"? When he "appoints mercy and truth."²³

The premise of this passage is obvious: the man of plenty is in a position to be merciful and truthful with others, and thus to enter into social relationships motivated by

a sense of communal and personal responsibility.

A final reason may be linked to the personal consequences for one who possesses wealth, for it is financial security which allows one to be independent and self-sufficient.

As illustrative of this, the Rabbinic explanation of the wordage

וְכָל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ

"And the famine was over all the face of the earth", (Gen. 41:56) is noteworthy.

Now Scripture should write, and the famine was over the earth; why state, "And the famine was over all the face of the earth" (Gen. 41:56). Said R. Samuel b. Nachmani: The famine commenced first with the wealthy. When one is wealthy he has a smiling face *pinning* to show his friends. But when one is poor he has not the face to see him, being ashamed before him....²⁴

Closely allied to this are two other statements, the first attributed to R. Jochanan and R. Eliezer, and the second to R. Ammi and R. Assi.

R. Jochanan and R. Eliezer both state: As soon as a man needs the support of his fellow creatures, his face changes color like the Kerum, as it is said: "As the Kerum is to be reviled among the sons of men" (Psalm 12:9, "When vileness is exalted among the sons of men--J.P.S.).

R. Ammi and R. Assi: (When a man needs the support of his fellow beings) it is as if he were punished with two punishments, fire and water, "When Thou hast caused men to ride over our heads, we went through fire and water" (Psalm 66:12).²⁵

Not only is one's physical appearance affected, but the mental and psychological attitude as well.

We have learned in a Mishnah-- Rabbi Eliezer, the Great, said: Whoever has a morsel of bread in his basket and thinks, what will I eat tomorrow--he is of the men of little faith.²⁶

This passage reflects the dilemma of the individual who, because of monetary instability, becomes disenchanted with any belief or faith in God. Such a Rabbinic declaration as this implies that this phenomenon was existent and had to be combatted.

Perhaps most helpful in this regard is a glance at the eight designations given to the poor man in the Rabbinic elucidation of "If thy brother be waxen poor..." (Lev. 25:25). Extrapolating from these, we can sense the advantageous position of the rich.

Eight designations were given to the poor man: *u'r* means literally poor. *יוֹדֵחַ* --He is called *יוֹדֵחַ* because he longs *רָצָה* for everything; *יוֹדֵחַ* because he is despised by all, "the poor man's *יוֹדֵחַ* wisdom is despised" (Eccl. 9:16); *עֲדֵי* because he is dispossessed *עֲדֵי* of property; *עֲדֵי* because he is detached *עֲדֵי* from property; *עֲדֵי* for he is crushed *עֲדֵי* -- he sees a thing and cannot eat it,

he sees a thing and cannot taste
it, he sees a thing and cannot
drink it; ^{for} because he is lowly
^{for} before everyone like a kind
of lowest thresh-hold. Accordingly,
Moses exhorts Israel saying "If thy
brother be waxen poor (^{for} from ^{for},
poverty in its lowest sense and
worst aspect), then shall his kins-
man...redeem." 27

Who Is "Wealthy"?

Thus far we have been dealing with the term *g'v* as specifically denoting financial resources, and this would be quite in accord with Jochanan's original formulation of the term. Such an exclusive reference for *g'v*, however, would limit unjustly and unrealistically the candidates who could qualify for the receipt of prophetic power. Ezekiel, as a case in point, was considered far from wealthy; he was compared to Isaiah as a country-man to a city-dweller.²⁸

Therefore, just as one was compelled to modify a strict connotation of physical virility for the term *g'm* to one inclusive of spiritual vigor, so here, in the case of *g'v*, one must provide for the incorporation of those prophetic personalities who were not necessarily affluent, and yet "wealthy".

We are led to this complementary interpretation of *g'v* by a second Rabbinic exposition of "If thy brother be waxen poor..." (Lev. 25:25). In this passage, the two verses, "The poor man and the *g'm* *g'v* meet together; the Lord giveth light to the eyes of them both" (Prov. 29:13) and "The rich and the poor meet together -- The Lord is the Maker of them all" (Prov. 22:2) are linked together by applying a *g'm* *g'v* by means of the word *g'v*. This technique deems *g'm* as synonymous with *g'v* and derived not from *g'm* "oppression" as in the J.P.S. rendition, but from *g'm* "middle", "midst", implying a "middle-class man", a

"man of means", a rich man.

"The poor man" refers to one who is poor in the knowledge of the Torah, and the "middle-class man" applies to one who learns one or two Orders. If the poor man stood in the company of the middle-class man and said: Teach me one chapter of *Shema*, and he taught it to him, then "The Lord giveth light to the eyes of them both", and they acquire this world and the World to Come. "The rich and the poor meet together" which means one who is rich in knowledge of the Torah and one who is poor. If that poor man says to that rich man, Teach me a Chapter of *Shema*, and he does not teach it to him, but rather says to him, Why would I want to sit down and teach you the chapter *Shema* or *Shema*? Read the Scripture and study the Mishnah with people such as yourself, then, "The Lord is the Maker of them all," He who made this man wise *and* is able to make him foolish *and*, and He who made this man foolish is able to make him wise. Another interpretation: "Poor" refers to a man who is poor in property, and a "middle-class man", one who makes a living. If the poor man stands in the company of the middle-class man and says to him: Give me charity and he gives it to him, then, "The Lord giveth light to the eyes of them both"; the one obtains temporal life and the other the life of the World to Come. "The rich and the poor". "Rich" refers to one who is rich in property and "poor" to one who is poor in property. If the poor man stood in the company of the rich and said: Give me charity, and he did not give it to him, then, "The Lord is the maker of them all"-- He who made this one poor is able to make him rich, and He who made this one rich is able to make him poor.²⁹

Herein, we find two of the four elements upon which we focused to ascertain the reasons for wealth's pre-emi-

"...in want of all things." R. Ammi said in Rab's name: This means without a lamp or table. R. Hisda said: Without a wife. R. Shesheth said: Without an attendant. R. Nachman said: Without knowledge.... Abaye said: We have it on tradition that no one is poor, save he who lacks knowledge. In the West there is a proverb: He who has this, has everything; he who lacks this, what has he? Has one ~~acquired~~ acquired this, what does he lack? Has he not acquired this, what does he possess? ³⁰

The knowledge spoken of here is *דעת*. It is knowledge as common sense, as perspective, as a deepened appreciation of wealth's essential nature. The "wealth" of the *דעת* is not to be calculated solely in terms of cash value. "Wealth" is to be gauged by a yardstick calibrated to measure spiritually as well as materially. This is the knowledge which can make one *דעת*,

A Rabbinic exposition of "Now the Children of Reuben and the Children of Gad had a very great multitude of cattle..." (Num. 32:1) utilizing, "A wise man's understanding is at his right hand, but a fool's understanding at his left" (Eccl. 10:2), as the ~~parable~~ verse, embellishes this matter of proper perspective.

"A wise man's understanding is at his right hand" refers to Moses, while "...But a fool's understanding at his left" refers to the Children of Reuben and Gad who made the essential matter *דעת* subordinate, and regarded the subordinate issue *דעת* as major, in that they cherished their property more than human life,

for they said to Moses: "We will build sheepfolds here for our cattle, and cities for our little ones" (Num. 32:16). Moses said to them: That is not right. Rather do the more essential matter first. Build your cities for your little ones and afterward folds for your sheep. Thus "A wise man's understanding..." refers to Moses, and "...But a fool's understanding..." refers to the Children of Reuben and Gad. God said to them: You cherish your cattle more than human souls; by your life, there will be no blessing in it. Of them it says, "An estate may be gotten hastily at the beginning, but the end thereof shall not be blessed" (Prov. 20:21). Also, "Weary not thyself to be rich; cease from thine own wisdom" (Prov. 23:4). And who is rich? He that rejoices in his lot

וְהָיָה אִתּוֹ שְׂמֵחָה וְשָׂמַיִם וְשָׂמַיִם

As it says, "When thou eatest the labor of thy hands happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee" (Ps. 128:2).²¹

The Children of Reuben and Gad in this passage are far from deprivation. They are already blessed with "a very great multitude of cattle." And yet, they are not aware of their favorable circumstances, in that they lack the "knowledge", the *דַּעַת*, the perspective which can make of them *רַצְוֵה*. The deepened appreciation of what wealth truly consists of; the ability to distinguish between the *עֵשֶׂר*, "essential", and the *שְׁבַע*, "subordinate"; this they do not possess. For this reason they are foolish, a conclusion reminiscent of the *עוֹלָם* of Lev. Rab. 34:4.

Moses owns this "knowledge", and it is on the battleground of judgement that Moses challenges the Children of

Reuben and Gad. The dilemma with which Moses confronts them is one which requires a decision between an unsatisfiable quest for more gain, as opposed to a placid acceptance of what one does have at the moment, and which one can enjoy to its fullest. The issue does not urge a choice between a state of poverty or that of wealth. Moses does not demand that the tribes relinquish their holdings and cling to "knowledge" as their sole resource. On the contrary, poverty is indeed an evil, as we have seen. Rather, both Moses and God maintain that the Children of Reuben and Gad must add "knowledge" to their wealth, must supplement their resources with a cognizance of, and a gratitude for, what they have. It is not a matter, then, of possession, but of satisfaction. The message is crystalized in the final words:

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ? וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ

"Who is rich? He who rejoices in his lot." Each man has a "lot", but this is not the prime criterion for the *יִשְׂרָאֵל*. He must be content with his lot. Attitude based upon *יִשְׂרָאֵל*, rather than accumulation, becomes the standard. Thus, whether one is vastly wealthy or no, he can still be "wealthy".

Ben Zoma makes this argument even more emphatic:

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ? וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ "Who is it that is

richest among the rich -- one who delights in his portion."³²

That a man's *יִשְׂרָאֵל* is indeed his "wealth", is graphically delineated by the Talmudic substitution of *יִשְׂרָאֵל* for *יִשְׂרָאֵל*:

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ? וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ "Who is rich? All who have the proper attitude toward his wealth."³³ Each

man then has "his portion" -- he who is gratified by it is the *אִשְׁתּוֹ*.

We can thus understand why the prophet is to be *אִשְׁתּוֹ*. By being able to rejoice in that which he has, whatever it be, he will be more fully committed to the service of God without materialistic distraction.

This conclusion, though significant, does not adequately evaluate the prophet- *אִשְׁתּוֹ*. He is representative of far more. This becomes apparent when we draw the implications of this striking passage:

A sign of conceit is poverty, and poverty is found in Babylon.

וְכִי יִשְׁתָּהּ אִשְׁתּוֹ אִשְׁתּוֹ בָּנָה
By poverty, poverty of learning is meant, as it is written, "We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts." (Song of Songs 8:8)³⁴ *אִשְׁתּוֹ*.

Firstly, let us note that the "learning" mentioned here reflects the "knowledge" we discovered earlier in our analysis. It is Torah-"knowledge" of the sort that makes one *אִשְׁתּוֹ* rather than *אִשְׁתּוֹ*; it is "knowledge" as attitude, as perspective, as the recognition of the essential from the irrelevant. He who lacks this "knowledge" is indeed the "poor" man, and such poverty is surely to be linked to conceit. A man's inability to rejoice in his lot--his consideration of himself as poor--reflects a basic dissatisfaction with self. Because of this dissatisfaction with self, he is dissatisfied with others, and forthwith manifests arrogance and hostility towards them.

By an extension of the same reasoning, however, the *ḥay* is representative of a new disposition, one which is the antithesis of conceit. This is indeed the case for his ability to rejoice in what he has must presuppose an acceptance of self. Thus, he, in turn, will approve and affirm others, rather than denounce and humiliate in arrogance.

This exploration discloses a most important feature of the *ḥay*. To be *ḥay*, he firstly must be the possessor of a vastly noble quality, designated thus far in our survey by the general terms "knowledge", "perspective", "attitude", which manifests itself as an acceptance of self and of others. That this quality which empowers one to accept himself, and consequently his lot and others as well, is humility will be established in our analysis of *ḥay*.

SUMMARY

The *ṭey* is one who rejoices in and is content with his "lot", whatever it be. This does not imply, however, that abject poverty is to be a virtue. Poverty is an evil, and wealth is esteemed. It is esteemed because its source is God; because an act of great merit and excellence which revealed one's commitment and obligation to God predicated the grant; because of the goals toward which wealth could be channelled; and because of the personal consequences, physical and psychological, for the one who possesses it. Indeed, each man is to have "his lot", but the criterion of "wealth" is the attitude displayed toward it, rather than the amount acquired. The *ṭey*, then, is one who measures his wealth in spiritual as well as materialistic terms.

The prophet is to be such an *ṭey* for two reasons. By being able to rejoice in that which he has, whatever it be, he will be more completely dedicated to the service of God without materialistic distraction. More important, however, it would attest to the fact that he is the possessor of a vastly noble quality, humility, which manifests itself as an acceptance of self and of others. That the quality of humility does indeed endow one with the ability to be "wealthy" will be established in our analysis of *ṭey*.

III--THE WISE MAN

What Is *Chochma* ?

The third qualification which Rabbi Jochanan posits in Nedarim 38a is that the prophet is to be a wise man, *chochma*. What then is Wisdom?

The Biblical literature introduces us to the conception of Wisdom which finds abundant expression in the post-Biblical period. Wisdom is identified with Torah.

*וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵן חָכְמָה
וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵן חָכְמָה
וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵן חָכְמָה
וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵן חָכְמָה
וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵן חָכְמָה*

Behold, I have taught you statutes and ordinances, even as the Lord my God commanded me.... Observe therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples, that, when they hear all these statutes, shall say: "Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." (Dt. 4:5-6)

The "statutes and ordinances" *mitzvot* of the Torah are "your wisdom" *chochma*.

The most significant Rabbinic passage demonstrating this Biblical concept does so by treating the sublime poem in praise of primeval Wisdom found in the Book of Proverbs 8:22-32.

Focusing upon "In the beginning" (Gen. 1:1), R. Oshaya begins his exposition by citing as his *source* verse, "Then I was by Him as a nursling *gumme*; and I was daily all delight" (Proverbs 8:30). After experimenting with "tutor", "covered",

"hidden", and "great" as possible explanations for *pan*, the Rabbi concludes *pan* is a workman, *pan*, an artist or architect. Thus the subject of Proverbs 8:30, which is, according to the Rabbi, Torah, is asserting:

"I was the working tool of the Holy One, Blessed be He." In human practice, when a mortal king builds a palace, he builds it not with his own skill, but with the skill of an architect. The architect moreover does not build it out of his head, but employs plans and diagrams to know how to arrange the chambers and the wicket doors.

The Midrash now continues: "Thus God consulted the Torah and created the world." Indeed, the Torah declares in confirmation, "With the beginning God created" (Gen. 1:1), and the word "beginning" refers only to the Torah, as in the verse, "The Lord made me as the beginning *pan* of His way" (Proverbs 8:22).¹

By thus viewing *pan*, not in temporal or chronological terms, but rather as a logical beginning, or as Slonimsky suggests, "a first principle"², R. Oshaya weds Wisdom with Torah as the topic of Proverbs 8:22-32. This paeon of praise, originally composed in behalf of Wisdom, becomes connotative of Torah. It is Torah, Torah as God's Wisdom, that is present at creation, and the means whereby an orderly creation takes place. "With the first principle", i.e., with Torah, God fashioned the world.

In the Midrash then the Torah, identified with the primeval wisdom, is

the blue-print, the objectified mind of God, but also the instrumental power, i.e., both the plan and the architect, which God employs in the creation of the world and of man.³

The Tanchuma obviously presumes the above exegesis when it reports:

"In the beginning God created!"
This is what Scripture has in mind when it says, "The Lord by wisdom founded the earth" (Proverbs 3:19). And as God proceeded to create His world He took counsel with the Torah and so created the world.⁴

The Torah is Wisdom; Wisdom, Torah.

Still another Proverbs passage (9:1-4) serves to stimulate the identification of *חכמה* and *תורה*. Bar Kappara is the author of this analysis.

Wisdom hath builded her house,
She hath hewn out her seven pillars;
She hath prepared her meat, she hath mingled her wine;
She hath also furnished her table.
She hath sent forth her maidens,
she calleth,
Upon the highest places of the city:
"Whoso is thoughtless, let him turn in hither;"
As for him that lacketh understanding,
she saith to him: (Proverbs 9:1-4).

Bar Kappara expounded the above as referring to the Torah. "Wisdom hath builded her house" means the Torah, as (as indicated by what) is written, "For the Lord giveth wisdom" (Proverbs 2:6), "The Lord made me as the beginning of the way" (Proverbs 8:22). "She hath hewn out her seven pillars" alludes to the seven books of the Torah. But surely there are

only five? Bar Kappara considered the portion from the beginning *וְהָיָה* (Num. 1:1) up to "And it came to pass, when the ark set forward" (Num. 10:35) as one book; from "And it came to pass..." up to "And when it rested..." (Num. 10:36) as another one; thence to the end thereof as another one. Lo, this makes seven (books).

The Midrash now elaborates. "She hath prepared her meat" *וַתַּעֲרֹךְ* is rendered as "She hath done her slaughtering" and alludes to the penalties *פְּסוּלֵי חַיִּים* (death penalties in the Torah); "She hath mingled her wine" refers to (the hermeneutic methods of inferences) *וְהָיָה כְּמִשְׁכַּח הַיַּיִן* from major to minor and from analogy of expressions; "She hath also set (*וַתַּעֲרֹךְ*) her table" is an allusion to valuations *וְהָיָה כְּמִשְׁכַּח הַיַּיִן*.⁵ Once again, Torah and Wisdom become synonymous terms.

This theme of Torah = Wisdom is not restricted to the Book of Proverbs. Its realm extends far beyond. After the Rabbis have substantiated their contention, motivated by "And this is the blessing" (Dt. 33:1), that men must not only labor or meditate in Torah, but must also fulfill the Word of the Torah, they embark upon an extension of the latter.

In them that fulfill it. A man may say, I have⁶ acquired wisdom, but I have not learnt Torah; what shall I do under such circumstances? God said to Israel: By your life, the whole of wisdom and the whole of the Torah are comprised in one trifling thing: whosoever fears Me and fulfills the Torah holds all wisdom and all the Torah in his heart. Whence

this? For it is written, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; / A good understanding have all they that do thereafter." (Psalm 111:10). "The fear of the Lord, is clean, enduring forever" (Psalm 19:10). "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom" (Job 28:28).⁷

That Wisdom is Torah-knowledge is the underlying motif of such a passage.

The Rabbis, in examining "...See the Lord hath called by name Bezalel...And He hath filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, and in knowledge...." (Ex. 35:30), recall the original verse "...and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge..." (Ex. 31:3) and explain

*וַיִּמְלֵךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת בְּזַלְאֵל בְּרוּחַ אֱלֹהֵי חָכְמָה
וּבְרוּחַ אֱלֹהֵי דַעַת וּבְרוּחַ אֱלֹהֵי יוֹשָׁד וְיִדְעָה
וּבְרוּחַ אֱלֹהֵי חֵסֶד וְיִרְאָה וּבְרוּחַ אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמִירָה*

"in wisdom--meaning that he was wise in the Torah; in understanding--that he could understand the Halachah; in knowledge--that he was full of understanding in the Talmud."⁸ With such application, all dimensions of learning are linked to Torah and Torah-study.

A final example indicating the complete identification of Torah and Wisdom focuses upon the figure of Noah, "These are the generations of Noah. Noah was in his generations a man righteous and whole-hearted..." (Gen. 6:9).

וְהָיָה נֹחַ אִישׁ צַדִּיק וְשֹׁמֵר מִצְוֹת אֱלֹהִים

Thus did R. Tanchuma bar Abba in the academy open with the *hachana*

verse, "The fruit of the righteous ^{א'ל} is a tree of life..." (Proverbs 11:30). R. Judah the Levite bar Shalom said: "At the time that a righteous man departs from the world without children, he is grieved and cries. The Holy One Blessed be He says to him: 'Why do you grieve and cry? Is it because you have not established the fruit of children? In this world I have fruit more excellent than children.' The man replies: 'Master of the World, what is this fruit?' The Holy One answers: 'It is Torah in which you have engaged, for thus it says, "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life", and "tree of life" refers to naught but Torah, as it says, "She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her..."' (Proverbs 3:18)."

The original personification of Wisdom of Proverbs 3:18 is now rendered as a representation of Torah.

We have the answer, then, to our initial question. What is the nature of Wisdom? Wisdom and Torah are one, Torah being the very expression of God's Wisdom.

The Attainment of Wisdom

Having acknowledged the identification of Wisdom with the Torah, we can logically draw the conclusion, with Moore, that "the study of the law and the cultivation of wisdom went hand in hand."¹⁰

Indeed, when R. Joshua b. Hananiah was asked by the Alexandrians

מה צריך אדם ללמוד כדי להשיג חכמה?

"What must a man do that he may become wise?", he replied:

אין צורך ללמוד הרבה, אלא ללמוד מעט מעט.

"Let him engage much in study (sitting in the schoolhouse) and a little in business."¹¹

Again, King Ahaz, in an attempt to divest Israel of the *חכמה*, must, as we shall see,¹² prevent the further development of wise men *חכמים*. To achieve this, he seized *את* the synagogues and the schools, thus deserving his name.

Wisdom, then, was the consequence of the study of Torah.

This, however, is only a partial solution to the attainment of Wisdom, for the Alexandrians are not fully content with R. Joshua's rejoinder. "Did not many do so (engage much in study) and it was of no avail to them?" they ask. To this, the Rabbi retorts: *אין צורך ללמוד הרבה, אלא ללמוד מעט מעט.*

אין צורך ללמוד הרבה, אלא ללמוד מעט מעט.

"Rather let them pray for mercy from Him to whom is the wisdom, for it is said, 'For the Lord giveth wisdom, out of His mouth cometh knowledge and discernment.'" (Proverbs 2:6)¹¹.

Since Torah and Wisdom are equated, the source of both is identical. All Wisdom is God's Wisdom, and thus revealed by

God.

This is beautifully conveyed by an unusual Rabbinic analysis of "...and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them..." (Num. 11:17). Conventionally, this text is employed to indicate the reception of prophetic power by the Elders through the agency of Moses, rather than God. For example, in a passage which we will note in our survey of ¹³, distinctions are drawn between Eldad and Medad and the Elders. One of these assumes the following form:

That (the prophetic spirit ~~passed~~) of the Elders came from Moses, as it says, "And I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them" (Num. 11:17). These (Eldad and Medad), however, derived their spirit of prophecy from the Holy One Blessed be He, as it says, "And the spirit rested upon them" (Num. 11:26).

The passage now maintains:

*and now the spirit which was upon
Moses did not diminish when he
gave of it to the Elders for the
spirit which was upon him did not diminish
and so it is with the spirit of prophecy*

If you ask, Since the Elders received their prophetic spirit from that of Moses, perhaps Moses was deprived of some of his prophetic spirit? No. To what may this be compared? To a candle that was burning and from which many candles were lit, yet the light of its flame did not diminish. So also here. Moses lost nothing of his own; for it says, "And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto

Moses" (Dt. 34:10).¹⁴

This conventional treatment, however, undergoes a change.

ואני אקח מן הרוח - אשר נתתי בך
 ונתתי על זקני ישראל חכמה ונבונה
 ונאמרו עיניהם ולא חסד אמרו בלתי כן
 לא יסור חכמהו כי אשה חסדה בלתי

"And I will take of the spirit which is upon thee..."--to what was Moses like at that hour? To a candle stationed at the top of a candlestick and many candles were kindled from it and it did not lose any flame. So too, the wisdom of Moses did not diminish at all.¹⁵

The spirit with which God has endowed Moses, and which He in turn will bestow upon the Elders, is חכמה Wisdom, rather than the usual spirit of prophecy.

The relevance of this substitution of "wisdom" for the "prophetic spirit" in the Rabbinic understanding of this passage will be discussed at the conclusion of our analysis.^{15a} At this time, we need only appreciate that Wisdom's source is indeed God.

Indicative of the same theme is the Rabbinic analysis of the competence of Bezalel. Reacting to the verse "...and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge..." (Ex. 31:3), the Rabbis ask:

כל הידע בזה מנין? מן הקדוש דבר אלהים

"Whence came all this knowledge? From the Holy One Blessed be He, namely from the spirit of God." The passage continues:

Similarly in the case of Joshua who descended from Joseph, you find

written: "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom" (Dt. 34:9). See also what is written of Othniel, the son of Kenaz, who descended from Judah: "And the spirit of the Lord came upon him and he judged Israel" (Judges 3:10).... (R. Hanina now contributes;) Thus it is written, "But it is a spirit in man, / And the breath of the Almighty that giveth them understanding" (Job 32:8) *וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיֵּי אֲדָמָה* and all the understanding possessed by Bezalel was from the Almighty.¹⁶

The attainment of true Wisdom, then, must partake of both of the dimensions which Rabbi Joshua indicated. Its acquisition must be realized by means of a blend of human effort manifested by the study of the Law and of God's patronage, evinced by God's favor bestowed upon the individual.

R. Jochanan, in describing the proper procedure and course of action for the attainment of Wisdom, suggests the relationship between the two elements:

R. Jochanan said: The Holy One Blessed be He gives wisdom only to one who already has wisdom
וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיֵּי אֲדָמָה
 as it says, "He giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding."
 (Dan. 2:21)¹⁷.

By maintaining that God gives Wisdom only to one who already possesses Wisdom, this passage implies that the human factor must precede and earn the second, the divine. It is through the study of Torah that one ascends to the

initial condition of Wisdom, that of acknowledging God and assuming the tasks and responsibilities necessary for an appropriate relationship with Him. This, in turn, will give rise to God's kindly auspices.

Indeed, the Rabbis assert:

וְיִפְסֹד כִּשְׁכֹּחַ הַתּוֹרָה
 ...that all who neglect the Words
 of Torah, it is as though he de-
 nies the Holy One Blessed be He,
 for He gave the Torah to Israel
 only that they may be engaged in
 it day and night, as it says "But
 thou shalt meditate therein day
 and night" (Joshua 1:8).¹⁸

The Rabbis add, however, "He who is engaged in the Torah and observes it, it is as though he received it from Mt. Sinai." Through Wisdom achieved by the agency of Torah-study, one vicariously bears witness to God's supremacy, and thus gains God's interest and favor in exchange.

In conclusion, then, study and the reciprocal relationship with God which it fosters lead to Wisdom. It is through the study of Torah, the human element, that one gains Wisdom; the Wisdom through which he recognizes his obligations to God, and as a consequence of which, God will find him meritorious enough for additional dispensations. The human and the divine are thus inextricably linked.

Why Is Wisdom Important?

והם הם, והם הם
 These are the things for which no measure is prescribed: Peah (leaving part of one's crop unreaped for the benefit of the poor), First-Fruits, the Festal-Offering (the Temple offering of the Israelites for the Three Festivals), deeds of lovingkindness, and the Study of the Law *והם הם*. These are things whose fruits a man enjoys in this world while the capital is laid up for him in the world-to-come: honoring father and mother, deeds of lovingkindness, making peace between a man and his fellow, *והם הם* and the Study of the Law is equal to them all.¹⁹

This passage unconditionally avows that the Study of the Law, and logically its consequence, Wisdom, were certainly admired as accomplishments of excellence. Why, however, were they accorded such regard? A glance at the "harvest" of Wisdom and study will ready us to fully appreciate their great significance. The eloquence of Rabbi Meir is germane:

R. Meir said: Whosoever labours in the Torah for its own sake, merits many things; and not only so, but the whole world is indebted to him: he is called friend, beloved, a lover of the All-present, a lover of mankind: it clothes him in *והם הם* humility and reverence; it fits him to become just, pious, upright and faithful; it keeps him far from sin, and brings him near to virtue: through him the world enjoys counsel and sound knowledge, understanding and strength; as it is said, "Counsel is mine, and sound knowledge; I am understanding; I have strength" (Pro-

verbs 8:14); and it gives him sovereignty and dominion and discerning judgment: to him the secrets of the Torah are revealed; he is made like a never-failing fountain, and like a river that flows on with ever-sustained vigor; he becomes modest, patient, and forgiving of insults; and it magnifies and exalts him above all things.²⁰

Of immediate relevance for us is R. Meir's assertion that *anav*, humility, the fourth of Jochanan's designations, is rooted in Wisdom, in the study of Torah. Meir declared that by means of Wisdom one became "modest, patient, and forgiving of insults." This contention will be echoed in our analysis of the source of *anav*²¹. There we will discover that humility does indeed presuppose the knowledge and awareness of God's desires, and these are achieved only through Wisdom, through study. Similarly, it is due to this basic relationship between Wisdom and humility, that the term "knowledge" in our analysis of "Who is Wealthy" had direct reference to humility²².

Furthermore, since we have specified humility as the quality which enables one to be *anav*,²³ "wealth" itself will be contingent upon Wisdom. This was reflected in our analysis of "Who is Wealthy" by the declaration that it is Torah-knowledge that distinguishes the *anav* from the *gadol* in monetary as well as other matters.²⁴ The association of "wealth" and knowledge is more cogently conveyed, however, in two other passages, one by a Tannah, the other containing a statement

by an Amorah.

The Tannaitic passage states in the name of R. Eleazar:

וְהוּא אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְאַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Whoever has knowledge will eventually be wealthy, as it is written, "And by knowledge shall the chambers be filled with all precious and pleasant riches" (Proverbs 24:4).²⁵

The second passage relates:

R. Isaac said: He who desires to become wise should turn to the south (when praying) and he who desires to become rich should turn to the north... R. Joshua b. Levi, however, said that he should always turn to the south, because through obtaining wisdom he will obtain wealth, as it says, "Length of days are in her (wisdom's) right hand, in her left hand are riches and honor" (Proverbs 3:16).²⁶

By means of diligence in study, then, one will gain an appreciation of the true nature of "wealth".

Since Meir also includes *וְהוּא* as a product of Wisdom, whereby one is *וְהוּא* even the aspects of the *וְהוּא*, those of testing, listening, and sacrifice are linked to *וְהוּא*. Thus Wisdom serves as the reservoir out of which the prophet is to draw, to refresh and replenish his constantly utilized *וְהוּא*, *וְהוּא*, *וְהוּא* dimensions. It is most important, then, for the prophet to be *וְהוּא*, to possess the Torah-knowledge which will invest him with those characteristics indispensable for his role

and function.

We can therefore describe the primary province of Wisdom as that of endowing one with the attitudes, the principles, and the ethical ideals for proper conduct and behavior.

Once R. Tarfon and the elders sat in the upper chamber of the house of Nitzah in Lydda, when this question was raised before them: *הא עשה או עשה*
 "Is study greater, or doing?" R. Tarfon said, "Doing was greater." R. Akiba said, "Study was greater." *אמרו לו ר' עקיבא*
אמר ר' עקיבא
 Then they all answered and said: "Study is greater, for it leads to doing."²⁷

Simeon ben Gamaliel captures the essence of this argument more succinctly: *אין חכמה מביאה שום דבר אלא עשה*
אין חכמה מביאה שום דבר אלא עשה
 "Wisdom does not lead to words, nor is it words that lead to Wisdom--only works."²⁸

It is never an assured conclusion, however, that Wisdom, in and of itself, will attain the glorious ends which Rabbi Meir attributed to it.

There is also Wisdom which is either beneficial or detrimental to its possessor; beneficial, like that possessed by Joshua, of whom it says, "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of Wisdom" (Dt. 34:9). To what was he compared: to a pool of water that give a whole city to drink, and all were praising it. One said to them: Praise ye rather this fountain which supplies this pool. So people were praising Joshua for giving the whole of Israel to drink of his Wisdom, but he said: Praise ye Moses who is my source of

diligently keep all this commandment which I command you, to do it, to love the Lord your God..." (Dt. 11:22), the Rabbis rhetorically ask, "Why is this said?" Their answer is:

Because it says "Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and His testimonies, and His statutes, which He hath commanded thee" *לא ידעו לומר כי ידעו את המצוות ולא ידעו לעשותן* (Dt. 6:17),

I might understand that because a man keeps ~~the~~ the words of Torah, he need only sit and do nothing. Thus, our text (Dt. 11:22) states ~~that~~ "to do it", you must return to do them. If a man studies Torah, there is in his hand one ~~word~~; if he learns and keeps ~~them~~, there are in his hand two ~~words~~; if he learns and keeps them and puts them into action ~~etc.~~, there is no one superior to him.³¹

In spite of the superficial duplication due to the appearance of *לא ידעו לומר* in both passages, Deuteronomy 11:22 is not a superfluous verse. On the contrary, it completes the thought of Deuteronomy 6:17. One is not only to keep the commandments--he is also to do them, to apply them in practice.

R. Hiyya and R. Jochanan underscore this theme. Commenting upon "...and keep My commandments and do them" (Lev. 26:3), R. Hiyya taught:

This refers to one who learns with the intention of practicing, and not to one who learns with the intention of not practicing. He who learns with no intention of practicing had been better unborn.³²

R. Jochanan said:

If one learns with the intention of not practicing, it were better for him had the after-birth in which he lay been turned over his face and he had not come out into the open air of this world.³²

We therefore appreciate the importance of Wisdom. By means of it, one becomes cognizant of his task in life, and is enabled to fulfill himself in accord with the dictates which God has set down in His Law.

Was Wisdom Rewarded?

In connection with an investigation as to whether Wisdom was rewarded by the receipt of prophetic power, an awareness of instances in which a prophet is said to possess *chochma* is relevant. From such citations, we can deduce some element of association between Wisdom and prophecy.

Moses, for example, is titled in one Midrashic account

Avnei Chochma, Avnei Nevi'im, "the sage of great sages, the father of prophets"³³, and in another *Avnei Chochma, Avnei Nevi'im*, "the father of Wisdom, the father of the prophets"³⁴. The Elders, potential recipients of the prophetic word, are described as *Avnei Chochma*.³⁵

A Tosephta passage goes further and ascribes *chochma* to the entire group of early prophets.

One should not stand to recite the Tefillah while engaged in conversation, or laughter, or frivolity, or idle matters, but rather in the context of words of Wisdom *chochma*; and similarly, one should not take leave of his friends in the midst of conversation, or laughter, or idle words, or frivolity, but rather in the context of words of Wisdom *chochma*. For so we find in the case of the early prophets that they concluded their words with messages of praise and comfort.³⁶

Indeed, the image of the prophet was so interwoven with that of the wise man, that that which was affirmed of the one, could also be reported of the other.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Whoever is boastful, if he is a Sage,

his Wisdom departs from him; if he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him. Resh Lakish said: As to every man who becomes angry, if he is a Sage, his Wisdom departs from him; if he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him. 37

The foregoing evidence certainly justifies the establishment of a relationship between Wisdom and prophecy. Is there any testimony, however, that Wisdom serves as an introductory stage in the gradation leading to prophecy?

The Midrash furnishes us with a passage which not only links *wisdom* with *prophecy*, but actually views the *prophecy* as an embryonic *wisdom*. Commenting upon "And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel", the Rabbis begin a series of illustrations to demonstrate that *prophecy*, which they read as *There was woe* "There was woe in the days of", denotes trouble. The second illustration is the one in which we are interested.

"And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz" (Isaiah 7:1). What trouble was there then? "The Arameans on the east, and the Philistines on the west" (Isaiah 9:11). (The Rabbis now attempt to trace the trouble expressed in this latter verse as precipitated by Ahaz. For this purpose they devise a *parable* which can be applied to the King.) This may be compared to the son of a king against whom his tutor plotted in order to kill him. Said he to himself: "If I slay him now, my life will be forfeit to the King. Rather I will withdraw his foster-mother from him, and he will die on his own." (Now the Rabbis offer the *parable*.) Ahaz said similarly: If there are no kids there are no he-goats; if there are no he-goats, there are no sheep; if there are no sheep there is no shepherd; if there is no shepherd, there

is no world. He reasoned: No children ~~and~~; no students ~~and~~; no students, no wise men ~~and~~; no wise men, no Elders ~~and~~; no Elders, no prophets ~~and~~; and if there are no prophets, the Holy One Blessed be He will not cause His ~~and~~ to rest upon them. Thus it is written, "Bind up the testimony, shut up the instruction among My disciples" (Isaiah 8:16). R. Hunia said in R. Leazar's name: Why was he called Ahaz? Because he seized ~~all~~ the synagogues and the schools.... As soon as he seized the synagogues and schools, all began lamenting "Woe". Thus there was woe in the days of Ahaz.

As we had noted earlier, Ahaz, in order to impede the intimacy between God and Israel, had to forestall the further development of wise men. To attain this end, he appropriated the schools and synagogues, for it was through the Wisdom derived from Torah-study and learning that the bond between Israel and God had been forged. More significant, however, is the progression which the passage graphically indicates--through study one advanced to the title of ~~and~~ "wise men"; and this classification eventually culminated in ~~and~~ "prophets". Ahaz, by closing the schools, was to successfully prevent the cultivation of prophetic personalities in Israel. Through study, one advanced in Wisdom, and Wisdom was a prerequisite for prophecy.

A parallel passage eliminates "the Elders" as an intervening phase between "wise men" and "prophets", demonstrating more dramatically a sequence in which the prophet evolves out of Study and Wisdom, seemingly as compensation for his

labor.³⁹

Narratives centering about Solomon depict an individual who actually receives the prophetic spirit after gaining Wisdom and willingly sharing this knowledge with others.

After R. Simon in the name of R. Simeon b. Halaphta relates the dream of Solomon in which he asks of God *na'af* "Wisdom" rather than "silver and gold and pearls", for *ki kol* "for all is included in it (Wisdom)"--another indication of *na'af* as underlying "wealth"--Rabbi Isaac expresses himself. Commenting upon, "He (Solomon) came to Jerusalem, and stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and offered up burnt-offerings, and offered peace-offerings, and made a feast to all his servants" (I Kings 3:15), he states, "From this (we learn) that one makes a feast at the completion of the study of Torah, *na'af ki na'af*." Our passage then concludes, "Immediately, the Holy Spirit rested upon him and he composed these three books: Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes."⁴⁰

Any ambiguity as to whether Solomon received the Holy Spirit because of his completion of the study of the Torah or because he had prepared a feast in honor of this event is dispelled by a parallel version. Here it is R. Eleazar, rather than R. Isaac, who responds to I Kings 3:15 with the words, "From this (we learn) that one makes a feast at the completion of the study of Torah *na'af ki na'af*." Now, however, Rabbi Judan interjects:

This is to teach you that whoever

teaches the Torah publicly merits that the Holy Spirit should rest upon him. For thus did Solomon, who taught, and the Holy Spirit rested upon him, and he composed three books: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs.⁴¹

Judan indicates that because Solomon taught, because he shared and utilized his Wisdom, he merited the Holy Spirit. It was his accomplishment, his attainment of knowledge and his willingness to demonstrate it to others, rather than the preparation of a feast, which enabled him to earn the prophetic Word.

The achievement of Wisdom through study and the receipt of prophetic power were so interlinked in the thought of the Rabbis that generalized formulations, universally valid, were framed signalling the importance and value of attaining Wisdom--both for its own sake, and in order to discover proper conduct.

With regard to the latter, Rabbi Acha said: "One who learns in order to translate into action ~~and~~ is worthy to receive the Holy Spirit."⁴² And as for the former, R. Levi bar Chujyah said: "One who upon leaving the synagogue goes into the house of study and studies the Torah is deemed worthy to welcome the Shechinah."⁴³ Wisdom was indeed regarded as an important link coupling man and God together.

The Rabbinic thought-pattern which has unfolded in this analysis--that Wisdom is Torah; that the study of Torah, supplemented by its effect, God's patronage, are the means whereby Wisdom is attained; that Wisdom underlies all other prophetic faculties, such as *וִיפֹאֵה*, *וְיִרְאֶה*, *וְיִשְׁמַע*; and that Wisdom is a prerequisite of prophecy--indicates a significant change which has emerged in the Rabbinic understanding of prophecy. In essence, Torah-Wisdom has become a prerequisite for prophecy, and enforces its demands and restrictions upon the prophet. The potential prophet, as Isaiah, is in attendance at the *וְיִשְׁמַע*,⁴⁴ and it is his Torah-Wisdom which readies him for the role of prophet. In this light, the replacement of "wisdom" for the "prophetic spirit" in Sifre Numbers #93⁴⁵ could well be viewed as a reflection of this new ideology. By stressing the study of Torah and a knowledge and acknowledgement of God based upon such study, the Rabbis have established a common ground for both prophet and Rabbi.

SUMMARY

The Rabbinic literature adopts and elaborates upon the conception of Wisdom as found in the Scriptures. Wisdom is Torah, Torah being the very expression of God's Wisdom.

A logical ramification of this identification of Torah with Wisdom is that the study of Torah is an essential means of Wisdom's acquisition. Investigating this possibility, we discovered another, inextricably and reasonably interlinked with it, that of God's support and patronage. We concluded, therefore, that the attainment of Wisdom was realized by means of a blend of human effort directed towards the study of the Law, and, as a consequence, of God's favor bestowed upon the individual which was won by such effort. Study, and the reciprocal relationship with God which it fosters, thus leads to Wisdom.

Wisdom's importance for the prophet is acknowledged by the recognition that it not only underlies the qualities of *חכמה*, *דעת*, and *יושר*, but that it also endows one with the attitudes, the principles, and the ethical ideals for proper conduct and behavior. By means of it, one becomes apprized of his responsibility as outlined by the decrees which God has laid down in His Law. It is Wisdom, then, that couples man and God as one.

Instances which cite prophetic personalities, such as Moses and the Elders, as possessed of *חכמה*, indicate the existence of a close linkage between prophecy and Wisdom. Furthermore, the Midrashic account concerning Ahaz demon-

strates a sequence in which the prophet develops out of the
psn. Narratives which focus upon Solomon portray his
receipt of the prophetic spirit after he had attained Wisdom
and willingly shared this knowledge with others.

IV--THE HUMBLE MAN

What Is *aniv*?

The concept of *aniv*, the final, essential constituent of the prophet's nature which Jochanan sketches for us, was alluded to at the conclusion of our survey of the *aniv*. At that time we probed the intent of the Rabbinic formulation *aniv aniv aniv* "Poverty is a sign of conceit."¹

We determined that the "poor" man was indeed to be associated with conceit, because the displeasure of the arrogant individual towards others is linked to a discontent with himself, a state of considering himself as poor. He projects his own inadequacies onto others.

We also resolved, by the same logic of psychological causation, that wealth would be the manifestation of a new disposition, one which is the opposite of conceit, one which would entail an acceptance and approval of others. The *aniv* would be representative of this, for, his delight with his lot would presuppose an acceptance of self; and this, in turn, would produce positive relationships with others, for no antagonism against himself would be diverted onto others. That it is humility, the quiet confidence that one is living a maximal life, which fosters this benevolent relationship with others, and enables one to be *aniv*, will become apparent in the following investigation.

The exposition of "Now the man Moses was very humble, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth" (Num. 12:3) introduces us to the *לִשָּׁה עֵבֶר*.

"Now the man Moses was very humble"
כֵּן הָיָה מֹשֶׁה. This means he was humble with reference to his temperament (disposition) *לִשָּׁה עֵבֶר*. You are of the opinion that he was humble with reference his disposition. Perhaps it means he was humble with reference to his bodily strength (physical prowess)? (*כֵּן* is here given the specific translation "strength"). Scripture says, "And thou shalt do to him as thou didst unto Sihon King of the Amorites" (Num. 21:34); he fell upon Sihon and slew him, and on Og and slew him (Thus Moses was not humble in terms of bodily strength). Another Opinion. "Very Humble" *כֵּן הָיָה* means humble with reference to his disposition, *לִשָּׁה עֵבֶר* his temperament. You say it means humble in his disposition. Perhaps it means humble with reference to his wealth? (*כֵּן* is here interpreted as having the particular meaning "wealth"). But Scripture says, "Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt" (Ex. 11:3). (This verse, which is subsequent to "...and let them ask every man of his neighbor...jewels of silver and jewels of gold" (Ex. 11:2) indicates to the Rabbis that Moses also shared in the wealth). And also we find that the sapphire of the tablets were Moses', as it is said, "At that time the Lord said to me: Hew thee two tables of stones like unto the first" (Dt. 10:1), and in another place it states, "And the tablets were the work *מְעֵשֶׂה* of God" (Ex. 32:16), and it states, "And they saw the God of Israel; and there was under His feet the like of a paved work *מְעֵשֶׂה* of sapphire stone" (Ex. 24:10). (The Rabbis draw a *קוּדְשָׁא*, an analogy-argument which implies from the similarity of two cases that, what has been decided in the one, applies also in the other). Just as the work *מְעֵשֶׂה* mentioned here (Ex. 24:10) was of sapphire,

so also the work ~~למנו~~ mentioned there (Ex. 32:16) referring to the tablets) were of sapphire. (Therefore Moses was not humble with reference to wealth.)²

Our passage simply sets forth Moses' humility as a matter of temperament, of disposition, but this diagnosis lacks full clarity. It is the epilogue attached to a parallel version which supplies us with some indication of what is meant by ~~למנו~~ ~~למנו~~.

It is written, "Now the man Moses was very humble." And it is written, "And, behold, ye are risen up in your father's stead, a brood of sinful men..." (Num. 32:14). He could have been severe, ~~למנו~~ ~~למנו~~ but he was ruler over his inclination. The Holy One, Blessed be He said ~~למנו~~ ~~למנו~~ Behold Moses is restrained because of humility, and does not demand his due. Just as he demanded concerning My honor, "Whoso is on the Lord's side, let him come unto Me," (Ex. 32: 26), so also I am demanding his honor.³

Our illustration portrays ~~למנו~~ as the ability to stifle any tendency to assert oneself, to call attention to oneself, to advance oneself at the expense of another. ~~למנו~~, however, does not suggest a curtailing of initiative--Moses himself was a most vibrant individual. Rather, it was a manifestation of balance and moderation in one's behavior. It was a restraint from vituperation in favor of a positive relation with another. Instead of responding with self-righteous severity to the desires of the tribes of Reuben

and Gad to settle on the opposite side of the Jordan, Moses invokes a softness of speech, a pleasantness of manner, which belies self-control and self-discipline. Moses *עניו* *נ/ס* --he was withheld by his humility. His quiet rejoinder represented him as *גאון* *נ/ס*, as *נאמן* *נ/ס*, as humble.

There is far more substance to humility, however, than merely a pleasantness in manner. What generates this kind of response toward others?

*הוא נהנה בנפשו מן המעשים הטובים
העושים לו ואלו הם המעשים הטובים
העושים לו ואלו הם המעשים הטובים
העושים לו ואלו הם המעשים הטובים
העושים לו ואלו הם המעשים הטובים*

Our Rabbis taught: They who suffer insults but do not inflict them in revenge, who hear themselves reviled and do not reply, who perform religious precepts because of love of God and rejoice in their chastisements, of such the Scripture says, "And they that love him are like the sun when he goeth forth in his might." (Judges 5:31).⁴

This passage implies that the agreeable spirit manifested towards others by the *נ/ס* is founded primarily upon an attitude of personal confidence in oneself, an inner security which maintains one as living an authentic life, without recourse to any external criteria. Moses lived such a life, and thus he was not impelled to indulge himself with a vitriolic assault upon the Children of Reuben and Gad as a compensation for dissatisfaction with himself. Being his own resource, without the need to prove himself to anyone else,

Moses could confront situations with composure and tranquility of mind.

We can justify our contention, then, that "Wealth is a sign of humility." For one to be *ḥayil*, to rejoice in his "lot", one must first be *ḥayil*--one must possess an authenticity of self, the conviction that he is living life fully, a confidence that what he is is worthwhile.

From the foregoing evidence, *ḥayil*, this attribute representing a personal authenticity, has as its fundamental referent the realm of human relations. Buttressing this view, is a behavioral definition of humility:

Teach the members of thy household humility. For when one is humble and the members of his household are humble, if a poor man comes and stands in the doorway of the master of the house and inquires of them, 'Is your father within?' they answer, 'Ay, come in, enter.' Even before he has entered, a table is set for him. When he enters and eats and drinks and offers a blessing up to Heaven, great delight of spirit is vouchsafed to the master of the house. But when one is not humble and the members of his household are short-tempered, if a poor man comes and stands in the doorway and inquires of them, 'Is your father within?' they answer, 'No!' and rebuke him and drive him off in anger.²

Here we witness humility displayed in one's daily social relationships. The *ḥayil*, because he entertained a proper perspective towards himself, thus enabling him to be the *ḥayil*, could focus in a similar fashion upon the diversity

of human claims which he encountered external to himself. Because he was tolerant of himself, he could be tolerant of others; because he was benevolent towards himself, he could be so towards others. His inner complacency forestalled any need within him for self-exaltation or for glorification above others, and he could thus identify and relate with others, regardless of their circumstance. In addition, his inner certainty of self motivated him to give of himself to others, without harboring any fear that such an act would lead to a reduction in himself.

Much of this spirit is captured for us in the following Talmudic anecdote.

R. Judah son of R. Simeon ben Pazzi asked R. Simeon ben Pazzi: What is preferable? Reproof with honest purpose, or false modesty? He answered: Won't you agree that true modesty is better, for a master said: Modesty is the greatest of them all? Thus, also is false modesty preferable.... What is honest reproof and what is false modesty?--For instance, the case of R. Huna and R. Hiyya ben Rab who were sitting before Samuel, when Hiyya ben Rab said: Sir, look how he is vexing me greatly. He (R. Huna) undertook not to vex him anymore. After he (Hiyya) left, R. Huna said: He did this and that (unseemly) thing. Whereupon Samuel said: Why did you not tell him that to his face? He replied: Forbidden that the seed of Rab should be put to shame through me.

R. Huna displayed *shame* in his relation to R. Hiyya, just as Moses had done in his relation to the Children of Reuben and Gad. Because both possessed an inner assurance of au-

thenticity, the peace of mind and inner serenity which led to an acceptance of themselves as they were, they were restrained from indulging in open rebuke and disparagement of another, from seeking further self-advancement, and, in consequence of the latter, from making such demands upon others.

Its Source

What, however, is the source of *אֱלֹהִים*? That it is primarily the quiet confidence of an individual experiencing a maximal life, does not provide us with a comprehension of its origin. It is by extrapolating from the following exposition of Rabbi Mathna, who interprets *אֱלֹהִים* of Proverbs 22:4 as "heel" rather than "reward", that we receive our answer.

That which wisdom has made a crown to her head, humility has made a heel for her foot. That which wisdom has made a crown for her head, as it says, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Psalm 111:10). Humility has made a heel for her foot, as it says, "The fear of the Lord is the heel *אֱלֹהִים* of humility."

This passage maintains that wisdom has set as its highest goal, as its "crown", the "fear of the Lord", and that it is this very quality which leads to humility. Inasmuch as wisdom leads to "fear of the Lord", and this in turn to humility, we can conclude that humility presupposes the knowledge and the awareness of God's desires. Thus it is the equilibrium which he enjoys in his own conscious relationship with his God that is projected by the *אֱלֹהִים* onto the relationships he has with others. His understanding of God enables him to be the *אֱלֹהִים*.

To buttress this latter point, that the relationship of the humble toward his fellow mirrors that which he experiences with God, we have recourse to a Rabbinic gener-

alization of the *אִשָּׁרָה* stemming from the conduct of Abraham.

And He (God) said to him, "Abraham."
And he replied, "Here I am." (Gen. 22:1)--What kind of expression is *'אָן*? It is the expression of humility, of piety. For thus is the humility of righteous men in every instance.

This passage demonstrates *אִשָּׁרָה* in its aspect of "answer", *אִשָּׁרָה*. The humble one, because of his confidence in himself, is able to respond to God as he will do to man. In the case of Abraham, we need merely cite the contrast the Rabbis draw between him and Job concerning, "Let thy house be opened wide"

But Abraham did not act this way. Instead he would go forth...and when he found wayfarers, he brought them into his house....⁹

to recognize that the *'אָן* which he directed to God, he also dispatched toward his fellow mortal.

To briefly rehearse our findings, the *אִשָּׁרָה* accepts himself as he is, nurtures the confidence that he is living a maximal life, considers himself *אִשָּׁרָה*. By means of this *אִשָּׁרָה*, he is able *לִשְׁכַּח* so that he need not quest for additional self-esteem in the eyes of others, and, more important, he is able to affirm others and view them as worthwhile.

Such a quality for the prophet is indispensable. As one who is to labor and serve in behalf of others, for such will be the dictates of God's commission, the prophet must

of necessity accept others. To accept others, he must first accept himself--he must be the *for* *the*.

The Ladder of Perfection

To more graphically gauge the significance of humility, we have recourse to the spiritual ladder of perfection.

R. Phinehas b. Jair says: Zeal leads to cleanliness, and cleanliness leads to purity, purity to restraint, restraint to holiness, holiness to humility, humility to the fear of sin, the fear of sin to saintliness, saintliness to the receipt of the Holy Spirit, the receipt of the Holy Spirit to the Resurrection of the Dead. And the Resurrection of the Dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory. Amen.¹⁰

A variant reading expresses the progression in this manner:

R. Phinehas b. Jair said: Study leads to precision, precision to zeal, zeal to cleanliness, cleanliness to restraint, restraint to purity, purity to saintliness, saintliness to humility, humility to the fear of sin, the fear of sin to holiness, holiness to the receipt of the Holy Spirit, and the receipt of the Holy Spirit leads to the Resurrection of the Dead.¹¹

The variants consist of beginning the progression with "study leads to precision, and precision to zeal", which is lacking in the Mishnah; of reversing the order of purity and restraint; and most important, transposing the order of saintliness and holiness. Therefore, whereas in the Mishnah saintliness leads to the receipt of the Holy Spirit, in Avodah Zarah saintliness leads to humility; and whereas in the Mishnah holiness leads to humility, in Avodah Zarah holiness leads to the Holy Spirit. Though we cannot be dogmatic as to the

respective ranks of the characteristics, we can conclude, in the face of this confusion, that humility certainly occupied an elevated rung in the ladder of significant living for the Rabbis.

Of even greater relevance is the commentary which follows the impressive series in Avodah Zarah. Before we note this, an observation is warranted. All of these qualities but for the last two, the receipt of the Holy Spirit and the Resurrection of the Dead, both of which are God-bestowed, lie within the province of mortal achievement. Study, precision, zeal, cleanliness, restraint, purity, saintliness, humility, fear of sin, and holiness, all are attainable by human effort. It is in light of this observation that we now turn to the epilogue.

And saintliness *אִשְׁתִּי* is greater than all of these, as it is said, "Then thou didst speak in vision to Thy saintly ones." (Psalm 89:20).

This then differs from the view of R. Joshua b. Levy, for R. Joshua b. Levy said, Humility is the greatest of them all, for Scripture says, "The spirit of the Lord, God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to bring good tidings unto the meek," *רוּחַ יְהוָה עָלַי לְבַשְׁתִּי* (Isaiah 61:1).

וְהָיָה אֲנִי לְבִשְׁתִּי
לְבִשְׁתִּי אֲנִי לְבִשְׁתִּי
It does not say, "unto the saints", but "unto the meek" from which you learn that humility is the greatest of all of these.¹¹

Both the anonymous statement and Rabbi Joshua ben Levy's assertion have meaning only when related to the Mishnah Soṭah text, for in that version saintliness was

the proximate cause of the receipt of the Holy Spirit, and thus was the final and ultimate attainment for man. That this conviction was challenged by advancing humility as superior to saintliness reinforces the deduction we inferred from the jockeyed positions of holiness and saintliness--that humility certainly shared in the glory which the Rabbinic mind showered upon saintliness and holiness. If it were not the direct cause for the receipt of the Holy Spirit in the above passages, it was certainly an essential element for its acquisition, and respected as such.

Was Humility Rewarded?

As far as its actual effect within the prophetic realm, the passages of Mishnah Sotah 9:15 and Avodah Zarah 20b do not evaluate humility fairly. Possession of it did produce prophetic power, as exemplified by the narratives concerning Eldad and Medad.

They (Eldad and Medad) remained in the camp because they saw Moses who was selecting for himself the Elders. They said: "We are not worthy for this greatness." They went and hid themselves. God said to them: "You belittled yourselves; I will elevate you more than all of them." Of the Seventy Elders it states: "They prophesied, but they did so no more" (Num. 11:25)--they prophesied temporarily. Concerning Eldad and Medad it says: "...and they prophesied in the camp" (Num. 11:26)--they were prophesying until the day of their death. And what were they saying? "Moses shall die and Joshua shall bring Israel unto the land."¹²

A briefer recitation of the above is found in the Talmud.

They remained in the camp at the time that the Holy One Blessed be He told Moses: "Gather unto Me 70 men." Eldad and Medad said, "We are not worthy for this greatness." The Holy One Blessed be He said: "Since you belittled yourselves I will add more greatness to your greatness." And what greatness did He add to them? All the other prophets prophesied and ceased, whereas they prophesied and did not cease. And what did they prophesy?--They said: "Moses shall die and Joshua shall bring Israel into the land."¹³

Although the Sanhedrin passage does not provide proof-texts for the distinction between the Elders and Eldad and Medad, it does indicate, as the Sifré, that the humility of the two was to be dramatically acknowledged. "I will elevate you more than all of them" (Sifré) and, "I will add more greatness to your greatness" (Sanhedrin) share an identical intent. The humility of Eldad and Medad, here expressed as "We are not worthy for this greatness," an indication of restraint based upon an acceptance of their present existence as rich and complete, and deficient in nothing that further advancement could provide, earns for them prophetic power. That we are indeed dealing with the prophetic personality is indicated by the significant variant in which the Sanhedrin passage, in drawing its distinction, calls the 70 Elders *שבעים זקנים* whereas the Sifre maintains the appellation *שבעים זקנים*.

A longer narrative offers some differences. Firstly, this version omits any statement by God. Secondly, it changes "We are not worthy for this greatness" to "We are not worthy to be a part of the appointment to the office of Elder." Finally, the aggrandizement of the two men in this rendition is greatly expanded. Not only does this version add four more distinctions, but it amplifies further the one occurring in the shorter versions.

1. "The Elders did not prophesy but for the morrow as it says 'And say thou unto the people: Sanctify yourselves for tomorrow' (Num. 11:18), whereas these (Eldad and

Medad) prophesied what will be in the future at the end of 40 years, as it says 'But there remained two men in the camp.'" (Num. 11:26) (The longer version employs a different proof-text with regard to the Elders. It utilizes Num. 11:18 rather than 11:25--"They prophesied, but did so no more.")

2. The Elders did not enter the land of Israel but Eldad and Medad did.

3. The names of the Elders were not explicitly mentioned whereas those of Eldad and Medad were.

4. The Elders lost their prophecy.

5. The prophecy of the Elders came from Moses (Num. 11:25), but the prophecy of Eldad and Medad was from the Holy One Blessed be He (Num. 11:26).¹⁴

In both long and short accounts, however, there is no question that the humility of Eldad and Medad, led to additional merit.

The lives of Hillel the Elder and Samuel the Little serve to substantiate humility as a quality worthy of prophetic power. Both men are described as *אדם המצוי* "one who is deserving that the Shechinah should alight upon him." And at their respective deaths, they are described as *אדם*, "one who lived humbly."¹⁵

Parallels to the above characterization provide us with two interesting insights. One passage describes each individual as *אדם ראוי* "a man worthy of the Holy Spirit",¹⁶ thus implying once again that the Rabbis employ

the Shechinah, as they do the Holy Spirit, to denote prophecy. Both *נביא* and *נביא* are alternate terms in expressing the same prophetic phenomenon in these passages.

The second insight is afforded us by the depiction of Hillel the Elder as *היה זה אדם דא היה שכינה יושבת עליו* "one who is worthy that the Shechinah should rest on him as it did on Moses, our Master,"¹⁷ suggesting that the Shechinah which made Moses a prophet is available to every man.

To single out Moses as the "other" factor in the comparison was, to be sure, an excellent choice. Moses, to the Rabbinic mind, was the paragon of humility; even Scripture attests to this, "Now the man Moses was very meek." (Num. 12:3).

A Rabbinic interpretation, based upon "And Moses drew near unto the thick darkness" (Ex. 20:18) suggests that this very quality of meekness contributed to Moses' eminence as a prophet. The Rabbis query, "What brought him this distinction (to draw near)? His meekness *בגלל רכותו*." And the Rabbis draw the lesson *מי שרוך יושבת שכינה עליו* "Whoever is meek will cause the Shechinah to dwell with man upon earth."¹⁸ Humility does indeed entail the reward of prophetic power.

Its Antithesis--Arrogance

The great dimension of humility can be appreciated best by witnessing the consequences of its antithesis, arrogance. In the very same passage which deals with the meekness of Moses, we find the Rabbis vehemently denouncing pride and concluding with the general statement: *מיהו שיהיה לו כבוד ויהיה לו כבוד* "Whoever is arrogant causes the land to be defiled and the *אדמה* to withdraw."¹⁹

To probe more directly into the results of arrogance for the prophetic personality we can point to Phinehas. Analyzing the Eliezer-Rebecca narrative of Gen. 24:13 ff., the Midrash rules *הוא היה עשיר* Jephthah is the latter case. God was resentful of Jephthah's vow in which he maintained that, should his return from the Amonite battle be victorious, anything that greeted him first would be sacrificed to God. "Would a camel or ass or dog be suitable?" asks the Midrash. Thus God answers Jephthah's vow in an unfitting manner by providing his daughter as the first greeter. The Rabbis ask, "Could not Phinehas absolve him of his vow?" At this point, hubris enters. *הוא היה עשיר*

הוא היה עשיר Phinehas thinks: "He needs me, and should I go to him?" *הוא היה עשיר* Jephthah maintains: "I am chief of the rulers of Israel and should I betake myself to Phinehas?"

הוא היה עשיר "Between this attitude and that attitude" Jephthah's daughter perishes. The

tale does not terminate here, however. Because of their respective sin of hubris, both Jephthah and Phinehas are punished. Jephthah dies a slow and agonizing death--limb by limb--a conclusion derived from the plural 'ר in

וְרַגְלָיו בְּעָרִים שְׂרָפָה (Judges 12:7), which indicates to the Rabbis that his limbs were buried in different cities.

As for Phinehas *וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ הָיָה בְּאֵזְרוֹ* "the Holy Spirit was taken from him", a consequence which the Rabbis draw from the plu-perfect interpretation of הָיָה in *וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ הָיָה בְּאֵזְרוֹ*

וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ הָיָה בְּאֵזְרוֹ "Phinehas ben Eleazar had been ruler over them."²⁰

An alternate version of this narrative more effectively delineates the pride of these two men. Jephthah is quoted as stating: "I am head of the Judges of Israel, Chief of the rulers, shall I humble myself *וְהָיִיתִי כְּעַבְדְּךָ* and go to the commoner?" Phinehas, on the other hand, is reported as stating: "I am High Priest, son of a High Priest, and shall I go to the Ignoramus *וְהָיִיתִי כְּעַבְדְּךָ*?" For this reason, *וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ הָיָה בְּאֵזְרוֹ* "The Holy Spirit departed from him."²¹

Another example of pride conveys God's personal attitude towards it in dialogue form--

Then Saul drew near to Samuel in the gate and asked, "Which is the house of the seer?" "And Samuel answered Saul and said, 'I am the seer'" (I Sam. 9:19). The Holy One said to him, "You are a seer? By thy life, I will inform you that you are not a seer." And when did He make this known to him? At the time that He said to him, "Fill thy horn with oil, and go, I will send thee

awake, Deborah...utter a song" that she has lost her prophetic power because of the pride of Verse 5.²³

We can thus acknowledge the importance of humility in the frame-work of Jochanan's statement, and be more certain of our conclusion that *naip* *for* was but a dictation by context and not a reassessment of principle.

SUMMARY

The *12Y 1%* is one who possesses a sense of self-authenticity. He accepts himself, confident and assured that he is living life completely, fully realizing himself and his potential. Because of this, for one to be *22Y*, rejoicing in his lot, one must first be *12Y*, accepting of his lot, accepting of himself.

This attitude of self-authenticity is a consequence of the possession of Wisdom, as was indicated in the previous chapter.²⁴ The *12Y 1%* enjoys a relationship with God which is founded upon a knowledge and an awareness of God's desires and dictates, and thus is able to foster within himself, and exhibit outwardly as well, this assurance of a life positively lived.

Therefore, the *12Y 1%* manifests his sense of authenticity in his contact with others. Because of his faith in and approval of himself, he need not seek to ennoble himself, need not anxiously quest for self-aggrandizement, as evinced by the restraint which Eldad and Medad demonstrated. Furthermore, since he does not indulge in self-criticism or harsh self-judgment, he does not project a resentment, based upon personal lack, onto others. He can display a social benevolence because of this acceptance of self, as Abraham. He can accept the poor and aid them, and he can withhold himself from being the cause of harm or embarrassment for another.

The relevance of *22Y* for the prophet then is unquestioned. Because the prophet as an *12Y* will bear no ill-

will towards himself, he thus will direct none towards others. Consequently, he will be able to relate more effectively and positively with others, and fulfill his Sender's edict, designed to improve the lot of His people. Furthermore, the absence of unbridled ambition will enable him to adequately apprise himself of his relation to God, that he is God's servant and must obey.

Rabbinic accounts, such as those featuring Eldad and Medad, Hillel the Elder, Samuel the Little, and Moses, indicate that humility was rewarded by the reception of prophetic power. Indeed, records of the effect of its antithesis, arrogance, as portrayed in the lives of Jephthah and Phinehas, Samuel, and Deborah, buttress this conclusion.

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed each of the four qualities which Johanan had cited in terms of its meaning, its application, its importance, and its effect, we can draw some conclusions with regard to the Rabbinic appraisal of the prophetic phenomenon which his statement reflected.

One of the most notable developments in the literature of the post-Biblical period is the conscious attempt by the Rabbis to portray the receipt of prophecy by the prophet in terms of a reward earned and a goal fulfilled, rather than an irrational and supernatural grant of favor on the part of God. We have observed that in our investigations of the *ḥaluk*, the *ḥaluk*, the *ḥaluk*, and the *ḥaluk*, the Rabbis carefully, and often fancifully, demonstrate that prophecy was won--that prophecy was something sought after and attained. The Biblical view that the prophet was called by God first, and that this call was the inception of a life marked by dedication and commitment is reversed. Prophecy, to the Rabbinic mind, was the product of a process, rather than the beginning of one. It was the culmination of a process predicated upon the possession of merit and desert. Whereas the Biblical prophet received the call and then had to maintain himself as worthy, the Rabbinic prophet must be worthy before he receives the call. Prophecy to the Rabbi was thus the result of stringent preparation.

The Holy Spirit so frequently comes
only after a certain degree of ethi-

cal excellence has been attained. It does not come at random, erratically, unaccountably, a mysterious visitant totally inexplicable. It is the crowning stage of a series of uninterrupted strivings after the highest and the best.¹

This introduction of a process into the prophetic experience was a natural and necessary one for the Rabbis for three major reasons.

Firstly, it enabled them to account for prophecy in their attempt to deal rationally with God and the manifestations of His activity. To them, God operated in a covenantal manner; all aspects of His relationship to the world were to be explained, harmonized, and catalogued in logical and coherent terms. Why did God choose Moses? Why was Abraham called? Why was Israel chosen? These were questions which were dealt with in a rational perspective. There was no room for the cryptic and the mysterious.

Why the prophet was chosen certainly had to be included as a natural aspect of their rational concerns. The Rabbinic reversal of the Biblical sequence of events, thus designating process, eliminated the possibility of any abnormal or unearthly explanation of the prophet's commission from God. Instead, a pattern of worthiness appeared. Various characteristics, characteristics which were attainable by man, as represented by the *נִיחַ*, the *נִיחַ*, the *נִיחַ*, the *נִיחַ*, were viewed as the motivating stimulus for the God-bestowed gift of prophecy.

The concept of process was also necessary to adapt prophecy to the basic Rabbinic premise that all was bounded within

and explainable by the Masora, the chain of tradition. The sudden seizure, the unmediated revelation, and the radical representation of the Biblical prophet was alien to this framework. Such an aberration would have seriously threatened the comprehensible legal system constituted by logical deduction which the Rabbis had founded upon this Masora. It was thus imperative that the prophet become a part of this process, of this stream of tradition, and authenticated by it, just as the Rabbi himself.

Supplementary to the second is a third. This concept of process enabled the Rabbis to harmonize the more radical and emotional Biblical prophetic figure with the image of the teacher which played a central role in the Rabbinic context. The Rabbi embodied in his person the Masora, the tradition-- he was its primary exemplar and transmitter. His direct linear ancestor² had to bear some resemblance to him. A prophetic process, such as the one we witnessed in probing "The Wise Man", achieved this end. Wisdom, identified as Torah, was to be the initial possession of the prophet, for such Wisdom served as the source for the prophet's *וידע, ירא, ישי* dimensions. Torah-Wisdom was thus the root from which sprouted the prophetic personality; it was the preliminary stage of a process towards prophecy, imposing its indispensable demands upon the prophet. A process, then, which emphasized the study of Torah, and the need for a knowledge of God based upon such study, not only introduced the element of tradition and the observance of the Law into prophecy, but also established a similarity in function for both prophet and Rabbi. Both develop out of the context of Torah-study.

FOOTNOTES

Preface

1. Bab. Talmud Nedarim 38a
2. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan אבות דרבי נתן

Introduction

1. The Shechinah and the Holy Spirit will be the most recurrent verbiage denoting prophecy in this analysis. J. Abelson, in The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, demonstrates that the indication of prophecy was indeed a function of the Holy Spirit in Chapters 14-19 (pp. 174-267). Therein he states that the Rabbinic "Holy Spirit" incorporated the Biblical "Spirit of God" as "the well-spring of prophecy" (p.198); that its expanded scope included the designation of "the existence of the gift of prophecy in Israel or that individual" (p.208); and he asserts, "Enough has now been said to show the close affinity between the Holy Spirit and Prophecy." (p.258). Herbert Parzen, in his article "The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature" (Jewish Quarterly Review, N.S. Vol. 20), supports his conclusions: "As is to be expected, the greatest and the most compelling effect of the Ruah Hakodesh--Divine Inspiration--upon an individual is prophecy" (p. 66). He himself concludes: "...the greatest effect of the Ruah Hakodesh--the most important effect--prophecy," (p.76) As for the Shechinah, see Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, p.250, where the author describes the operation of the Shechinah as either referring to God's actual communication to the prophet, "His utterance or נִפְּטָה" or as referring to a visionary experience of God. Indeed, the interchangeability of Holy Spirit and Shechinah as the Divine factor in prophetic communication is frequently observed. See Abelson's Appendix I, item c, p.378-- "On the Interchanging of the terms Shechinah and Ruah Ha-Kodesh" in the area of prophecy. Also note in this analysis pp.35,41,43,128.
2. Bab. Talmud Nedarim 38a
3. *ibid.*
4. This passage originally occurs in Rosh Hashanah 21b.
5. Bab. Talmud Shabbath 92a
6. Sifré deBe Rab, Num., פסוקי #92
7. Num. Rabbah 22:7
8. Bab. Talmud Horayoth 9a

I--The Strong Man

1. Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Lauterbach edition, Tractate Amalek, Vol.2, p.141, v.86

23. Berakhoth 7a, Bab. Talmud
24. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי דשיר #92
25. Gen. Rabbah 39:9
26. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865, #22 p. אבא
27. Exod. Rabbah 46:3
28. Yevamoth 62a, Bab. Talmud
29. Eccles. Rabbah פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא
30. Pesiktha deRab Kahana פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא
31. Exod. Rabbah 32:1
32. Sotah 3b, Bab. Talmud

The Willingness to Sacrifice in Behalf of Israel

1. Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Lauterbach edition, Tractate Pisha, Vol. I, p.8, v.88
 - 1a. Herein pp.34-35.
 2. Herein pp. 40-41.
 3. Herein page 34.
 4. Exod. Rabbah 7:3
 5. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי דשיר #91
Yalkut Shim'oni, פסוקי דשיר, #1634, פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא
 6. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי דשיר #92
 7. Lev. Rabbah 10:2. The Pesiktha deRab Kahana (PK) 125a discusses Amos first, and then Micah, and in its description of Amos, contains an additional statement which is also found in Eccles. Rabbah פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא. The PK has, "People say the Holy One abandoned all his world and caused His Shechinah to rest on this stammerer, on this tongueless person." Eccles. Rabbah reads, "The Holy One abandoned all His creatures and did not cause His Shechinah to rest except on this stammerer, this tongueless person."
8. Pesiktha deRab Kahana (PK) 125a
9. Pesiktha Rabbathi 150b
10. Sanhedrin 39a, Bab. Talmud
11. Pesiktha Rabbathi 137a
12. Exod. Rabbah 5:20, p.57 herein
13. Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Lauterbach edition, Tractate Pisha, Vol. I, p.10, v.103
14. Pesiktha Rabbathi 111a, p.14 herein.
15. Yalkut Shim'oni פסוקי דשיר, פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא reads "Rabbi Menachma bar Jacob" פסוקי דשיר, פסוקי דשיר
16. Ibid. reads "Rabbi Menachma in the name of Rabbi Tanchum"
17. Pesiktha Rabbathi 111a
Yalkut Shim'oni, פסוקי דשיר, פסוקי דשיר, p. אבא, פסוקי דשיר, פסוקי דשיר
18. Exod. Rabbah 5:20
19. Num. Rabbah 15:20
Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865, פסוקי דשיר, #13, p. אבא b
20. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי דשיר #92, herein p.3
21. Megillah 14b, Bab. Talmud
22. Sanhedrin 39b, Bab. Talmud

II--The Wealthy Man

1. Bab. Talmud Nedarim 38a; Yalkut Shim'oni *פסח, ה' שנה, ע"פ שו"ת, p. 100 b*
2. "Romani" in the Yalkut Shim'oni
3. This footnote has been deleted.
4. Gen. Rabbah 79:5
5. Bab. Talmud Horayoth 9a
6. Sifré deḇe Rab, Deut., *וידבר, #352*
7. Bab. Talmud Pesahim 49a
8. Bab. Talmud Qiddushin 82b
9. Num. Rabbah 22:8; Yalkut Shim'oni *פסח, ה' שנה, וידבר, p. 100 b*; ibid. *פסח, וידבר, וידבר, p. 100 b*
10. Num. Rabbah 22:7
11. Exod. Rabbah 31:5
12. Exod. Rabbah 46:2
13. Bab. Talmud Shabbath 119a
- 14 and 15 have been deleted.
16. Bab. Talmud Berakhoth 63a
17. Sifré deḇe Rab Deut. *וידבר, # 118*
18. Exod. Rabbah 31:3; Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 *וידבר 8, p. 100 a*
19. Num. Rabbah 22:7
20. Bab. Talmud Yoma 35b
21. Bab. Talmud Berakhoth 61b, Pesahim 25a, Sanhedrin 74a, Yoma 82a
22. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 *וידבר #14, p. 100 b*
23. Bab. Talmud 'Eruvin 86a
24. Gen. Rabbah 91:5
25. Bab. Talmud Berakhoth 6b
26. Bab. Talmud Soṭah 48b
27. Lev. Rabbah 34:6
28. Bab. Talmud Hagigah 13b
29. Lev. Rabbah 34:4
30. Bab. Talmud Nedarim 41a
31. Num. Rabbah 22:9
32. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan *וידבר, וידבר, וידבר*
33. Bab. Talmud Shabbath 25b
34. Bab. Talmud Qiddushin 49b

III--The Wise Man

1. Gen. Rabbah 1:1
2. Slonimsky, H., "The Philosophy Implicit in the Midrash", Hebrew Union College Annual Vol. 27, 1956, p.245.
3. ibid.
4. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 *וידבר #1, p/a*
5. Lev. Rabbah 11:3. Bab. Talmud Shabbath 116a attributes this analysis of seven books of the Torah to R. Samuel b. Nachmani in R. Jonathan's name.
6. *וידבר* suggests "I have not learned Torah..."
7. Deut. Rabbah 11:6
8. Exod. Rabbah 48:4
9. Tanhuma Buber *וידבר #2, p. 100 a*
10. Moore, G.F., Judaism, Vol. I, p. 265
11. Bab. Talmud Niddah 70b

12. Herein page 105 (Gen. Rabbah 42:3).
13. Num. Rabbah 15:19, herein page 127
14. Num. Rabbah 15:19
15. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי, #93
- 15a. Herein page 109
16. Exod. Rabbah 48:4
Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 פסוקי #5, p. 109a
17. Bab. Talmud Berakhoth 55a
18. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 פסוקי, #1, p. 109a; Tanhuma Buber פסוקי, #1, p. 109a
19. Mishnah Peah 1:1
20. Pirke Avoth 6:1
21. Herein page 119
22. Herein page 84
23. Herein page 84
24. Herein pages 83, 79
25. Bab. Talmud Sanhedrin 92a
26. Bab. Talmud Bava Bathra 25b
27. Bab. Talmud Qiddushin 40b
28. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan אבות, #108
29. Exod. Rabbah 31:3
30. Deut. Rabbah 11:6
31. Sifré debé Rab, Deut. פסוקי, #48
32. Lev. Rabbah 35:7
33. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי, #135
34. Lev. Rabbah 1:15
35. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי, #92
36. Tosephta Berakhoth 3:21
37. Bab. Talmud Pesahim 66b
38. Gen. Rabbah 42:3
39. Yer. Talmud Sanhedrin 37a
40. Eccles. Rabbah אבות, p. 109a
41. Song of Songs Rabbah אבות, p. 109a
42. Lev. Rabbah 35:7
43. Bab. Talmud Berakhoth 64a
44. Lev Rabbah 10:2
45. Herein page 94

IV--The Humble Man

1. Herein page 83
2. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי, #101
3. Yalkut Shim'oni אבות, פסוקי, #101, p. 109a
4. Bab. Talmud Gittin 36b
5. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan אבות, #108
6. Bab. Talmud 'Arakhin 16b
7. Song of Songs Rabbah אבות, p. 109b
8. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 פסוקי, #22, p. 109b
9. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan אבות, #108
10. Mishnah Soṭah 9:15
11. Bab. Talmud 'Avodah Zarah 20b
12. Sifré debé Rab, Num., פסוקי, #95
13. Bab. Talmud Sanhedrin 17a
14. Num. Rabbah 15:19
Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 פסוקי #12, p. 109a
15. Bab. Talmud Soṭah 48b

16. Tosephta Sotah 13:3, 13:4
17. Bab. Talmud Sanhedrin 11a
18. Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Lauterbach edition, Tractate Bahodesh, Vol. II, p. 273, v. 98
19. Ibid. verse 109
20. Gen. Rabbah 60:3
21. Tanhuma, Stettin, 1865 *אגדה* #5, p. *סא* a
22. Sifré de' Rab, Deut. *פ' ד'*, #17
23. Bab. Talmud Pesahim 66b
24. Herein page 98

Conclusion

1. Abelson, J. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, page 243
2. Avoth de-Rabbi Natan *אבות, אפר*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Avoth de-Rabbi Natan. Ed. S. Schechter, Vienna, 1887.

Biblia Hebraica. Ed. Rudolf Kittel, Stuttgart, 1937.

Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Ed. tr. J. Z. Lauterbach,
Volumes I-III, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication
Society of America, 1949.

Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Ed. I. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1865.

Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Ed. H. S. Horovitz, I. A. Rabin,
Frankfort, 1931.

Midrash Rabbah. (2 volume edition), New York, E. Grossman's
Book Store, 1952.

Mishnayot. (2 volume edition), *ל"ב' א"י דלפנינו תל"ב" א"ב"ב*,
1952.

Pesiktha deRab Kahana. Ed. S. Buber, Lyck, 1868. New York,
Om Publishing Co., 1949.

Pesiktha Rabbathi. Ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1880.

Sifra. Ed. I. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1862.

Sifré deRab. Ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864.

Sifré on Numbers. Ed. H. S. Horovitz, Leipzig, 1917.

Talmud, Babylonian. New York, N. Y., Otzar Hasefarim, Inc.,
1957.

Talmud, Palestinian. Krotoschin edition, 1866.

Tanhuma. Stettin, 1865.

Tanhuma (S. Buber, Volumes I-II). Ed. Rabbi H. Horowitz,
New York, 1946.

Tosephta. Ed. M. S. Zuckermann, Trier, 1882.

Yalkut Shim'oni (2 volume edition), Vilna, 1898.

Secondary Sources

- J. Abelson. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature. London, Macmillan, 1912.
- H. N. Bialik and J. H. Rawnitzky. Sefer Ha-Aggadah. Tel-Aviv, Dvir Co. Ltd., 1960.
- A. Cohen. Everyman's Talmud. New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1949.
- Herbert Danby.(tr.). The Mishnah. London, Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Judah David Eisenstein. ספר המעשר והתרומה. New York, the ed., 1922.
- Isidore Epstein.(tr. and ed.). The Babylonian Talmud. London, The Soncino Press, 1948.
- H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (tr. and ed.). Midrash Rabbah. London, The Soncino Press, 1939.
- Shrage Frenkel. עשרת הדיברות. Krakau, A. Faust (by) A. Zupnik and Knoller (in) Przemysl, 1877.
- Louis Ginzberg. The Legends of the Jews. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1925.
- Moses David Gross. מסכת עירובין. Jerusalem, Musad Harav Kook, 1954-1955.
- E. G. Hirsch. "Prophets and Prophecy" (Jewish Encyclopedia X). New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1901.
- The Holy Scriptures, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1955.
- Aaron Hyman. דברי חיים ופנינים (Volumes I-III). Tel-Aviv, Dvir, 1936-1939.
- Marcus Jastrow. Dictionary of Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi, Midrashic Literature and Targumim. New York, Pardes, 1950.
- Max Kadushin. The Rabbinic Mind. New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952.
- Kaufmann Kohler. Jewish Theology. New York, Macmillan, 1918.

Alexander Kohut. ארוך כורז (Aruch Completum). Hebräischer Verlag "Menorah" G. m. b. H. Wiln-Berlin, Vindobona, 1926.

Claude G. Montefiore and H. Loewe. A Rabbinic Anthology. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960.

George Foot Moore. Judaism (In the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim). Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1958.

Herbert Parzen. "The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature" (Jewish Quarterly Review N. S. 20). Philadelphia, 1929-1930.

Raphaelo Rabinovicz. ר'צ"ו 'ק"צ (Variae Lectiones in Mishnam et in Talmud Babylonicum). Munich, H. Roesl, 1867-1897.

Solomon Schechter. Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York, Schocken Books, 1961.

Henry Slonimsky. "The Philosophy Implicit in the Midrash" (Hebrew Union College Annual XXVII). Cincinnati, 1956.

Hermann L. Strack. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York, Meridian Books, Inc., Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959.

Chaim Tchernowitz. היסטוריה של ההלכה (History of the Halachah). New York, 1934.

Ephraim E. Urbach. התקופה הגאוןית והרבנות. Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 1960-1961.

-----, " התקופה הגאוןית " (תקופה 17). Jerusalem, 1945-1946.

-----, " התקופה הגאוןית " (תקופה). Jerusalem

Heinz A. Fischel. The Rabbinic Conception of Prophecy. (Doctoral Thesis) University of Edinburg, Scotland, 1944.