

THE RELATION OF DIVINATION TO PROPHECY

JACK SYIRBALL

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

FEBRUARY, 1921.

*Rec. 12/80*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

-----

- Batten, Loring W.,----The Hebrew Prophet.
- Buttenwieser, M.,-----The Prophets of Israel.
- Cornill, C. H.,-----The Prophets of Israel.
- Darmesteter, James----The Prophets of Israel.
- Davidson, A. B.,-----Old Testament Prophecy.
- Davies, T. Witton,----Magic, Divination, and Demonology among  
the Hebrews and their Neighbors.
- Jevons, Frank B.,-----Introduction to the History of Religion.
- Jewish Encyclopedia---Articles Divination, Dreams, Prophecy,  
False Prophet.
- Joyce, G. C.,-----The Inspiration of Prophecy.
- Knobel, August,-----Der Prophetismus der Hebräer.
- Kraetzschmar, Richard-Prophet und Seher im Alten Israel.
- Kuenen, A.,-----Priests and Prophets of Jahweh (in "Nation-  
al Religions and Universal Religions.")
- Mast, I. N.,-----Prophetic Revelation from Moses to David.
- Silver, A. H.,-----Divination in Ancient Israel.
- Smith, J. M. Powis,---The Prophet and his Problems.
- Smith, W. Robertson,--The Prophets of Israel.
- Toy, C. H.,-----Introduction to the History of Religions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Bibliography.

I Introduction.

II Earliest Period-Divination in Israel-Seers.

III Samuel-Prophetic Guilds.

IV Nathan, Gad, Hemen, Iddo, Ahijah, Shemayah, Jehu, Micaiah.

V Elijah and Elisha.

VI Literary Prophetic Schools.

VII The Great Prophets.

VIII False Prophecy.

IX Women Prophets and Diviners.

X Notes.

CHAPTER ONE  
-----  
INTRODUCTION

The question of the rise and development of divination and prophecy among the Hebrews and their relation, if any, to one another is in many respects similar to that of the process of evolution and the development of life. Not only is our problem enshrouded in the deepest mystery, an affair of remote ages, but likewise very little is known about it definitely. The material at hand, composed for the most part of non-contemporaneous evidence and testimony, that is to say, of writings which were written at a later period than the events actually described, cannot always be accepted at face value. We must in many cases, make a little allowance due to the probability that perhaps the author of the later period, while describing the events of the earlier times, may have allowed a little of the beliefs and superstitions of his own times to creep into the record of the past, the result being that he ascribes to his predecessors beliefs and views which they really did not possess and to a certain extent distorts the actual state of the former affairs.

As an example of this process we may quote the two-fold presentation of the character of Samuel, a character who will be described in great detail in the third chapter. According to the one presentation Samuel is an ordinary local seer or diviner, having no national reputation and known only to those of the immediate environment. This view, of course, is the correct view. According to the second presentation Samuel is a great national figure with none of the characteristics delineated in the first presentation.

This view, of course, is the view of tradition, of subsequent amplification, of legendary accretion, and the investigator, especially the young and comparatively inexperienced investigator, must be constantly on the alert lest he place too much credence in legendary evidence and give too little to authentic testimony.

This example will show the effect which the products of later ages may have on the phenomena of the preceding periods which we may be attempting to investigate. Later writers may have palliated them and colored them from the points of view of the subsequent times, in the course of which palliation the true features of the matter may have become shaded and the whole impregnated with a foreign hue. As another example, various features of divination, when written down at a later date, would be colored or changed to suit the exigencies of the times. The true features might be purposely falsified so as to present the matter in an unfavorable light. As a third and more striking example—the true prophets, or the people and writers living at the time of the true prophets, may have purposely endowed the earlier prophets and diviners, who really occupied a very important place in the development of prophecy, with ignoble motives, may have overlooked the fact that they were an earlier stage in prophetic history, and that they were therefore somewhat crude and primitive, and may have therefore misrepresented the facts regarding the earlier prophets to such an extent that, unless we are constantly on our guard, we may be misled by these later portrayals to form an altogether unjustified impression of the development of prophecy and the character and purpose of the former prophets and diviners.

In addition to this first difficulty a second one presents itself in the path of the investigator of the problem of the re-

lation between divination and prophecy. Our material for this subject is limited to the Bible. In comparison to the total bulk of the Old Testament the references to our subject are very few and far between. This causes the searcher, on the one hand, to turn to non-Biblical works to see whether any light can be thrown on his already sufficiently obscure subject, and, on the other hand, makes him view the scanty and meagre evidence he has before him from a critical and analytical point of view, seeking to fill up the lacunae of the Biblical testimony from his own mind and to create analyses between Israelitish divination and prophecy and that of foreign nations. For example, we have no record in the Old Testament that divination flourished among the Hebrews while they were in the land of Egypt. On the other hand, however, we know from various sources that the Egyptians and all the other then existing nations indulged in divinatory practices. Are we not therefore justified in assuming, *a posteriori*, that the Israelites were no exception to the rule and that they had divination in some form or other at this period of their history, even though little or no mention thereof is made in the Bible, which is practically our only source book? These two difficulties are only a small proportion of the actual difficulties which confront us, but in order not to appear to lay too much stress on the difficulties we shall omit the mention of the others.

Strictly speaking, the subject of our thesis may be defined as the relation between divination and prophecy in the Bible. We have purposely limited ourselves to the time of the great prophets, and we may state that Deutero-Isaiah (and perhaps too including Malachi) in our opinion forms the *terminus ad quem* of real prophecy and that immediately after him real prophecy ceased. In

5

addition we assume on the basis of definite evidence that the transition and development from divination to prophecy among the Hebrews had been thoroughly consummated at the time of the second Isaiah, if not before his time, and that the general run of prophecy, so called, which prevailed during the latter part of the exile (excepting Haggai and Malachi) and in times subsequent thereto can not be called real prophecy and had few, if any, characteristics of actual prophecy. Hence, in general, our terminus ad quem includes the great literary prophets, Deutero Isaiah, and one or two of the minor prophets who came after him.

It shall be our task, then, in the following pages, to attempt to trace the history and the development of Hebrew prophecy; to show the beginnings of prophecy in the old divinatory practices of the nation; to show how prophecy developed on the ground of divination which flourished in Israel as in all nations of the times, and how in the course of time it became differentiated from divination, threw off its coarse features because of certain impulses and factors which produced an ever widening breach between the two, and finally led up to the great system of Hebrew prophecy which is a feature exclusive to Judaism, which is unparalleled in the history of the world, and which renders Israel distinct from every other nation of the globe. The development of Hebrew prophecy is the answer to the perplexing question as to why the prophecy and divination of every other nation perished and disappeared. We shall show why Hebrew prophecy alone survived and the great force it has exercised in the civilization and humanization of Israel and of all other nations.

We shall therefore begin with the earliest records of the Bible concerning divination among the Hebrews, discussing its probable origin, development, and character, and the characteristics

-  
which distinguished Hebrew divination and diviners from those of other nations. We shall then trace the slow transition of divination to prophecy, under the leadership of Samuel, the first real prophet in the later sense of the word, though he is not to be compared to the literary prophets, and diviner likewise, following its development under later men such as Nathan, Gad, Jehu, Elijah and Elisha including the prophetic guilds and schools, till with the literary prophets the transition from divination to prophecy has been completed entirely and prophecy has sluffed off practically every trace of its divinatory origin, though some authorities assert that here and there a vestige thereof is discernible, with which view we cannot, however, agree. We shall concern ourselves not only with the rise of prophecy in and departure from divination, but likewise with the reasons therefore, with the unseen but impelling forces and causes which made this development and departure inevitable.

A few more words regarding the post-exilic prophets. Our thesis by no means includes the majority of either the exilic or post exilic prophets, since post-exilic prophecy for the most part concerned itself only with cryptic formulae for discovering "the time of the end" and with mystic and non-inspired predictions of the end of the people's persecutions and the ushering in of the glorious kingdom of Israel's supremacy. This neo-prophecy represents a radical departure from the glorious and lofty and inspired words of Isaiah and the other great and real prophets who were concerned, not with the aggrandizement of Israel's broken and political power, but with the conservation and regeneration of Israel's moral and spiritual power. Our subject therefore is limited strictly from the beginnings of divination through the great prophets, and the problem of early divination itself is touched upon only for

the purpose of bringing out the fundamental points of resemblance and difference between divination and prophecy.

Naturally, even though we have devoted a large amount of time to this fascinating and interesting study, we are by no means authorities or experts on it. Many errors of judgment will undoubtedly mark the progress of our product. Many flaws will result from our failure to analyze and scrutinize the available sources more carefully than we did. And yet withal we cannot help feel that to a great extent the fruits of our endeavor may be relied on. Our work represents a careful perusal of the works of our predecessors and a careful study of the actual source books of the Bible. Our thesis is concerned with a new field which has not as yet been treated exhaustively by any scholar. Crude though it may appear, may we express the fervent hope that it may be the means to guide many on the path of knowledge and understanding and that it may be an ever available source book for those who come after us, to which they may betake themselves in much the same manner as we have utilized the efforts and products of our antecessors as stepping stones to our own presentation of the subject.

8  
-  
CHAPTER TWO

FROM DIVINATION TO EARLIEST PROPHECY.  
-----

Divination is the science that seeks to discover the will of the supernatural powers by the observation of phenomena. It is the endeavor to obtain information about things of the future or affairs otherwise removed from ordinary perception by consulting informants other than human. From this rough definition of divination alone we can see the point from which, in the course of time, the distinction between divination and prophecy arose. Prophecy, especially of the earliest kind, it is true, did concern itself with the above, and yet it had in addition a moral and theistic essence which eventually enabled it to become differentiated from divination, which embraces all attempts to obtain secret knowledge from the denizens of the spirit world.

The early Hebrews and their Semitic heathen kinsfolk derived their divinatory and superstitious practices from a common ancestral tradition. Even though, in our opinion, the Hebrews had divination long before they came into Canaan, yet it is likewise true that they may have adopted, and actually did, many features of divination from the Canaanites. It is not at all necessary for us to go into the problem of the origin of divination too carefully. Some scholars are inclined to the view that divination was not indigenous in Israel, but that it was taken over from the nations with whom it eventually came into contact. This statement, they say, applies likewise to the earlier forms of prophecy which had much in common with divination. Others assert that divination is uni-

versal in its practice, the spontaneous creation of all peoples in the earlier stages of their development, and that while certain kinds of divinatory practices may be foreign in origin, yet divination as such is indigenous in Israel as among all other peoples.

Be that as it may, we may safely assert that from the time the Israelites established themselves in Palestine they were accustomed to practice divination. There may even be reason to believe that the habit may be more ancient, being inherited from the pre-Mosaic times, though positive evidence is lacking. For example, Joseph represents himself as having used the silver cup which was placed in Benjamin's sack for purposes of divination <sup>(1)</sup> and states furthermore that high officials of the Egyptian court like himself were addicted to the same habit <sup>(2)</sup>. However, we cannot accept this evidence as conclusive, since much of the Pentateuchal history which can be adduced may not be reliable, because it reflects the feelings and conceptions of the times at which they were written, and we know that the story of Joseph was written down at least six hundred years after the events which it purports to describe <sup>(3)</sup> took place. Even the surviving historical books, i.e. Judges, Samuel, and Kings, in which we recognize our main sources, are undoubtedly palliated to a considerable extent from the standpoint of the time in which they were actually written and do not faithfully portray in all respects the status of affairs prevailing at the times they describe.

Hence the problem as to whether or not divination and early prophecy were indigenous in Israel cannot be solved with ease. More stress is laid on the question whether early prophecy was indigenous in Israel, such as is evidenced, for example, in the prophetic guilds at the time of Samuel. Some scholars hold that this pheno-

menon was taken over bodily from the Canaanites; others as stoutly maintain that it was indigenous in Israel. At any rate no one can dispute the assertion that real prophecy was indigenous in Israel; that the literary prophets and even their forerunners, like Samuel, Elijah, and Nathan, are the unique creation of Israel, and that they represent a rank unattained by the diviners or prophets of any other nation in the history of the world. This indiginity of Israel's great prophets may be set down as a great difference between divination and prophecy.

The primary function of divination was, not so much to discover the will of the deity as to obtain information on matters past, present, and future, which information none but the supernatural powers possessed. Divination helped man to solve the many practical and pressing problems which confronted him. Despite its thorough selfishness, it was not mere inquisitiveness that led to its rise, for it served practical purposes. Divination was employed by men to solve their personal and private perplexities and needs. It found a reason for its existence in the fact that the recognized religion of the state had a relation to the gods or deities as a community, not as individuals, and that therefore in Israel, as in other nations, the individual had to resort to divination. Hence one of the primary features of divination is the fact that it is <sup>chiefly or largely</sup> personal and individual, not for one moment concerned with the state or the community, not with weighty, general problems, but only with trivial affairs of an essentially individual and private nature.

For a long period of time divination was regarded as legitimate in Israel. It did not, in Israel, concern itself very much with the element of phenomena observation. This statement, of course, applies only to Biblical divination. The Romans, the Greeks, and, in

still earlier times, the Egyptians and Babylonians likewise, had their liver and bird and entrail observation, but Biblical divination seems to be free from all this. Whether Israel formerly employed it and then abandoned it, or whether it never passed thru this stage is problematical. Evidently, therefore, we must distinguish between divination proper, i.e. the seeking of knowledge of future events through other than human informants, and the observation forms of divination. It is evident likewise that prophecy developed only from the former.

When the Israelites at first resorted to magic and divination, it was in the belief that their deity or deities (for we must not remain blind to the fact that monotheism in Israel was not achieved till the time of the Deuteronomic reformation, about the year 621 B.C.E., or, at the very latest, a few years after<sup>(5)</sup>, and that up to this time polytheism was the rule<sup>(6)</sup>) sanctioned and controlled these practices and accepted them as legitimate, as the privilege and prerogative of the individual adherent to the faith. Hence formerly all divination in Israel was legal and lawful. There came a time, however, when certain forms of divination began to be looked upon with suspicion. The literary records which, with a few exceptions, are the products of a later period, draw a sharp line of demarcation between legitimate (official) and illegitimate divination, which is called Kesem, a term likewise applied to the false prophets by the true ones. It is quite possible that this distinction was first made by the later prophets, as, for example, by the authors of Deuteronomy or even previous thereto<sup>(7)</sup>. It is likewise possible that the later authors did not wish to have it appear that divination was practiced with impunity in ancient Israel and for that reason differentiated between the legitimate (those forms of divination which could not be given up) and the illegiti-

mate which they represented only non-Israelites as having employed. Hence the Urim and Tummim represent a form of divination which was legitimate and which could not be done away with, while the necromancy practiced by Saul and the witch of Endor in summoning up the spirit of Samuel represents an illegitimate form of divination. The references to the Urim and the Tummim allude to the practice of obtaining a reply from the oracle by means of casting lots with sacred stones or blocks of wood <sup>(8)</sup>. This was called "seeking Jahweh" (Darash badonoy) in the lowest sense, with a far lower and less spiritual meaning than is ascribed to the phrase in Deuteronomy, the great prophets, and the Psalms. "Seeking Jahweh" originally meant to have recourse to the oracle in order to obtain advice upon some practical difficulty. The conception of seeking God in the highest sense, of the striving of the soul towards God and of carrying out His laws of morality, came only with the later prophets <sup>(8a)</sup>.

The Ephod and Terafim <sup>(9)</sup> were used in divination by the priests. Divination by means of them was considered legitimate for hundreds of years. Dreams and visions were regarded at the beginning as true sources of revelation, whether sent by Jahweh or by another deity <sup>(10)</sup>. Acts of divination to test the deity or to make sure of his presence and cooperation were likewise regarded as legitimate in the early stages. Sortilege (divining by means of sacred lots) played a significant role in ancient Hebrew divination, and its hold on the people was so strong that even the official religious ritual retained it till a very late date. The Urim and the Tummim already referred to were a sort of sortilege incorporated into the official religion. Later on the oracle, whose minister was a priest <sup>(11)</sup>, gradually yielded to the prophet, the human interpreter of the deity. Other forms of divination <sup>(12)</sup> are looked upon as fully in keeping with the belief in the deity (Jahweh). These

are the only forms of divination which, even at the earliest period of which we have record in the Bible, were permitted in Israel. The rest were absolutely taboo (13) .

Hence a big advance is noted, even at this premature period, in the Israelitish over the Canaanitish divination. The source from which information is expected is Jahweh, it being understood that "Jahweh" in these days meant the tribal deity or the local deity, and not the national or the universal Deity of later years. Though there may have been many tribal deities (all called "Jahweh") the tribe or the people of one definite locality strictly ignored them and worshipped its one deity, whereas the Canaanites venerated a multiplicity of deities or, like the Philistines and Phoenicians, a duality of Baal and Astarte. As national monotheism developed in Israel the practice of divination became more and more divested of its objectionable features, and this influence paved the way for the development of early prophecy from divination.

The purer form of divination which was the seed of prophecy was in marked contrast with the dark secrecy of magic. Magic was ashamed to face the light. Divination in Israel was consecrated to the service of the deity, although it is true that the diviner did not always use his powers only for distinctively religious purposes.

Magic, however, was not and it was taboo in ancient Israel from time immemorial. There is no record of any legitimate magic in the Bible. Magic is the means of securing superhuman results by adopting the methods of the superhuman powers. As such divination and magic differ essentially in their aims and methods, and it is evident that prophecy could never have developed along the lines of magic. Divination seeks to learn the divine will in order to be guided; magic studies divine action in order to imitate it and to

accomplish divine results. Divination is an inquirer and its virtue is obedience. Magic is an investigator and imitator and its virtue is achievement. Divination is the more reverent and allies itself more easily with religion. In fact magic has always been the rival of divination, while divination was always its ally.

Magic is essentially a directive and coercive procedure, differing in this respect from fully-formed religion, which is essentially submissive and obedient. Religion, even when it employs force, recognizes the protective function of the deity. Magic is without such acknowledgment, without emotion or worship. In the absence of distinct religious systems magic has been a bond of social union, but it always fostered belief in a false science of sequence, and as a result it has always been the aim of religion to banish magic from the world. Even the religions of the heathen world condemned magic while approving of divination. The Book of Deuteronomy sharply condemns magic and forbids it entirely <sup>(14)</sup>, and since magic had none of the redeeming features of divination it fell into absolute disuse and decay among the Hebrews and could have exercised no influence whatsoever on the subsequent development of prophecy from divination.

Perhaps it would be of benefit to enter into a brief discussion of some of the most salient features of and differences between Hebrew and heathen divination, in order that we may understand how Hebrew divination survived and developed into prophecy while heathen divination grew constantly weaker and weaker and finally disappeared. Hebrew divination resembled the heathen because they both rested on the exercise of the same faculties. They both sprang from the same root, yet in their development they differed greatly. In the case of Hebrew divination the spiritual des-

cendant of the diviner was the prophet, an Amos, an Isaiah, a man of the highest moral standing. In the case of heathen divination he was a trickster, a cheat, a juggler. Let us take as an example the Greek diviner, perhaps the best equipped of all the non-Hebraic diviners. The Greek and Hebrew had in common the same unquestioning belief in the possibility of ascertaining facts by superhuman means, the same ready recourse to the oracle in every kind of emergency, and even the use of identical methods to a certain extent. The Greeks turned to the oracle in times of war, on occasions of sickness, and for the solution of ritual questions. Both the Greeks and the Hebrews accepted dreams as a special form and mode of divine communication (15). Both Greek and Hebrew diviners divined by means of rods and arrows, but whereas the Greeks and other heathens employed necromancy and other derogatory means, Hebrew divination early rid itself of them. There is a sharp contrast between some of the Greek methods and the sacred lot and dream of which early Hebrew prophecy approved. Greek and other heathen divination remained polytheistic to the end, while divination in Israel, with the constant and ever recurring development of monotheism, little by little sluffed off the most objectionable features and led logically to the earliest form of prophecy which, though having a lot in common with divination, yet has elements of a higher and moral character which finally enabled it to prevail.

The antecedents of prophecy go back a long distance. From the remotest beginnings there never was a time when prophecy or something analogous to it did not exist. In the wider sense of the word prophecy is coeval with religion. Men from earliest times believed some of their number possessed of the exceptional powers

and privileges to cross the threshold of this world and to mingle with the inhabitants of the supernatural world. The Hebrews believed that certain of their number were possessed of hidden faculties which could enable them to predict the future, to answer personal questions, to solve personal difficulties, to intercede for them and to discover the will of the deity. We may be sure that divination in Israel goes back quite a distance. The first diviners of the earliest type and most primitive kind may have very well been called "Kosemim" <sup>(16)</sup>, a name which later became a term of opprobrium. The different kinds of diviners each must have been called a specific name but there likewise must have been a comprehensive name which included all of them. At any rate the early diviners among the Hebrews must have had a descriptive name, with no redeeming features at all.

Gradually, however, a little change began to take place, imperceptibly and in a manner regarding which we have no exact data and which is very difficult to grasp clearly or to describe. It seems that slowly but surely there developed in Israel a certain class of diviners who, while having many of the characteristics of their predecessors and of their fellow-diviners, had certain traits or predispositions to traits which would make them seem a little higher, an indefinable something which admitted of development. These diviners seem to have given up some of the most objectionable features of divination. This group was called the Roim, the seers, a group of plain men, quietly working for the interests of private people but yet, as it were, already a little conscious of the fact that from private affairs to tribal and national interests was but one or two steps.

It appears that even before the time of the seers there was a group of diviners called Cohanim, or priests. <sup>(17)</sup> There is e-

vidence to show that before the time of the original priesthood the priests used to perform such functions as consulting the oracle by means of the sacred lot. As time went on and the temple cult developed, the priests drew further and further away from divination and assumed more and more the duties of the priesthood in our sense of the word. At any rate in the earliest and even in the earlier times one of the functions of the priests was to interpret the will of the deity (Jahweh). His name designated him as a diviner or soothsayer, consulting the will of the deity by means of the Ephod and the sacred lots.

The priest saw to national affairs and to tribal affairs (at least in the period with which we are dealing) as, for example, the administration of justice, the ritual and moral code, and the discovery of the will of God in great crises. If in the early days his functions were more and more those of the diviners, they gradually changed and were relegated to the succeeding order of Roim. The Roeh had no official title. He is associated with no particular sanctuary. He is rather the diviner par excellence in the interest of the private life of the people. The early soothsayer and seer was in touch with and primarily concerned with the life of the individual, unlike his successors of the classical period of prophecy, who had larger interests at heart. The authority of the Roeh, as well as the early diviners, lasted only as long as his guidance proved helpful and his information proved true.

The seer could be consulted on matters entirely secular and private. Thus, for example, Saul is urged to consult the seer Samuel regarding the whereabouts of his father's lost asses. Jeroboam sends his wife to ascertain whether or not his child will recover (18) (19)

. The recovery of lost articles was one of the chief du-

ties of the seer, as was the giving of information regarding other personal matters such as the success of a venture or recovery from sickness. The Roeh was the seer, the one who saw, and it was the popular notion that nothing was too hard for the seer's powers. Indeed here was the one characteristic of the seer which lifted him above the rank and category of the earlier diviners and stamped him as being potentially and partially a prophet. The religion of Israel was becoming stronger and stronger. The people, little by little, were becoming accustomed to the idea of Jahweh, either the tribal or local, not the national. Previous divination did not associate itself so much with the deity. But the seer gave out his information in the name of the Jahweh or at least in the name of religion, of the accepted and current religious beliefs, working quietly, unheralded and unenthusiastic. That he had spiritual gifts is undeniable. He was accessible to anybody, but, as frequently happened, he ran the danger of using his spiritual gifts for his own personal interests. It was those seers who forgot the personal side of their occupation and used their powers for the benefit of the community who finally paved the way for the development of prophecy from the seers (20)

The seer was entitled to receive a fee from the one who consulted him. This fee-giving and receiving was characteristic of the diviner, a feature which our seer retained. It was perhaps the only method the diviner had of making his living. For example, Saul at first is unwilling to appear before the seer of Ramah because he thought that he had nothing to give him for his services, and only when his companion reminds him that they have something to give him does he consent to go (21). Naaman too offers Elisha presents and money for curing him of his leprosy. Elisha of course refuses it (22), showing a little advance, but the fact that Naaman of-

ferred it and that Elisha's servant later on persuaded Naaman into believing that Elisha had changed his mind shows that the giving of fees was not only customary but expected.

The Roeh had absolutely nothing in common with the enthusiasts of later times or with the howling dervishes of other peoples with the exception of the gift of divination. He concerned himself in a quiet unobtrusive way merely with secular affairs while the later addicts to prophetism were enthusiasts for the cause of Jahweh and Israel. The seer appeared as an individual; the later prophets appeared in groups or bands. It is very difficult, in fact impossible for us to discover the method which the Roim used in their divination and how they ascertained the things which were asked of them. Hereof the Bible tells us practically nothing.

The transformation from seer to prophet was, of course, not immediate and complete. Long afterwards, it seems, certain characteristics of the diviner are recognizable in the prophets, especially those prophets before the great prophets. Yet the higher and more spiritual elements in the Hebrew seer finally became predominant in the prophet. As previously hinted, the Roeh represented, we may say, the first step in the development of prophecy. We may call him the first and lowest type of prophet, differing from the other diviners, soothsayers, and conjurers of his day, like the Kosemim, the Menacheshim, and the Meonenim, in that he is more or less one who "sees" in the name of his Jahweh and speaks in his name. In fact, we are told that one who was later called a Nabi (prophet) was previously called "seer".

(23)

It shows, at least, that though this statement is by no means true in all details, since what was meant by prophet at the time this passage was written was something far higher and more spiritual than was the seer, yet at any rate the seer had

redeeming features along which he developed into the prophet, and the later writer easily fell into the mistake of confounding him with the Nabi, no doubt unintentionally, since he forgot the original meaning of the word "seer".

Let us give a little attention to another so called step in the process of evolution from seer to prophet. Many authorities (24)

state that the term "Ish Elohim" was a designation of the seer even previous to the Roeh. However, in view of the fact that almost all the references to the Ish Elohim are concerned with Samuel, (25) Elijah and Elisha, or, in general, with persons who lived after the time of Samuel, there is reason to believe that the term is one which came into use after the period of the Roim. We are told in I Samuel 2:27 that an Ish Elohim came to Eli, before the time of Samuel's activity, and prophecied the destruction of Eli's house and the death of his two sons, but this seems to be an insertion of a later editor and can hardly be taken as an actual description of the conditions of the times. In addition, the passage in the Book of Samuel quoted in connection with Note 23 seems to recognize the Nabi as the successor of the Roeh, and we know that the Nebiim developed after the advent of Samuel, who was a Roeh. It seems therefore that the Ish Elohim had no official place either before or after the Roeh, and though quite a few people were given the name of Ish Elohim (Samuel himself is called Ish Elohim in one or two places) it seems to me more a complimentary form of appellation, or at any rate a little advance over the seer. If anything, the term Ish Elohim is subsequent to the term Roeh, and it seems to denote more a definite specific individual and is not a generic name for the members of one species, as is the term Roim.

The term Roeh itself has an interesting history. It seems to have fallen into use at a comparatively early date. With one exception (26) the term Roeh is used exclusively of the times of Samuel, (27) and only the older portion of the books of Samuel retains it. All in all the period of the Roim, as we have a record of them in the Bible, lasted about a hundred years, or perhaps a few more. The probable explanation of the little evidence we have concerning the Roeh and the scant use of the term is that the bulk of the canonical writings proceed from a time when it was considered that the special function of declaring and announcing characterized prophecy in Israel better than the elementary office of divining and seeing.

A few more words about the Ish Elohim. The transition from Roeh to Wabi did not take such a very long time. We know that after the Roeh period another class, the Chozeh, prevailed. If we posit that the Ish Elohim prevailed after the Roeh we would be crowding three kinds of prophets into too narrow a period. We would otherwise have to assume that the three, Roeh, Chozeh, and Ish Elohim, existed at the same time and we would then be at a loss to explain the differences between the Ish Elohim and the other three classes. At best the question is not an easy one. Despite all we have said the term Ish Elohim may yet have been a distinct designation, though in one passage Samuel is called an Ish Elohim and his ordinary designation was Roeh. The passage in I Sam. 2:27 in my opinion may be a later interpolation and may not necessarily be taken to state that the class of Ish Elohim existed before the Roim, because, as we see, the Ish Elohim mentioned in this passage prophecies doom to Eli and his sons because they did not carry out the ritual law and the temple sacrifices as they should have

done. In this respect this prophet is altogether different from such prophets as Nathan and Gad who did not care about the ritual but only about the moral law. Perhaps this passage was a later insertion by some member of the priestly class, since it is evident that we cannot account for the existence of an Ish Elohim at this period who chastises the violation of the ritual law.

Despite the fact that the bulk of the canonical writings abrogated the seer's function of seeing, we must at the same time remember that seeing is always an essential of true prophecy, though in the sense of seeing the moral laws of God and not seeing the trivial affairs of the world by means of some sort of divinatory power. Hence the continued use of the term Mareh (sight) and Chazon (vision) till the last days of prophetic history, long after the time when seeing as used in the primitive sense had ceased to be a distinctive function of the prophet. How soon after the time of Samuel the term Roeh gave way to the term Nabi is hard to estimate. The term Nebiim as referring to the ecstatic and frenzied prophets existed already in the time of Samuel and Saul (28). but it is difficult to ascertain definitely whether this word is to be ascribed to the later author of the passage or to be referred to the Canaanitic ecstatics with whom the people were all too acquainted (29). This question will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter. It will suffice to state that the term Roeh flourished about a half century before Samuel and for a similar period after Samuel; that for the last thirty or forty years of their existence the Roim lived side by side with the Nebiim, a term which, originally associated with ecstatic rites, in the course of time gradually assumed, as we shall explain at greater length subsequently, a more substantial meaning and finally superseded all

other terms for the prophets .There was an intermediary stage, the Chozeb,as we shall explain in the fourth chapter,a term which was employed after the period of the Roim,and perhaps for a time coeval with it,before the term Nabi received its highest meaning.

CHAPTER THREESAMUEL AND THE EARLY PROPHETIC GUILDS.  
-----

Israel was in great danger. An enemy had descended upon her with vast hordes, with an entirely new and foreign culture, and was threatening her very existence. The Philistines were absolute masters of the land. Beginning almost with the earliest times of the entrance into Canaan by the separate tribes, or, at the most, in groups of two or three tribes <sup>(30)</sup>, the Philistines had proved a thorn in the side of the Hebrews. <sup>(31)</sup> It was they who had overwhelmed the tribe of Dan and forced its remnants to seek a new dwelling place far to the north. During the period when Samson was supposed to have lived the Philistines were constantly harassing Israel and making inroads into their territory. Finally, in the days of Eli, the Philistines invaded the strong tribe of Ephraim, which had hitherto been able to defend itself from the invading hordes whereas the weaker ones had been already overcome and defeated the Israelites at Aphek, which decisive victory was almost immediately followed by the crushing disaster in which Eli's two sons were killed, thirty thousand Hebrew warriors were slaughtered, and the power of Israel seemingly irretrievably broken.

From now on the Philistines were the undisputed lords of the land. All resistance was crushed out of the Israelites. Their enemy removed every carpenter and locksmith, every means of cutting weapons was taken away, garrisons were placed in the land to keep the Israelites in check <sup>(32)</sup>, and heavy tribute was imposed upon the people. Israel's military prowess and courage was fast disappearing, and it is likely that the Israelites would never have thrown

off their yoke and regained their independence were it not for one man, Samuel.

Samuel, from early childhood, was placed in the temple as a servant to Eli, or, more properly, as some sort of a preliminary stage to the priesthood such as certain non-Jewish churches have even today. That he later was a priest and discharged the duties of a priest is likewise true. <sup>(33)</sup> But he was likewise a seer, a local seer, with his residence at Ramah and like the great majority of the seers, from whom he did not seem to differ in the least <sup>(34)</sup>. He was instrumental in recovering lost articles, he interested himself in people's private affairs, he took fees for his services, and was unknown except in his immediate vicinity, for Saul had never heard of him, and his companion, while he had heard of Samuel, did not know his name or where he lived, despite the fact that <sup>(35)</sup> the both of them lived only a short distance away from him. Samuel, of course, had the reputation of expecting payment for his services.

But Samuel was something more than a mere seer. If he had been only a seer Israel would never have freed itself from the yoke of the Philistines. But Samuel, unlike all other seers, who were selfish, avaricious, and ambitious, and who interested themselves only in individual and secular affairs, was a patriot <sup>(36)</sup>, an ardent lover of his country and of His God in whose name he spoke and to whom he had been consecrated as a child and to whom he had been a loyal and devoted servant since boyhood. He was interested in affairs which touched, not only his local region, but his tribe Ephraim and the other tribes. He remembered vaguely the God whom he had served as a child, the ancient strength and glory of his tribe, and he hated the Philistines who had invaded his sacred land. He realized that his tribe, Ephraim, had been entirely crushed, and that no

deliverer could be found in it. He longed eagerly for a hero, a man from some other tribe, a sturdy military leader who would oppose the dreaded Philistines and check them, eventually driving them out of the land.

The tribe of Benjamin seemed the logical place to look for a savior. Situated in the mountains and very inaccessible, it had suffered the least from the Philistines and had remained practically intact. Saul was the man whom Samuel chose as his agent of delivery, a stalwart, imposing man, and a towering figure. Accordingly Samuel prepared the stage for the enacting of one of the most dramatic scenes of Israelitish prophecy. It happened one day that Kish, the father of Saul, misses a few asses. In my opinion it seems that these asses may have been spirited away at Samuel's orders. Saul is ordered to find them, and sets out with a companion, who finally leads him to the Seer Samuel, seemingly a preconceived plan. Samuel, ignoring to a great extent the trifling loss of the asses, directs his attention forthwith to the great national crisis. He predicts that at Givath Elohim Saul will meet with a band of Nebiim, descending from the high place with harps, flutes, timbrels and other musical instruments, prophesying (i.e. practicing mantic rites) and putting themselves into an ecstatic condition for the sake of arousing enthusiasm and religious patriotism. Samuel predicts likewise that Saul will join with them and "prophecy himself" into this same ecstatic religious condition. The selection of the place Givath Elohim is significant. Samuel chose it because of the fact that a Philistine garrison was located at this place and he wished to show Saul that the land, his country, was indeed in a very degrading state of degradation and subjugation when Philistine garrisons dotted its surface.

Of course the predictions of Samuel came true, since they had all been prearranged. Saul met the band of Webiim, became enthused, and determined to act as Israel's leader, encouraged by his anointment at the hand of Samuel. The fact that Samuel anointed Saul raises him far above the level of the ordinary seer and stamps him as a forerunner of the great prophets. (37) The battle with Hachash, the Ammonite, (38) in which Saul overwhelmingly defeated the arrogant invader, proved to the people that his military prowess was sufficient, and they willingly accepted Saul as their leader and king. With Saul began to wage a continual war against the Philistines. However, it was an unequal struggle. He by no means had the cooperation of all the tribes. The southern tribes did not participate at all, and the remoter northern tribes were too far away. Saul by no means was the ruler or the king over all Israel. At the most he controlled two or three tribes and had to content himself mostly with guerilla warfare in the mountains, for had he trusted himself to a decisive pitched battle on the level field, he and his small army would have been annihilated. The story that Saul aroused all Israel to war against Hachash (39) and that he was king over all Israel (40) and that Samuel himself was a great national figure, is of course a tradition, a product of the later ages, when all Israel had been united into one and when the writers no longer remembered the time when Israel had been composed of separate tribes. The man who united all Israel and overwhelmed the Philistines was David. Saul, at the time when he was getting old, had not as yet seen the culmination of his plans, and Samuel was likewise disappointed in Saul. Samuel therefore put his hope in David, and anointed him as Saul's successor and the king of Israel. Before his death Saul decided to risk all in a final con-

fight, in a pitched battle, but the Philistines overwhelmed the Israelites, and Saul and his son were slain. David, after a long struggle, after many years of strategy and warfare, finally united all the tribes of Israel, joined Israel with Judah, defeated the Philistines once and for all (they are not heard of in Israelitish history after David) and thoroughly vindicated the hopes of Samuel who, however, had not lived to see the culmination of his life work and the fruition of the great confidence he had placed in David.

Samuel, therefore, was immeasurably above the Moim. His patriotism, his zeal, his ardor for his tribe and his nation, placed him far above their plane. The power he assumed of anointing Saul and David stamped him as a great man, an approach to the real prophets who battled for the sake of God. His attitude of statesman with a distinctively religious point of view and purpose was the characteristic attitude of the Hebrew prophet<sup>(41)</sup>, at least of the prophetic forerunners. Samuel was the first to assume it. In so using the influence he possessed as a diviner as an instrument for the attainment of the religious and social welfare of the nation, he raised the seers and their work to that higher plane where it became prophecy. From the days of Samuel onwards we find the prophets in the closest of relationships to the political circumstances of their times. They made it their business to watch the course of national affairs in general and specially to control and judge the conduct of the reigning monarch and his counsellors. The example which Samuel set of unselfish devotion to his people inspired his followers to pursue the same method. Gradually the lower and more mechanical features of divination dropped away from prophecy and it became in increasing measure a conscious relation be-

tween the spirit of God and the spirit of man. We may call Samuel the inaugurator of the line of inspired prophets who, acting independently of the schools of the prophets, were the guiding spirits of their generations, the messengers of God to His people.

But Samuel likewise accomplished another great work which influenced the entire course of Israelitish history and the history of prophecy. It was he who founded prophecy and the prophetic schools. These were bands, or, properly speaking, guilds of prophets which Samuel organized for the sake of stirring up the religious zeal of the people and to arouse them from the lethargy into which they had sunk as a result of the Philistinian<sup>c</sup> domination. These prophetic guilds, the first mention of which is found regarding the time of Samuel, were undoubtedly the result of Samuel's activities and efforts. No doubt there were among the Canaanites prophets of this nature, ecstasies, organized into bands for the purposes of promoting their heathen religious rites. These prophetists, as we may call them to distinguish them from the prophets, certainly thought themselves the prophetists<sup>2</sup> of their own deity, and even committed grave sexual crimes and afflicted their own bodies in order to honor him and to worship him.<sup>2</sup> Samuel perceived the possibilities for good latent in these prophetists; he realized that by organizing them into a band and by teaching them the nature of the work he had determined to accomplish and the necessity of throwing off the yoke of the Philistines he could through them arouse all Israel to a realization of the danger threatening their country and their faith. Accordingly he took over from the Canaanites the general characteristics of their prophetists, though their objects were absolutely different, the methods they used were quite similar. It is hardly probable that these bands existed in

Israel before the time of Samuel. There would have been no occasion for their rise at a previous period, and in addition no record is found of them previous to Samuel. That the order of the Nebiim at that time was a new one in Israel is clearly indicated in the

Book of Samuel. (42) Here the prophetists were mocked at by the people, regarded as something unworthy and noteworthy, were looked upon with distrust and of doubtful origin, since the words "And who is their father" (43) implies clearly that the Nebiim were, on the ground of the Canaanitish prophetists with whom the people of the times were rather familiar, regarded as obscure people without any known origin. (44) The statement "Is Saul also among the prophets" (45)

clearly expresses the surprise of the people at seeing the noble and well known Saul become one of these unknown and unusual madmen.

Hence it seems almost beyond a doubt that the system of prophetism passed over to Israel from the Canaanites, that their introduction was entirely the work of Samuel, and that their primary purpose was to arouse the people to religious and martial enthusiasm. The element of self-induced ecstasy and enthusiasm was taken over from the Canaanites and endowed with a religious motive. Samuel's Nebiim aroused themselves by means of music and song, being men after the manner of the Mohammedan fakirs, or of the dancing and howling dervishes, expressing their religious excitation through their eccentric mode of life. The word Hisnabe means, primarily, to live as a prophet, to rave, to behave in an unseemly manner, and the word Nebiim (46) which is applied to them means "those who rave," who act like mad in a state of self-induced ecstasy.

These prophetic bands in the early days were always attached

to the sanctuary, since their purpose was primarily religious. Saul met the band of prophets coming down from the high place, the local shrine. Such bands were, in later days, stationed at Bethel<sup>(47)</sup>, and at Jericho<sup>(48)</sup>. This attachment to the sanctuary is a feature which Samuel took over from the Canaanites, since the Canaanitish prophetists had the sanctuary as their central point. It might be stated in support of our thesis that the prophetic guilds were attached to the sanctuary that Samuel and thirty members of his prophetic guild<sup>2</sup> invited Saml to dine with them in the Lishkah (chamber) of the high place. The band of prophets which Saul met<sup>(49)</sup> and of which Samuel was the head were exercising a corporate and not an individual office, an innovation which was introduced by Samuel, who saw that the exigencies of the times demanded active effort on the part of many.

As previously stated, the chief characteristics of this early prophecy were its abnormal excitement and its infectious transmission from one person to another. The ecstatic state was sometimes superinduced by the drinking of intoxicating liquors, by violent movements, and by contemplation. The prophets of Baal in the days of Elijah<sup>(50)</sup> threw themselves into ecstasy by torturing their bodies and thus depriving themselves of their normal consciousness, thus coming into relation with the mysterious potencies and influences of the deity in whose name and for whose sake they were arousing themselves. Of these preceding methods there is no evidence that they were ever employed by the Hebrew prophetists. These were the most disgusting and objectionable features which Samuel would never have adopted from the Canaanites. The only method which Samuel's Nebiim used was the employment of music, of various musical instruments, and the playing of uncanny and wierd songs

which caused the prophets to lose control over themselves and put them into a state of mental rapture. In the course of this trance they engaged in violent singing exercises, in fervid excitement. The exercises and excitement and ecstasy were contagious from one member to the other. When Saul, who was, we may say, a candidate for admission to the ranks of the prophetists, saw the antics of the group and heard their howling and their frenzied music, placed as he was in a sympathetic mood as the result of Samuel's statement that he would join in with them, he could not help but prophecy and rave in the same manner <sup>(51)</sup>. Thrice the messengers of Saul were placed in an ecstatic fit at the sight of these enthusiasts <sup>(52)</sup>, and finally Saul himself is inoculated with their contagious spirit and not only did he rave and prophecy but so violent was his ecstasy that he stripped himself naked and lay down in that condition all that day and all that night. However, the people who looked on while the prophets threw Saul into the ecstatic state for the first time <sup>(53)</sup> were not affected by the unusual sights they saw.

We find a later record in I Sam. 18:10 that Saul continued to prophecy occasionally throughout his lifetime, and that for a time David played the harp to arouse him. He therefore seems to have remained one of the Nebiim all the rest of his life. We may assume that as a result of the fact that Saul joined the prophetic group, prophesied with them and made common cause with them, and as a result of the great victory which Saul gained over the Ammonites and of the wave of enthusiasm for Israel's cause which this undoubtedly aroused in the hearts of the people, the prophetists at the time of Samuel began to be looked upon with more and more respect. Certainly in subsequent times people

were sympathetic toward their work, for the overthrow of the Phoenician Baal worship was due to the work of Elisha and his prophetic guilds.

These prophets lived, not separately, but in a community or settlement <sup>(54)</sup>. The number of the enthusiasts in each band cannot at all be determined. When we consider that four fifths of the passages which treat of the prophetic guilds refer to the times of Elijah and Elisha we can readily understand the difficulty we will experience in determining the exact features of the school of Samuel and the consequent danger of ascribing to Samuel's party the characteristics of the later guilds will be apparent. Of the times of Elisha we know that there were prophetic schools <sup>(55)</sup> at Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal, and perhaps others, but at the time of Samuel we are certain only that the one school existed over which Samuel presided <sup>(56)</sup>. The school of prophets which Saul met is undoubtedly the same one, since it went to the garrison and the high place at Givath Elohim at the direction of Samuel. The fixed dwelling of Samuel's school was at Ramah, where they dwelt in tents or rude dwelling-houses <sup>(57)</sup>. Samuel dwelt among them, as it is expressly stated in this passage. With Ramah as their base the prophetists, when necessary, visited neighboring towns (as, for example, they journeyed to Givath Elohim) for the purpose of inspiring the people, of working up enthusiasm, and of gaining converts to their cause. Since we have no evidence that they had any remunerative occupation, it is reasonable to suppose that they lived from gifts, or, what is more probable, from the income of the sanctuary. We have no mention of any details regarding this matter in the times of Samuel, and when we come to treat of the schools of Elisha we shall discuss this problem a little

more fully.

We have already declared it to be our fixed belief that this prophetic school was founded by Samuel due to the exigencies of the Philistine oppression and the necessity of arousing the people to the realization of the servitude they would have to endure if they did not throw off the yoke of the oppressor. The fact that the school had not previously existed, that it is first mentioned in the time of Samuel and by Samuel himself; that he is the recognized leader of the school and could send it whithersoever he thought it necessary; that he knew of the movements of the school around Givath Elohim in advance and actually prearranged the whole affair <sup>(58)</sup>, for which reason he could predict so confidently all that would happen to Saul is, in my opinion, indisputable evidence that Samuel founded this prophetic school which was the pattern and model of all the later prophetistic schools. Samuel himself, of course, though he dwelt with the prophetists <sup>(59)</sup>, differed greatly from them in character. His function and gift as a seer and prophet differed greatly from theirs. Under Samuel prophecy became a recognized institution. He is the actual founder of the prophetic order and the terminus a quo for the history of the Hebrew prophecy, the terminus ad quem being either Deutero-Isaiah or Malachi. It is likewise my firm belief that Samuel took the institution over from the Canaanites, making the suitable changes which he as an ardent worshipper of Jahweh deemed necessary.

However, there seem to be two schools of thought prevailing among the scholars regarding these two points. Some scholars <sup>(60)</sup> gravitate to the opinion which we have already explained to be our view, that prophecy was taken over from the Canaanites by Samuel due to the conditions above mentioned. Others <sup>(61)</sup> as stoutly

maintain that this is only a mere matter of guess work and that there is no evidence of a positive nature to prove the existence of prophecy among the primitive Canaanites. However, this matter is actually immaterial. The dignity of Hebrew prophecy would suffer no loss even though it did come from Canaanitish origins. Samuel would still have the credit for establishing Hebrew prophecy and for modifying it to conform to Israel's higher standards. Samuel undoubtedly got rid of some of the most objectionable features of Canaanitish prophecy in adapting it to use in Israel. Some scholars are inclined to believe that Samuel did not organize the prophetists<sup>(62)</sup>. The vast majority firmly believe that he did<sup>(63)</sup>. Further discussion of these points is unnecessary, since our views have already been clearly stated.

Samuel began life as a seer, a diviner, and died as a prophet, as infinitely above his fellows, as the founder of the prophetic order. Moses cannot be considered the first or the greatest prophet. He was a leader, not a great prophet. If the crest and summit of prophecy had been reached with Moses it would leave us at a loss to explain the primitivity of prophecy under Samuel and the manner in which such lofty prophecy as that of Moses could have degenerated to such a degree of lowliness. Moses' prophecy, if we take the traditional view, would render the later prophets unnecessary, would stamp them as merely his imitators, would presuppose the existence of a lofty and superb system of prophecy at the earliest stage of Israel's religious life.

The delineation of the figure of Moses is a complete exposition of the conception of inspiration prevalent in prophetic circles at the time when prophecy was displaying its highest qualities and exerting its greatest influence<sup>(64)</sup>. The figure

and prophetic gift of Moses is presented by the Jahwist and Deuteronomist writers as the greatest desideratum of prophecy which they deemed it possible to reach, and is not to be construed as the actual attainment thereof. In the book of Deuteronomy in particular Moses is drawn and depicted as the ideal prophet, the man directly and completely inspired by God, the ideal, not the historical. It is clear that this evidence regarding Moses belongs to the age of prophecy and not to the age of the Exodus. Indeed, the figures of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Deutero Isaiah, living from five hundred to seven hundred years after Moses, are real prophets of the type such as Moses is portrayed as having been, and may be considered the attainment and the fulfillment of the prophetic ideal, while the prophets of the Jahwist, Elohist, and Deuteronomist schools never even began to attain to the sublimity which they achieved. Despite this fact the ethical and religious teachings of Moses, who was primarily a leader, never ceased to exert a purifying and refining influence upon the national and religious character of Israel, so that subsequent writers aggrandized him as a great man, a resplendent echo of the past, and endowed him with virtues which he by no means possessed. It is Samuel, and only Samuel, who elevated prophecy above divination and soothsaying, who gave it an ethical, religious, and national leitmotif, who founded the prophetic order, and paved the way for the appearance of the prophetic forerunners whom we shall discuss in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

NATHAN GAD HEMEN IDDO AHIJAH SHEMAYAH JEHU MICAIAH  
-----

The question as to whether or not the prophetic guild inaugurated by Samuel disappeared immediately after his death, the death of Saul, or the eradication of the Philistinian<sup>e</sup> menace, and did not reappear till the time of Elijah and Elisha will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter. Certain it is, however, that the period between Samuel and Elijah marks a further development of prophecy, a further departure from divination, and the building up of certain characteristics which distinguished the great prophets likewise. There are eight or nine prophets to be treated in this period, in addition to three or four anonymous prophets, each appearing individually, not attached to the prophetic schools, but separately working out their principles and doctrines. These prophets were Gad, Nathan, Hemen, Iddo, Ahijah, Shemayah, Jehu, Micaiah, and three or four unknown prophets. Let us turn now to an examination of the time, work, and character of each.

(65)

Gad is the seer of David . He seems to have accompanied David in all his flights before he became king ( I Sam. 22:5 ), to have given David much valuable advice on many occasions, to have remained loyal to him throughout and therefore to have been rewarded with the position of court seer (Choze) of David after David actually became king. Later on he reproved the king for having taken the census of the people contrary to the will of God. Since he is mentioned as David's seer he was attached to the court of David in the capacity of official advisor. He displays, seemingly, none of the characteristics of the diviners or the

early prophetists, and is the first Chozeah to be mentioned. He receives his inspiration from God, that is to say, he prophesied in the name of God and strove to advise the king on the strength of what he believed to be God's word. He was supported by the king entirely and yet did not hesitate to reprove the king when he thought that he had done wrong. However, since David himself realized the nature of his disobedient act and yielded to the words of Gad we are at a loss to know how Gad would have acted if David had differed with him. We may well infer that David acted practically as he wished, that the act of Gad in rebuking David was of great significance in the development of prophecy and the beginnings of the moral powers of the Chozim, but that nevertheless Gad did not begin to approximate the power of Samuel as demonstrated when he anointed Saul and David. Gad, living from the bounty of David, could never have attained complete independence from him.

We hear of three other Chozim, the only ones beside Gad, in the Book of Chronicles. (66) The name of one is Hemen, and he is called the seer of David (67), like Gad. The fact that he is mentioned in Chronicles and not in Kings and that nothing very important is mentioned of him indicate that his significance is not great. In (68) the same chapter of Chronicles he and Asaph and Jeduthun are mentioned as prophesying (Nibim) with musical instruments. It is out of the question that these three formed a prophetic school or were a part of a prophetic school in the reign of David similar to that of Samuel. We have no record in Kings that David had a court school of prophetists, and these three names may very well be a figment of the Chronicler's imagination, even as many other details of the priestly system which the Chronicler ascribes to

David are not historical. Hemen may have been David's Choze<sup>h</sup> or court seer before the time of Gad; perhaps he was a fictitious character. At any rate he is of little or no significance. The retention of the name of seer (Choze<sup>h</sup>) by Gad and Hemen shows that the change from divination to prophecy was far from rapid. Though little evidence can be produced it is a surmise that both Gad and Hemen (especially Hemen, on the ground of the passage which we have already quoted) still retained certain characteristics of the diviner or ancient seer. Asaph and Jeduthun are elsewhere mentioned as Chozim (69).

From the foregoing it is <sup>more or less</sup> evident that the Choze<sup>h</sup> is the official diviner attached to the court. Asaph and Jeduthun are mentioned as seers (Chozim) only once, in the passage last quoted. The interest of the Choze<sup>h</sup> is chiefly centered in the life of the king and of the nation, and though the Choze<sup>h</sup> divines for his king (70)

he is a little higher than the Roeh, who concerned himself solely with the individual. Gad is really a Choze<sup>h</sup>. In one place he is called Nabi (71), but we may count this merely as an indication of the tendency of the later times and of the later writers to compliment all those who spoke in the name of Jahweh with the title of Nabi. If we are to judge by the passage in Chronicles, which may have no historical value, it would seem that the Chozim still retain another feature of divination, i.e. the use of external stimuli, for Hemen, Asaph, and Jeduthun divine by the aid of psalteries, harps, and cymbals (72). It may likewise be possible that at the late date this passage was written down by the Chronicler, who wrote from a decidedly priestly standpoint, these musical instruments were not regarded as being used in divination but were only to be used in the ritual of the temple. This latter hypothe-

sis seems the most plausible.

Nathan is the first real forerunner of the great prophets after Samuel, and may be said to have excelled Samuel in this respect. His appearance marks a crisis and the beginning of a new development in prophecy. Since he outlived Gad by many years I have chosen to put him after Gad in logical sequence, for Gad was far below the level attained by Nathan. Nathan is always called a prophet<sup>(73)</sup> (Nabi) as used in the later sense, but this is the judgment passed upon him by the later people, and it is evident that he began life as a court seer. But an event occurred which stamped him as a worthy predecessor of the great prophets. David had committed a grievous crime against human life and the laws of morality by having Uriah killed in battle and then marrying his wife Bathsheba. Nathan, in some way, (perhaps in a miraculous way, as the biblical text seems to hint) got wind of the affair, and instead of using his influence and knowledge to extort money from David or to satisfy his ambition, he used it in the cause of justice and righteousness. "He came to David and gently but firmly reproached him for his crime, accused him of having committed a terrible sin against God's law of morality, and stated that God was displeased with such conduct.

This was indeed a crisis in the history of prophecy. That a seer, a court attachee, paid and supported by the king, should upset all precedents, should set aside all tradition, should venture outside of the circle of his court duties and go so far as to interfere with the king's private actions and to reprove him for violating the moral law which seemingly meant nothing to the rough warrior, this was a novelty, an unheard of occurrence. We may be sure that an unscrupulous diviner or seer would have welcomed the pos-

session of such a secret, however gained, as a means for extortion and blackmailing. But Nathan did no such thing. He felt that the time had come to assume some real power, to battle for the cause of justice, and right, to use wisely and morally the influence and the lesson which he had inherited from Samuel. If David had refused to listen to Nathan, or had shut him up in prison, or had taken his life, the history and development of prophecy would have been very different.

But David hearkened to Nathan's reproach and humbled himself before him. The appearance of Nathan before David and his bold declaration "Thou art the man", to which unscathing denouncement the despotic oriental king listened, made prophecy. From this time forth the prophets little by little threw off the divinatory characteristics, assumed power over the affairs of state, and became the moral castigators of the kings. They assumed the title of "moral leader", whereas the diviners did not concern themselves with the laws of morality. Nathan laid the foundation for the complete independence of the prophets. He was the first of a line of men who opposed irreligious, wicked, and untheocratic kings, who insisted zealously that the king obey the same laws which the people were made to respect, and who became the servants of God, not the mouth-pieces of the king. From this time forth the priests sank into mere officiating functionaries in the sanctuaries, while the religious and moral development of the nation fell exclusively into the hands of the prophets. From the time of Nathan onward the prophets became honored and respected kingly counsellors and mentors, to whom these monarchs felt that they had to listen, either willingly or unwillingly. And yet withall these prophetic fore-runners like Nathan, Jehu, Ahijah, and Micaiah, did not advance to

the conception of revelation held by the great prophets and their view of the means of revelation and relation between God and man. Nathan's God was primarily a national God, while the God of Isaiah and Jeremiah was the universal.

During the rest of his career Nathan continued to be a prominent power behind the throne. He must have existed coevally with Gad for a time, but we know nothing of any relations they may have had with each other. <sup>(74)</sup> Nathan outlived both Gad and David and at least the first five or ten years of Solomon's reign. He played a prominent part in the secular of the throne to Solomon instead of to Adonijah, and in fact was the instigator of this political scheme which placed Solomon on the throne, an example which was followed by Ahijah and Elisha.

Ahijah is another striking example of the movement inaugurated by Samuel and strengthened by Nathan. He too interfered in the political affairs of the country and did so in the name of the Lord. He disapproved of the despotic government of Solomon, together with the heavy taxation imposed upon the people, and the luxurious and expensive court which he kept up. He therefore set on foot a movement, even while Solomon was alive <sup>(75)</sup>, to divide the kingdom and to put Jeroboam at the head of the northern tribes. Whether Ahijah was alone in this venture or whether he was supported by other prophets is not clear. At least no positive evidence is at hand to show that he had other prophets working with him <sup>(76)</sup>. As a result of this scheme Solomon sought Jeroboam's life. Jeroboam fled to Egypt, and we may likewise infer that Ahijah became a persona non grata in the eyes of Solomon and was forced to take refuge and did not return to the land till after the death of Solomon. Ahijah regarded the sumptuous court

life of Solomon and his foreign marriages as destructive of and detrimental to the principles of pure Jahweh worship, and he evidently believed that Jeroboam would rule his new kingdom along the lines prevailing before the advent of David and Solomon. In this however he was grievously disappointed, because after the division of the kingdom Jeroboam broke away radically from his (Ahijah's) concepts and principles. Nevertheless, after the division, Ahijah took up his abode at his home in Shiloh and concerned himself no more with the southern kingdom.

(77)  
 Ahijah is everywhere referred to as a Nabi. However, it seems clear from a later incident in his life (78) that he possessed some sort of power of divination, that he was reputed to be a seer and to accept gifts or pay for his information. Years after the division of the kingdom, at the time when the prophet had become blind from old age, Jeroboam's child fell sick. Jeroboam sent his wife to inquire of the prophet whether or not the child would recover. Though she came disguised and though he was blind, the prophet, through some mysterious force or supernatural knowledge, (the Bible states that Jahweh told him) knew exactly who she was and for what purpose she had come before she entered the house. The fact that Ahijah knew this in advance and the fact that he was being consulted regarding an individual affair, the recovery of a child, are indications that Ahijah in some respects at least was a diviner, in others a prophet and a forerunner of the great prophets. That the later ages thought well of him is indicated by the fact that they called him a Nabi, and did not brand him as a Roeh or a Chozeh. At any rate Ahijah's preknowledge of the mission of Jeroboam's wife gave weight to the words of condemnation which the prophet-seer was addressing to the wife of the king who

had sinned and was leading his people into sin. This story affords an excellent illustration of the essential difference between divination in Israel and among the heathens. In a heathen country such supernatural power would have but enhanced the reputation of the seer. In Israel it was made the means of enforcing a lesson in faithfulness and righteousness. To the heathen divination was an empty marvel. To Israel it was a marvel with a moral purpose.

Shemayah, strange to say, though a contemporary of Ahijah, is designated only as an Ish Elohim <sup>(79)</sup>, a term far lower than Nabi and practically equivalent to Roeh. And yet he played a prominent part in the rebellion of Jeroboam. Immediately after the division of the kingdom Rheoboam wished to go up and war against the northern kingdom and restore it to his sway. Shemayah, however, the man of God, met him on the way, told him that the division of the kingdom was the work of God, and that he should not attack Jeroboam. Rheoboam passively accepted the advice and warning of Shemayah. Shemayah, though his power and authority were respected by the king, was yet no court seer ~~nor~~ prophet. Apart from the above passage he is not mentioned in Kings. and we know little more about him. In Chronicles, however, he seems to have played quite a prominent part in the attack made upon Rheoboam by Shishak, the king of Egypt. In this passage (II Chron. 12:5) he is called a Nabi, no doubt a complimentary term given him by the later writers. He announced to Rheoboam that because they had forsaken the Lord Shishak would overthrow his land, but when Rheoboam repented, he announced that the decree of inexorable destruction would be repealed. The historicity of the whole story is very questionable.

It may be that Shemayah belonged to the party of Ahijah, which, after all, is a possibility, and was assigned the task of

keeping Rehoboam out of war, an eventuality which Ahijah foresaw would be necessary. We have no record that Shemayah acted like a diviner or seer, but we may assume that he was no higher and represented a level of prophecy on a par with that of Ahijah. It is a peculiar fact that Ahijah, Jehu, Micaiah, the unknown prophet of I Kings 13:11, Elijah, and Elisha, all carried on their activities in the northern kingdom. If there were prophets in Judah at this time (except, perhaps, the anonymous one whom we shall soon discuss) we have no record of them.

We now come to the obscure and almost unintelligible story of two unknown and anonymous prophets (80). One day an anonymous Ish Elohim from Judah appeared before Jeroboam and predicted that Josiah, at a later date, would overthrow Jeroboam's altar. When Jeroboam ordered his attendants to seize the impudent seer-prophet, his outstretched hand became stiff and he could not draw it back. This Ish Elohim is a seer-prophet, since not only does he predict (81) the destruction of the altar, but his signs come true and he can stiffen Jeroboam's hand and restore it to its normal state at will, all three features clearly indicating that he was partly a diviner. The fact that he upbraided Jeroboam for sinning stamps him as far higher than a seer.

For some reason or other this Ish Elohim had been forbidden to partake of any food or drink while performing his mission to Jeroboam. He refuses the refreshment which Jeroboam offers him and his present likewise. However, an old Nabi who dwelt at Bethel, equally anonymous but always referred to as a Nabi, while the first one is always called Ish Elohim, persuades him to eat and drink. As a result of this act of disobedience the Ish Elohim who appeared to Jeroboam was killed by a lion. The old prophet buried him and

gave orders to his sons that he was to be buried in the same grave with the Ish Elohim.

The story is very obscure. Evidently the Ish Elohim came to Bethel from Judah to proclaim to Jeroboam the fall of his temple and household. He was forbidden to partake of the food and drink of Jeroboam's wicked kingdom, perhaps because the prophets, it may be, who set Jeroboam on the throne, deceived and disappointed by his disloyalty and wickedness, had, like Ahijah, foresworn all allegiance to him and regarded his city, Bethel, with its sanctuary, as unholy, and therefore had vowed never to partake of food or drink within its environs.

When the old prophet of Bethel heard of the terrible prophecies of the Ish Elohim against his land and king, he resolved to destroy him by persuading him to break his vow and disobey his orders. This he easily succeeded in doing, since he told the Ish Elohim that he was a prophet likewise and that there was therefore no objection to eating at his home. After the Ish Elohim had suffered the death penalty for his disobedient act the Nabi repented. He gave him an honorable burial and ordered his sons to bury him in the same grave with the Ish Elohim when he died.

The foregoing is merely my theory of the probable explanation of the story. The fact that the name of neither of the prophets is mentioned stamps it as an old legend or tale based on truth and handed down till at the time the passage was put into writing the names of the actors had been forgotten. At any rate the story throws no light on the development of prophecy. Both prophets were seer-prophets and their rank was much lower than that of Nathan, Ahijah, and Shemayah. It indicated only one fact, that at the time of Jeroboam the prophets were increasing in number. We are sure

that at least four existed at this time: Ahijah, Shemayah, and these two unnamed seers. Hence it is not altogether excluded that some sort of a prophetic entente, with Ahijah and Shemayah at its head, existed at this time, though numbering at the highest a mere handful. On the other hand it is equally as logical to assume that these are the only four prophets who existed at this time, since if more had existed they most likely would have been mentioned. We must, however, look to the two last conspicuous prophets of this period for development and advance.

The first of these was Jehu the son of Chanani. He is mentioned in only one passage in Kings (82) and is not given his official title. He is likewise mentioned in two passages in the Books of Chronicles, and in the third passage he is called the Chozeah or court prophet. He rebuked King Baasha of Israel for his wicked acts, and predicted the complete destruction of his household. If we are to judge from Chronicles he was likewise the court prophet and court secretary of Jehoshaphat and reprimanded him for helping Ahab. It seems strange that Kings mentions him only once and that Chronicles mentions him in the majority of cases. In II Chron. 16: 7-10 Chanani the seer is mentioned as having been thrown into a prison by Asa for rebuking him for his foreign alliance with Syria against Baasha. If we are to accept this statement at face value we must believe that Jehu's father was likewise a court prophet and seer. However, it may be reasonable to suppose that in this passage Jehu ben Chanani is meant, since we know that he was alive at the time of the reign of Asa, for Baasha and Asa were contemporaries. How much of these references in Chronicles we are to believe is, as previously remarked, problematical.

There is, of course, no further evidence regarding the nature

and character of Jehu. He seems, however, to have been quite fearless in his denunciation of Baasha and in this respect illustrates the gradual process of the prophets' removal of themselves from the jurisdiction and the authority of the kings. Micaiah and Elijah and Elisha, whom we shall soon discuss, were absolutely fearless and independent, whereas Gad and Nathan were the inaugurators of this system. We cannot underestimate the value of this feature of freedom and independence on the part of the prophets. Diviners and seers were always bound by masters. Only when the prophets like Nathan, Jehu, and Micaiah demonstrated to the kings and people that they were fearless and did not hesitate to proclaim the truth even at the risk of death could the prophets become real moral guides, and could the way be paved for the elimination of divination and the final triumph of the great prophets.

Even preceding Jehu ben Chanani in point of time but far below him in importance was a so-called prophet, Iddo by name, and mentioned in II Chron. 12:15 and 13:22. He was primarily a court prophet and scribe, as was Jehu b. Chanani, and has no real significance for the development of prophecy. In the first passage above quoted he is called a Chozeh. From Chronicles it appears that there were court prophets who combined the duties of official prophets and official scribes. The fact that Iddo is not mentioned in Kings makes his existence rather doubtful. After all it is to Kings, and not to Chronicles, that we must turn for real history. Iddo's title of Nabi was a compliment of the later ages likewise. As in the case of Nathan, (II Chron. 9:29), Samuel, Gad, Elijah, Jehu, and others, the writer of Chronicles has the tendency to regard all the prophets of this period as court prophets (cf. I Thron. 29:29) scribes, and writing prophets, and surely nothing is really further from

truth than this.

A worthy successor of Jehu was Micaiah ben Yimlah, whose story is graphically told in a single chapter (83). Who Micaiah was we do not know for sure. His is the first case of a solitary prophet taking issue with a whole band of prophets. It seems that Ahab, by reason of his Phoenician affiliations, established at the court a large group of four hundred prophets, all supported by the king and therefore bound to give him advice as he wished, following the counsels of meh. Micaiah may originally have been a member of the group, though this view seems rather impossible and there is no evidence to support it, which some authorities, nevertheless, take (84). This group of four hundred prophets, though prophesying in the name of Jahweh, seems to have been a foreign importation, taken over from the Phoenicians, just as were the prophets of Baal mentioned earlier in Ahab's reign. At any rate the four hundred were practically worthless and invariably predicted what the king wished to hear.

Although from I Kings 22:28 Micaiah seems to have had the power of prediction, he differed radically from them. He realized that Ahab was not a moral man; that he had violated his sacred agreement with his God and his religion by marrying a foreign woman; that he was idolatrous. Thus at an early date in his prophetic career Micaiah reproached Ahab for his wrongdoings and prophesied that evil would eventually befall him. For this reason he was shut up in prison, where he remained for the rest of his life.

At the time of Ahab's last war he and Jehoshaphat determined to go up to Ramoth Gilead to wage war against the Syrians. Ahab consulted the four hundred prophets, and they as usual predicted a brilliant success. Jehoshaphat, however, puts no trust in what these hirelings say, and asks whether or not there is another,

a real prophet, and Ahab grudgingly orders Micaiah to be brought from prison. Micaiah, on the ground of Ahab's unjust acts, predicts disaster for him, telling him that the four hundred prophets have been deluded by a false spirit sent by God and therefore predict wrongly. Nevertheless Ahab determines to go and leaves word that Micaiah is to be taken back to prison and fed with scanty rations of food and water till he returns alive. Since Ahab was killed in the battle and nothing further is told of Micaiah, we may assume that he was left to die in prison, especially since Ahab's son, Ahaziah, who acceded to the throne, would not have been very liable to release from prison the man who had predicted the death of his father and whom he no doubt considered responsible for it.

It will be noticed that Micaiah does not deny that the four hundred prophets prophesy in the name of Jahweh. He freely admits that they are prophets of Jahweh but states that they are deluded, and cannot be real prophets, since they prophesy the words of man and not of God. Micaiah alone of the whole group stands out as the fearless champion of the cause of the Lord, a cause for which he suffered imprisonment, torment, and death. For many years he was a contemporary of Elijah, but Elijah seems to have outlived him by many years and had no relations with him. Aside from the fact that Micaiah had not advanced beyond the conception of the national God, he is the nearest approach to the great prophets, since from the passage which we have just discussed none of the traits of the diviners is ascribed to him. In many respects he seems a little higher than Elijah, but in many other respects Elijah far outstripped him. We have therefore thought it best to put Micaiah before Elijah, even though Elijah preceded him in point of time.

Another small and unimportant prophet is still to be men-

tioned, Jonah, son of Amittai, from Gath Hachefer. He evidently was a court prophet at the time of Jeroboam II, and predicted that Jeroboam would win back a large portion of the territory which Israel formerly owned but which had been taken away by the foreign nations under the rule of the preceding weaker kings. At any rate Jonah's character is very obscure and of little significance. His title of Nabi is likewise complimentary. The proverbial Jonah who is mentioned among the twelve minor prophets bears the name of Jonah ben Amittai and is commonly reputed to be the same man. We know, however, that the famous story of Jonah and the destruction of Nineveh is not true or historical, and that it is a product of a period at least three or four hundred years later, written to further the idea of tolerance among the nations. No doubt when the person who wrote this story was casting about for a suitable name for his hero from among the prophets who lived at the time of Nineveh's greatest era, a prophet who was little known and in whose life the story he was writing might fit in without detection, he chose the character of Jonah ben Amittai (II Kings 14:25) as very appropriate.

For the sake of completeness we may mention the Ish Elohim who appeared to Ahab (I Kings 20:28) (I Ki. 20:13 likewise) and predicted that Ahab would defeat the ~~Assyrians~~. He appears to have been a member of the party of Elijah, and it seems reasonable to suppose that hitherto he had been preaching against Ahab but now allows loyalty to his country and his Jahweh to overbalance his opposition to the king. There is likewise a third prophet, a member likewise of the prophetic guild of Elijah (I Ki. 20:38), who approached Ahab for having allowed Ben Hadad, the country's mortal enemy, for having escaped with his life.

The period of these eight or nine prophetic forerunners is indeed a productive and fertile one. Little by little, as we have seen, the prophets are becoming more independent of the royal power. They are gradually throwing off traits of the diviners apparent in themselves, and slowly but surely paving the way for the final rupture between prophecy and divination. They are becoming fearless advocates of their national God, of His laws of morality and justice, and have led up to the glorious figure of Elijah and to the less resplendent Elisha, whom we shall describe in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVEELIJAH, ELISHA, THE LATER PROPHETICAL GUILDS  
-----

Elijah was the most prominent, the foremost, and, in fact, really the only representative of the next step in true prophecy. Elijah maintained throughout his career, in private and in public, an attitude of unrelenting opposition to Ahab, a king whom he considered displeasing to Jahweh. Elijah is the first example of the preaching prophet. It is not only because of the religious degeneracy of the times but mainly because of the genuinely and potentially ethical character of his predecessors that a firmer and more rigorous demand for righteousness is made by Elijah, as a champion of the type of reform, both religious and ethical, which he saw the land of Israel needed.

Elijah was a devotee of the original desert and shepherd Jahweh. That he still retained the primitive conception of Jahweh dwelling on a desert mountain is clear from one chapter in the Books of Kings. (85) The early prophets (Elijah among them), over against the sensuousness and luxury of the Baalistic civilization of Canaan and Phoenicia, set the stern ideals of the desert and the pure worship of the deity. This movement really began with the accession of Solomon to throne, and Ahijah and his contemporaries may be said to have been the founders thereof. They stood for the pure and unadulterated worship of Jahweh, fighting tooth and nail against the Baals and the foreign nations and acting as champions of the pure and true type of religion. This is one of the things they contributed despite their crudeness and the primi-

tivity of their methods. While they of course failed partly to stop the progress of civilization and their ideals were but partially realized, they were the conserving element and laid the foundations for the lofty ethical and spiritual conception of God. This is their great advance over the diviners, whose successors they were.

Elijah thus was the foremost representative of this school of thought and action. At his time two religions of Jahweh had arisen in Canaan and existed side by side: the pure religion of Mosaic Israel, and the debased and hybrid religion (Baalism) arising through amalgamation with the native populations. In the latter there was the assimilation of the worship of Jahweh to the native worship of Canaan and to the worship imported from Phoenicia. Ostensibly and in name the people worshipped Jahweh and regarded themselves as bona fide Jahweh worshippers, but the conception they had of him and the service they rendered him were proper rather to the Baals or the local nature gods.

Elijah was one of the doughtiest champions of the old desert religion of Jahweh. He wished to purge the national religion from all traces of foreign worship. He was the fearless protagonist of the moral law of the stern and just shepherd God Jahweh. He did not hesitate to brave Ahab's wrath and Jezebel's scorn and persecution in reproving their unseemly acts. His chief purpose, however, was to arouse enthusiasm for the cause of Jahweh and to get rid of the Baalistic elements of the religion. It seems therefore that for this reason Elijah reestablished the prophetic guilds which Samuel had founded. We read that Jezebel killed all but one hundred (86) of these religious enthusiasts who had sworn eternal enmity to Baalism in Israel. There is no mention of the existence of these prophetic schools from the time of the death of

Samuel till the time of Elijah. With the death of Saul and Samuel and the defeat of the Philistines by David the need for these religious enthusiasts disappeared. Not until the time of Elijah, when a great struggle between Jahwism and Baalism took place, and it was deemed indispensable to have these zealous prophets of Jahweh once more, was there any occasion for their reintroduction. In addition we read (87) that two prophetic schools were already in existence before Elisha had become a real prophet and the successor of Elijah, and he could therefore not have been their founder. A third reason, we read that the prophet who appeared to Ahab in a passage already cited and predicted that his life would be forfeited for having allowed Ben Hadad to escape with his life, uncovered his head, and Ahab thereby recognized that he was "one of the prophets" ("the Nebiim,"), and this can mean only the prophetic guild which then existed.

We must consequently believe that from the time of Samuel to the time of Elijah the prophetic guilds did not exist, and that Elijah was the one who reorganized them under the stress of the struggle against the Baalistic elements in Jahwism. We are told little of the nature of these guilds in the time of Elijah, as is the case in the time of Samuel. They helped Elijah in his work, many losing their lives due to the persecutions of Jezebel. In the latter part of his career Elijah seems to have had nothing to do with them, perhaps due to the fact that they and he had not succeeded in carrying out their plans, but in the first part of his life he was their leader, and constantly stood in close touch with them. Since the heyday of the prophetic guilds was at the time of Elisha we shall discuss them more fully in the latter part of this chapter.

Elijah's greatest coup d'etat was the partial elimination of Baal worship (and perhaps the complete elimination) at the time of Ahab. For this he had been striving for many years, fighting constantly against the king and the queen. Finally a contest was held at Mount Carmel between the Baalists and the prophet Elijah. Elijah was vindicated by Jahweh and he forthwith seized the opportunity to destroy the so-called prophets of Baal. Elijah's triumph was seemingly complete, but it was short lived. Though Ahab and the people were convinced and resolved henceforth to worship only Jahweh, Jezebel upset all his plans. She killed the majority of Elijah's followers, forced Elijah to flee for his life, and undid all his work. Baal worship was just as prevalent as before the great contest. The fickle people reverted to it almost as soon as Elijah had descended from the altar on Mt. Carmel. Elijah continued to struggle against Baal all the rest of his life, but he knew, or, at least it is now known, that it was a hopeless struggle.

Elijah always remained a staunch devotee of the moral God Jahweh. He rebuked the immoral Ahab for having Naboth put to death, and prophesied the death of both Ahab and Jezebel for this violation of Jahweh's moral code. He rebuked Ahaziah<sup>(88)</sup>, Ahab's son, for consulting foreign gods as to whether he would recover from his accident and for not consulting Jahweh, and predicted that he would die as a result of this disloyal and disreligious act. Finally, however, Elijah, seeing his end drawing nigh without the attainment of his goal, anointed Elisha as his successor and gave over to him the realization of his purpose. It seems that during the latter part of his career Elijah kept aloof from the prophetic guilds, which began to flourish again immediately after Ahaziah's accession to the throne, and centered all his hope in his young and

enthusiastic successor Elisha.

Elijah is presented to us as a great miracle worker. It is a question how many of these miraculous stories we may actually believe. No doubt many of them are legendary; the others would picture him as a magic healer and diviner. The fact that practically three fourths of the legends and miracles of Elijah are identical with those of Elisha is likewise a suspicious circumstance. It is hardly in keeping with the sublime character of Elijah that he should stoop to dubious means savoring of the hidden arts of the seers and diviners. These miracles, however, is a question which will be ever in doubt, since so many stories were told about Elijah and so many legends and narratives added by the later writers that his true nature and character will always be a little obscure. In at least three incidents, however, which we may accept as true, because Elijah undoubtedly had some divinatory characteristics, Elijah demonstrates traces of divination. He knows in advance, thru some mysterious means, though nobody had ever told him, that the messengers of Ahaziah were going to consult Baal Zebub<sup>(89)</sup>, the god of Ekron. He is able to have consumed by fire the two groups of fifty men and their captains which Ahaziah sent to capture him,<sup>(90)</sup>

and finally, he was able, after the denouement at Carmel, to outrun the chariot of Ahab going at full speed from Carmel to Jezreel<sup>(91)</sup>. It is noteworthy that in one passage Elijah refers to himself twice as an Ish Elohim, and not as a Nabi. This is illustrative of the fact that the term Nabi had not yet been accepted as a designation for the great and real prophets, that Elijah did not consider himself as any more than an Ish Elihim and not as a great prophet, and that the term Nabi which is applied to him in almost every other place, as well as to his individual predece-

ssors was given by the later ages who considered him a real prophet on the strength of his achievements, far above the ordinary group prophets or prophet-diviners of either his or the preceding (92) times .

At the most Elijah was not a real, great prophet. He towered head and shoulders above his contemporaries and predecessors, but does not begin to approximate an Amos or a Hosea. His primitive conception of the national God Jahweh stamps as far below the loftiness of the literary prophets. In many instances he had the power of prediction and his words invariably came true. Yet he lived and labored with might and main in the interests of Jahweh and morality, and is truly a sublime and impressive character. We can readily see that Elijah was a fit forerunner of the great prophets, because, if we take away his nationalism, his divinatory traits, and his miracles, we could consider him a really great prophet. Though he preached he did not write down his preachments, and we cannot consider his moral sermons on a par with those of his successors. And yet withall he is the grandest character we have hitherto described.

Elisha, however, presents an entirely different picture. A big contrast exists between him and Elijah. He is recognized openly as a diviner and predictor. Ben Hadad, king of Syria, sends Hazael to him to ask whether or not he would get well (II Ki. 8:8-9) and evens sends with him a rich present which was to be given to Elisha as his fee. The miracles which he performs are mostly grotesque and vulgar. The grandeur and sublimity of Elijah are lacking in his character. The story of Elisha's summoning the bears to kill the children who were mocking him brands him as infinitely inferior to Elijah. For Elisha was not primarily a moral leader like

his predecessor. He was a demagogue, an instigator. When Elisha saw that the moral means adopted by Elijah produced no results and that Baalism still persisted in Israel in all its intensity, he adopted forcible means and stirred up a bloody revolution and a political agitation to accomplish his ends. He and his prophetic guilds instigated the rebellion of Jehu, whereby the reigning monarch of each kingdom was murdered, all the nobles and leaders who inclined towards the Baalistic Judaism were destroyed, and Baalism itself was thoroughly uprooted. Elisha attained his object, but he brought Israel to the verge of ruin by destroying the best part of the people. Even Hosea, inalterably opposed as he was to foreign elements in the worship, predicts ruin to the house of Jehu and regards his rebellion as wanton murder and bloodshed.

Elisha and his followers were very dangerous. They represent a reversion to questionable means, a relapse from the glory of Elijah, for Elijah was opposed to the violation of the laws of right government, not to government itself; Elijah was opposed to the immoral foreign worship features which had been introduced into the religion, but he would not employ similarly immoral means to eradicate them. Their dangerous spirit may be seen from the fact that Jehu and his rabid partisans did not stop at murdering the king of Israel but even murdered the king of Judah who at the time was a visitor in the northern kingdom, an act which was entirely unnecessary and hostile to the laws of ethics among the nations. The entire line of prophet-seers mentioned in the preceding chapter stood immeasurably above Elisha and his company, since they were not demagogues but moral leaders, determined to lead the people to the observance of the laws of morality and order, and not to the murdering of innocent people and the ushering in of a reign

of anarchy and indiscriminate bloodshed.

It was not Elisha who reestablished the prophetic guilds. This had been done by Elijah, as we have already explained. Elisha merely continued to work in conjunction with them. Under his guidance they flourished as never before. We know that at least three of these prophetic schools existed at his time in Jericho, in Bethel, and in Gilgal. The first two <sup>(93)</sup> existed before Elisha became the successor of Elijah. The third one, at Gilgal, <sup>(94)</sup> the one over which Elisha himself presided, was no doubt established by him. Perhaps there were other prophetic schools in addition to these three <sup>(95)</sup>. Elisha always stood in the closest of relations with the prophetic guilds, especially with the one at Gilgal which he founded. In this respect he exceeded Elijah by far, because the latter always maintained a quasi attitude of reserve towards them. But Elisha assisted them in every possible way and was the one to whom all looked as their leader. For Elijah is rarely, if ever, mentioned, as is Elisha, in connection with them. When the guild was in danger of being poisoned it was Elisha who advised them what to do, and when one of the guild lost his axe it was Elisha to whom he turned for assistance. Helpless as these guilds seemed to be without the leadership of Elisha, with him they succeeded in overthrowing Baal and coronating Jehu.

Strangely enough almost all the evidence regarding these prophetic guilds deals with the ones flourishing at the time of Elisha, though some of it deals with those which existed at the time of Samuel and Elijah. We learn now that the members of the prophetic guild members were distinguished by a rough mantle of camel or goat hair, and that they had certain marks or scars on their forehead <sup>(96)</sup> (self-imposed, of course) which stamped them

as the property of Jahweh and probably likewise enabled them to recognize one another. The prophets lived from alms, presents, fees, and from what they themselves could acquire, sometimes being actually forced to seek their subsistence in the fields and living on what they could find, <sup>(97)</sup> sometimes going hungry and needy. They have fixed abodes, where they lived in colonies in great numbers, under a sort of communistic system. Sometimes the prophets changed their abode if their former habitat could not support them. Of course they indulged in ecstatic raving, arousing themselves for the purpose of stimulation <sup>of</sup> enthusiasm for the cause of Jahweh. The ascetic and communistic life they lead reminds one of the Essenes and the later cloister or monastery orders, omitting only the ecstatic rites. Other than these ecstatic exercises we are told nothing of the work they performed.

Though Elisha was a fatherly superior to the prophetistic guild members by virtue of his anointment at the hand of Elijah, yet he occasionally participated in their rites. On one occasion, when he was requested by Jehoram and Jehoshaphat to give advice about the rebellion of Mesha, the king of Moab, he demanded a harpist, and when the harpist played, Elisha became inspired or excited and gave the required counsel. The inference is that excitation was an essential and indispensable element of the prophetists, though the great prophets discarded it entirely. In addition, Elisha lived with the prophetists, ate their food, and may therefore be considered one of them in all respects. We can now see that Elisha was far below the standard of Elijah. He had a crasser God conception, adopted force and not moral persuasion, and perhaps did more harm to Israel than good. Certain it is that Elisha did not advance the cause of true prophecy.

Prophetism had to come to an end sooner or later. It lacked the life giving moral force. After all, the real antecessors of prophecy were men like Micaiah, Samuel, Elijah, and Nathan. If Israel had had nothing better and higher than the prophetic guilds prophecy would never have developed. The physical enthusiasm of these raving prophetists was a dangerous ally of spiritual faith. Jehu's revolution, set on foot by Elisha with the aid of the prophetic guilds, used means far removed from the loftiness of Elijah's teachings. It was inevitable that they should eventually have degenerated into professionals, because their prophecy was artificial, while true prophecy was spontaneous. Taken as a whole they can hardly have stood far above the soothsayers and the diviners.

The prophetic guilds survived for a long time after the reign of Jehu, but their influence was nothing and they accomplished no good. They soon sank to the depths of hypocrisy and formalism and became subservient to the royal power once more, even as Ahab's prophets were to him. As soon as their leaders, Elijah, Elisha, and Samuel, were gone, they lost any virtues which they may have possessed. Micah states that the prophets divined solely for money, (98)

Amos disclaims all relationship with them, and Ezekiel states (99) that their consummate greed was one of their worst sins. Their official power was finally broken by the rise of the priest party. Whereas it was Samuel, Ahijah, and Elisha, all prophets, who set Saul and David, Jeroboam, and Jehu respectively on the throne in the early days, it was Jehoiada the priest and the priest party who set Joash on the throne not such a long time after the death of Elisha. From this time forth the power of the prophetic guilds was reduced to nothing, they were forced to make a living by accepting money; they gradually degenerated, and left the field clear

for the arrival of the great individual prophets of everlasting glory and renown.

The technical name for the prophetic guilds was Bene Ha-Nebiim, the meaning being "guilds of the Nebiim" or enthusiasts, from the general root Naba, to act like mad, in the reflexive stem. Now this word Nabi, which originally meant a howling ecstatic, a member of the prophetic guilds, came to be applied to the great prophets and regarded as a fit term of encomium and compliment even for the prophets like Elisha, Gad, Micaiah, and the others who came before them, is an interesting study in itself. We have seen that the oldest designations for the prophet-seers were Ish Elohim and Roeh. We have likewise seen that the terms were probably synonymous, since Samuel is called both Ish Elohim and Roeh. Elijah, Elisha, and the unknown prophet of I Ki. 13 are likewise called Ish Elohim frequently, so that we can see that the term was rather loosely used. The term for diviner before the Roeh, i.e. Cohen, the earliest designation of which we have any record, fell into disuse as a name for the diviners at an early date and was then applied specifically to the priests. After Roeh and Ish Elohim came the Chozeh, the official court seers. But as time went on both Chozeh and Roeh fell more and more into disfavor, especially at the time the books of Kings were composed (after the period of the prophetic forerunners, about or a little after 621 B.C.E.). Both terms suggested physical means of divination which were incompatible with a spiritual Yahwism. Already in the days of Amos the Chozeh was looked upon with contempt, and Roeh had long since disappeared. Amaziah, the priest, contemptuously calls Amos a Chozeh, a taunt which Amos ignores, (100) and Micah classes the Chozim with the Kosemim (101) and contrasts them with the real prophets, while Isaiah denies

to them and the professional guild prophets any possibility of  
 (102).  
 divine revelation .

What name, then, should be applied to the true prophets? The word Naba, which formerly meant "to rave", was given its plain and other meaning which was possible for it to have, i.e. "to declare", and the word Nabi, which originally, as applied to the prophetic guilds, meant "rabid declarer" or "excited speaker", was given the meaning "speaker for God", "declarer in the name of God", the idea of excitation being thus abstracted from it. When Isaiah unhesitatingly proclaimed himself a Nabi the transformation of the name began. It gradually lost all trace of its original prophetistic meaning and was slowly enriched in meaning, supplanting Choze and Roeh which, as stated before, fell into disuse and disfavor because they suggested divination by mantic machinations distasteful to the spiritualistic Jahwist. Already in the days of Amos the Nabi is an exalted individual, the chosen mouthpiece of Jahweh, and has thrown off those ecstatic traits which characterized the earlier Nebiim.

At the time that the life history of Elijah and Micaiah, Nathan, Ahijah, and the rest of the prophetic predecessors was written down, the authors of Kings felt that these men were so far ahead of their contemporaries that they deserved the honorary title Nabi. But the plural form of the word, Nebiim, is always used to designate the ecstatic guilds and the professional prophets, and even the real prophets like Isaiah, Micah, and Amos always refer to them as Nebiim. It is peculiar but true nevertheless that the singular of the word (Nabi) denotes a real, God-inspired prophet, while the plural of the same word still denotes, and always has denoted, (even before the days when "Nabi" received its lofty meaning)

---  
raving and ecstatic guild prophets, including false prophets, seers, soothsayers, and conjurers, who had no moral and intrinsic value, who were a hindrance rather than an aid to the religion of Israel, and who contributed nothing to the development of prophecy.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE LITERARY PROPHEPIC SCHOOLS

Before considering the literary prophets we must first consider the literary prophetic schools, institutions about which little is known, but of the existence of which we are positive. The first appearance of this century-long group of inspired prophets took place around the year 900 B.C.E., and their influence and existence lasted till, approximately, the year 621 B.C.E. and no doubt even a few years beyond this. These schools of writing prophets have absolutely nothing in common with the Nebiim. They are nowhere mentioned in the Bible, but we postulate their existence on the ground of definite facts and assert that they are the authors of many parts of the Bible.

They were deeply concerned with the development of the religion of Israel, with its purification, and with the formulation, in writing, of the principles of Judaism as legal norms and standards of laws. These prophets existed side by side with the individual prophets mentioned in the two preceding chapters. Though none of its members are mentioned by name we may assume that some of the prophetic forerunners we have treated of belonged to it, and the school was continuous for practically three hundred years. The writings which these prophetic schools left behind them indicate a great advance over the diviners and seers who left no writings and who did not even attempt to legislate for all the people. Our prophetic literary writers and legislators were supported by the more righteous and God-fearing kings, for otherwise the work

which they did would have been impossible and would have received no sanction.

Let us therefore briefly trace the history of these literary prophetic schools. We read that upon the accession of Asa to the throne of Judah <sup>(103)</sup> he carried on a sweeping religious reform. He removed the temple ~~Kedashoth~~, the groves of Astarte, the sun-pillars, and the images of every kind which had crept into the religion of Israel from the surrounding heathen nations, purged Israel of heathen divination (or, at least, tried to), and decreed that all divination henceforth was to be in the name of Jahweh <sup>(104)</sup>

The reforms of Asa were so sweeping that it is impossible to believe that he carried them out of his own accord and alone. He must have been the ardent supporter of a prophetic party which, realizing the necessity of cleansing Judaism from the many foreign elements which had crept in, arose at this time, constituted itself as an official priest party, and then secured Asa's sanction to carry out the above mentioned reforms. These prophets proceeded likewise to abolish divination as much as they could and to clothe with the sanction of religion those features of it which could not be dispensed with, at the same time eliminating some of the most objectionable foreign elements.

Hand in hand with this movement which was of a prohibitory and negative character must have gone a positive one, a flat declaration of the principles of Jahwism, in which the doctrines and creeds in whose behalf the reformation of Asa was undertaken were embodied in a small law code. This code is commonly referred to as the second code of the covenant or C 2, and consists of Exodus <sup>(105)</sup> 33: 12-34:26, and in addition a few verses in Numbers. Such laws as "Thou shalt not bow down to another god" and "Thou

shalt not make molten images" are principles which embody the underlying purpose of the reformation of Asa. The prophets who wrote down this code were primarily staunch devotees of the desert God Jahweh; they hated the Canaanitic culture and corruption, and tried to cleanse the worship of Jahweh of as much as this foreign dross as they could. They therefore embodied in writing the ideals of the pure worship of Jahweh, and presented them in the form and character of a covenant which Jahweh was making with the people. Of course if they had given out the covenant in their own name the chances are that their authority would have been questioned and that the people would not have been impressed with it. They therefore seized upon the historical figure of Moses, represented him as the recipient of the covenant, and wrote a historical background with him in the center so as to give sanction to their code. Some thirty years later a similar literary prophetic party from the kingdom of Israel took the code into the northern kingdom, adapted it to their own purpose, changing it in places to conform to the different conditions prevailing there, but leaving the motive intact, and produced C 1, <sup>(106)</sup> the second code of the covenant, for the purpose of purifying the worship of Jahweh in the Northern <sup>(107)</sup> Kingdom.

From now on the prophetic schools of this nature increased in number and in scope. From the year 800-740 the so-called first Jahwistic prophetic school (J 1) continued the preceding literary and reformatory activities, with the counter-movement of the first Elohist prophetic literary school (E 1) in the northern kingdom at the same time. Each produced a legal code and wrote certain portions of the Torah to regulate the life and conduct of the people and to purify the religious worship. More and more foreign religious

customs and rites were thrown off, and the worship of Jahweh purified a little more. From 740 to 690 in Judah the second Jahwistic literary prophetic school ( J 2 ) continued its activity. Prophetic activity ceased in Israel with the year 722, but the northern prophetic party transferred itself to Judah and continued its literary and prophetic activities as the second Elohist school ( E 2 ) in Judah for a time. From 690 to 640 the third Jahwistic school ( J 3 ) carried on its work, making great strides in the purification of the worship and in the promulgation of a superior God conception. Each one of these successive prophetic literary schools added a little to the enhancement of the importance and greatness of the power of Moses.

About the year 621 another prophetic literary movement developed with the fixed object and the avowed purpose of abolishing all the various local shrines, of ridding the national worship of the constantly recurring elements of defilement, and of setting up again more firmly and more unmistakably the guiding principles of Judaism. These schools, as it seems, carried on their activities independently of the great literary prophets like Isaiah, Amos, and Hosea, who flourished at the time of the Jahwistic schools. According <sup>(2)</sup> this prophetic party of the year 621 wrote the original parts of Deuteronomy ( D 1 ), and on the basis of this law book which they represented as having been written by Moses, as then having been lost and finally found by themselves, they induced Josiah to carry out another sweeping reform. It legislated more and more against all kinds of divination and set up the prophecy of Moses as the acme of the prophetic revelation. A secondary ( D 2 ) and even tertiary ( D 3 ) school of Deuteronomist prophets arose, modified and amplified the book, and finally redacted their work

and all the preceding legislation into a large compendium. Several references to the Deuteronomistic prophetic school seem to appear in Kings, which books were written by the various Deuteronomic authors, i.e. II Ki. 21:11 and II Ki. 23:2. It seems to me that the prophets here mentioned are those of the Deuteronomic school.

Deuteronomy, together with the Books of Kings, the product of the same school, of prophets, demonstrate the greatest headway in the reformation and spiritualization of divination. In fact Deuteronomy has the highest conception of prophecy next to the great prophets. Whereas the older sources of Samuel retain the henotheistic conception, which renders such a reformation impossible, the Book of Deuteronomy has the one God, the one central sanctuary. Working on the basis of the prophets of the J and the E schools, both of which did a considerable amount of reformation and purification of the worship, both of which legislated against divination, the Deuteronomistic prophets demonstrate the strongest aversion to divination of all kinds. It absolutely forbids any and every kind of divination (108). The prohibition of divination is meant to prepare the way for the commendation of prophecy, and the entire minds of the prophetic writers are influenced by their sense of the contrast between the respective functions of the prophet and the diviner. Of course, as we have previously hinted, the advanced and lofty point of view of Deuteronomy regarding the absolute prohibition of divination was not reached until after many previous stages had been traversed. The distinction between divination and prophecy was not original in the religion of Israel. In the early days of the national religion and history divination had been a popular and approved practice. Real prophecy had not yet appeared on the scene, though the predisposition to it kept

manifesting itself in the inspired characters which followed.

The Books of Samuel contain evidences of a later-age truer spiritual monotheism. It is stated in extenuation of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor that Saul removed from the land all the  
(109)  
Ovoth and Yidonim .It states likewise that there are only three legitimate means of divining (i.e of consulting Jahweh),as follows:dreams,sacred lots,and prophets.While this view of the later portions of Samuel is preprophetic,it illustrates the tendency to regard all the methods of divination as illegitimate. Deuteronomy and Kings go still further in their arraignment of divination.The Deuteronomic school admits that dreams are permitted as a means of consulting Jahweh (but not the dreams of the diviners or false prophets) ,likewise the prophets(in the older sense.But neither Deuteronomy or Kings mentions the Urim and the Tummim and never uses the term. "Shaal Badonoy",which refers to divination by means of the sacred lot.But they do use the term "Darash Badonoy",which means consultation of the Deity through the medium of a prophet.On the other hand the great prophets use the term Darash Badonoy to denote the seeking after God with the full conscience and the soul and not the consultation of Him thru the prophet.By "seek God",Isaiah,for example,means that the people should follow the teachings of God as revealed to them through their moral conscience.

Remarkable as were these literary prophetic schools and great as were their achievements,they are a far cry from the moral purity and the lofty ethical religiousness of the great prophets.We have no evidence that the great prophets favored the work of the Jahwist,Elohist,or Deuteronomist prophetic schools.On the contrary there is reason to believe that they had no sympathy for

these prophetic movements and literary activities. Jeremiah, who lived and preached at the time of the Deuteronomic reformation, states that the lying pen of the scribes had written in vain <sup>(110)</sup>, referring clearly to the Deuteronomic prophets and to their work. But we must likewise remember that the great prophets were centuries ahead of their contemporaries in moral concept and in religious purity. They themselves freely stated that the present generations could not comprehend their words. They seemed to them and perhaps even to us too radical in their denunciation of everything. We may be sure that the Jahwist, Elohist, and Deuteronomist prophetic schools tried to deal with conditions as they were and better the actually existing conditions as much as they could, and not to preach vainly for the establishment of ideal conditions which have not yet and perhaps never will be realized. They could not abolish all divination with one stroke of the pen: they therefore had to temporize, to compromise with it. Each succeeding school abolished more and more of divination, of foreign religious practices, established more and more of a spiritual God conception, and indeed they were really sincere in their work. That they accomplished a great deal is absolutely undeniable, and judged from this standard of actuality it was the pen of the great prophets which seems to have written in vain. That the literary prophetic schools could not and did not attain to the heights reached by the literary prophets is surely not their fault. Hence we cannot underestimate their importance in the history of the development of prophecy.

Institutional prophecy as evidenced in the Deuteronomistic school came to an end shortly after the production of the Book of Deuteronomy, when it was seemingly at the height of its power.

The priests immediately assumed the command over the state religion, and prophecy in the main disappears. The prophets' power was broken and from now on only individual prophets, like Deutero-Isaiah and Malachi, appear. The reason for this is to be found in the opening which the book itself gave to the priests. One of the chief legislative points of the book is the abolition of the various local sanctuaries and the making of the temple at Jerusalem the central sanctuary. Accordingly, it had to legislate that the priests and levites who had hitherto officiated at these local shrines could come to the temple at Jerusalem and should be accepted as the equals of the Jerusalem priests. This, however, the Jerusalem priests refused to do. They thereby set aside the decree of the Deuteronomist prophets, ignoring and scorning it, and constituted themselves as a hierarchy, controlling all public worship and the regulation of the religious life of the people. The prophets, their dicta disregarded, had to make way for the priests, and it is the priests who rule from now on.

The last great remaining code of the Pentateuch, the Priestly Code, was written by the priests, whereas C 1, C 2, J, E, and Deuteronomy were written by the prophetic schools. The first great prophet after this time, Ezekiel, is a priest, and is more concerned with the glorious resurrection of the priesthood and the restoration of the sanctuary than with the moral and spiritual regeneration which the great prophets made the basis of their preachments. Ezekiel himself is by no means to be considered a great literary prophet.

This is the end of the great movement from divination to prophecy, culminating in the unparalleled literary prophets. They represent the ne plus ultra, the acme, of purity of God conception, of universal moral perfection. Nothing can be added to them; nothing

can be taken away from them. They stand unique as the proudest product of Israel's religious genius. They are Israel's answers to the questions it asked itself during each generation in the days of its earliest development- "Why divination? ". The great prophets are the finished product, and we shall now turn to a discussion of their life and work so as to demonstrate their absolute break with the past and the unfathomable distance which separates them from the diviners, the Roim, the Chozim, the Nebiim, the prophetic forerunners, and the prophetic literary schools, all of whom were their temporal and spiritual predecessors.

CHAPTER    SEVEN  
THE        GREAT    PROPHETS  
---        -----    -----

Even a casual perusal of the writings of the great prophets will bring us face to face with a great problem which we have hitherto avoided mentioning. Are they in a class by themselves, or are they the highest development, the crest, of the movement which began with Samuel and has its root in early divination. We, of course are inclined to the latter view. Practically the only authority who represents the first point of view is Professor Moses Battenwieser. He admits that the institution of prophecy was common to all the religions of the Orient, that its origin lies far back in the primitive stages of religious development, and that it was indigenous to Israel even as it was to all the other nations of the ancient orient. But he states likewise that the literary or spiritual type of prophecy was from the very outset a distinct species, in pronounced opposition to the popular and primitive prophecy. There is undoubtedly a great deal of truth in this view and we can accept the greater part of it without impairing our own standpoint. Opposed to Prof. Battenwieser's point of view are the great scholars, Joyce, Budde, Knobel, and others, who, like ourselves, believe that great prophecy is the highest development of early prophecy, after a long period of change and evolution, so that the startling rapidity with which prophecy seemingly emerged from the lower forms may be easily understood on the ground of this long period of preparation.

Be this as it may, the question, though an interesting one, is

not of the greatest importance. The viewpoint of Dr. Battenwieser seems the least bit too extreme. We agree with him that the spiritual prophets were a unique species, but they certainly were not ignorant of what had preceded them. They did not work out their exalted doctrines on the spur of the moment, but only after a long and thoughtful process. They must have been acquainted with their predecessors, with the prophet-seers who came before them and with those who were contemporaneous with them. Hence, while we freely admit that the great prophets were a unique class, we can understand that they were not cut off entirely from the past and that they came to oppose and fight against early prophecy and divination only after a thorough study of the conditions of the previous and of the existing times.

The great prophets were the living depositaries of the idea of the kingdom of God. They cut themselves away entirely from divination and the methods of early prophecy. They followed higher, religio-ethical tendencies. Their task was to make the divine practical on earth and recognized by all. They are in the service of God alone and they recognize no human authority. They work, not for their own benefit or advantage, but for the sake of God and his peoples. They preach, not of secular, but of religious matters, not of private but of public concerns. Whereas divination seeks to discover the will of God by supernatural means, the prophets seek to tell the people the will of God which cannot and does not have to be discovered by supermundane methods but can be perceived in the moral conscience of each and any individual.

The prophets realized the moral corruptness of their people and tried to open their eyes to the perception of the fact that God is the moral ruler of the universe and that only a nation built

upon the firm foundation of justice, morality, and righteousness would and could endure. Not so the diviners. They had no divine inspiration. They cared only for human affairs, with no higher moral goal, with no loftier vision of the supreme moral law. They are in the service of human beings and are hired and paid for this purpose. Whereas the diviner had not risen beyond the part of a supernatural advisor, ready to exercise his powers in the interests of the consultant, to supply only to the individual the resources of supernatural power and knowledge, the prophet comes forward, not primarily in response to the people's inquiries, but spontaneously impelled by the conviction that God has put words into his mouth, a message which he had to deliver, equivalent to a divine command. This was the prophets' attitude toward their task and mission, immeasurably superior to the point of view of their predecessors and to the conceptions of the multitude of their own day. Their doctrine of the universality of the moral law was absolutely new, because before their time real universal monotheism was unknown.

Thus the task of the prophets was to promulgate the doctrines that God's government and interests were not merely national but universal; that righteousness is not merely tribal nor racial, but world-wide. These ideas are not mere abstractions, but principles of the divine government and of the right human life. Absolute compliance with the will of Jahweh, absolutely faithful worship of Him, the recognition of the community between God and man in the consciousness of the people, and the leading of a noble and God-fearing life, these were the doctrines to the promulgation of which they dedicated their lives. With the terrible weapon of God's retributive righteousness they sought to coerce and curb

the idolatrous and immoral leanings of their nation and to hold their hearts true to the allegiance of the living God; to beat at one with Him. This position of moral leadership was ever maintained by the great prophets. They were never passive instruments of divination, to say yes or no when the springs were touched by an inquiring hand, but they were active in trying to arouse the people to a realization of their God-given opportunities. Although they came apparently to predict doom, they were essentially the prophets of faith and hope. The nation may have been doomed, but they possessed the more glorious and the more comprehensive vision of the universal dominion of God, of God's greater purpose, and of the consequent and ultimate regeneration of Israel and, through Israel, of all mankind.

The early prophets and the diviners formed a definite and a separate class or caste. The priests and the levites all came from a certain tribe, and the diviners and the early prophetic schools formed classes or trade groups. But the great prophets' work was done separately, and they did not work as members of an institution. For them God reveals himself not only to the prophet but to every individual, and this revelation takes place immediately and unmistakably in each man's moral consciousness. How this conviction of a profound sense of their divine mission and the force of their claim to speak in the name of God established itself in the minds of the prophets is one of the most fundamental problems in the psychology of revelation. Years of thoughtful brooding, of conscious pondering over the errors of their people, over the relation between God and man, impelled them to speak. They had to answer the call whether they strove to resist it or not. It summoned them to the work of God like a fire burning irre-

sistibly in their bosoms, a flame which could not be withstood, a flame which forced them to proclaim God's message which He himself was commanding them.

The prophets disdained to claim any other authority than the intense conviction which they had of their personal mission. One of the chief characteristics of the prophets is the vehemence and the force with which they assert their claim to speak in the name of Jahweh. No man, no men, could have endured so severe and so long continued a strain of opposition, of odium, of persecution, and danger of death, had they not been upheld by the most profound sense of their divine mission. They had the invincible conviction of the reality of their divine commission. Theirs was the invidious and unwelcome task of denouncing the wrath of God upon the immorality and injustice of the nation they loved so much and of proclaiming that the divine punishment would inevitably ensue, since they knew that the people could never be moved to repentance and to the alteration of their course of conduct.

The diviners lived from their fees; the court prophets were supported by the king; the prophetistic guilds supported themselves from alms, presents, and agriculture. Not so the prophets. Each of them had a regular occupation, and disdained the taking of money for prophesying the word of God. Amos, for example, was a shepherd and trimmer of sycamore trees. Whereas the early prophets and diviners had to have signs and perform miracles, the prophets discarded both of them. Even Deuteronomy states that the true prophet can be distinguished from the false one only in that the sign of the true prophet will come true. The prophets, however, abolished the sign altogether, since they were perfectly convinced of the realization of their prophecies and of the reality

and urgency of their call. Isaiah once asked King Ahaz to request  
 a sign <sup>(111)</sup>, but only because he thinks that the king is about  
 to hearken to him and will do so if he promises a sign. Whereas  
 early diviners and prophets gave signs because they had to and  
 were asked to, Isaiah voluntarily offered Ahaz a sign so as to  
 convince the doubtful and wavering monarch, whom he already thought  
 half impressed, of the earnestness of his speech. Thus it happens  
 that one or two signs are mentioned of the canonical prophets.

The great prophets abolished all intermediaries between God  
 and man. Each man could have free access to God through his moral  
 will and by freeing himself of his preconceptions and prejudices.  
 Prophecy therefore discarded once and for all the apparatus of  
 divination, some of which, like the Ephod and the Urim and Thummim,  
 had been taken over into the official religion. They threw aside  
 all secret means and external appliances and machinery. God, they  
 asserted, speaks directly and immediately to the mind of the pro-  
 phet and of all men without the intervention of other or any  
 means. The prophet thus became the point at which God's revelation  
 and will to Israel was open and fluent, not congealed into dogmas,  
 formulae, mechanical devices, and institutions. After the advent of  
 the great prophets and through them all other ways of knowing and  
 learning the will of God gradually were given up.

We heartily concur with Dr. Battenwieser in his belief re-  
 garding prophetic inspiration. He states in part, "The inspiration  
 of the literary prophets and the mantic possession of the older  
 prophets are two distinct phenomena proceeding from radically  
 different states of mind and not, as it is widely thought, from  
 a common psychical basis. Inspiration, as the great literary prophet  
 understood it, is the governing principle at the root of the new

prophetic movement which began with Amos, and by virtue of this fact literary prophecy is fundamentally different from the preceding development". In this respect, surely, it can in no sense be considered the offspring or the continuation of the older prophecy, but must be regarded as a movement essentially independent and of its own kind. The more we puzzle over the distinctions and differences between the literary prophets and their predecessors the more are we inclined to believe, with Prof. Bultmann, that their precedence is in time only, and not in essence and evolution, and that prophetic revelation must be accounted the spontaneous creation of the immediate product of the rational, intuitive human mind (112)

The ecstasy of the older prophets is an entirely different thing from the inspiration of the literary prophets. The earlier prophets' ecstasy was subnormal; under its influence the Hebrews talked incoherently; the subnormal activity of the mind was so intense that it was insensible to influences from without and lost control of its own operations. This ecstatic excitation was usually self induced most often by rabid forms of music among the Hebrews. The prophet saw ecstatic visions, he dreamed ecstatic dreams, in this convulsed and exhausted condition in which he absolutely lost his normal consciousness and in which his ordinary mental functions were temporarily suspended. In this state the prophet does not know what he is to say and what his utterances will be (113), a state akin to insanity (114) in which the deity absolutely possessed the prophet and forced him to do as he (the deity) wished, the prophet being simply the passive recipient of the deity's message. Dreams, as well as visions, were, among the early prophets, ascribed to intercourse with and possession by the

deity, having the value of divinations and predictions.

On the other hand the inspiration of the literary prophets had nothing in common with this ecstasy of the prophets of the older type, a state which could be artificially produced at will. It is altogether distinct from prophetic possession, which means the absolute passivity of the mind in order to become the medium of divine revelation. The characteristic of the true prophet is that he retains his consciousness and self-control under revelation (115). With the early prophet the revelation was induced by artificial means and was subject to the will of the agent, irrespective of his moral status. With the literary prophets the revelation came unsolicited, irresistible, and only to such individuals whose moral natures qualified them to serve as channels of revelation.

The visions of the great literary prophets likewise are by no means related to the ecstatic dreams and visions of the diviner. The visions of the literary prophets (116) are in the nature of a spiritual experience, and since these cannot be expressed directly, the prophets resort to an indirect method of description. To them has come a divine moment when they have beheld the mystery of life revealed, when they have pierced to the reality of things as though by a divine intuition, when their individual mind has stood face to face with the infinite, universal mind as realized itself the chosen instrument of God's purpose. Such spiritual experiences are the fruit, not of an inert, passive mind, but of a mind consciously sounding the very depths of its being, a mind awakened to the fullest realization of its moral and spiritual constitution.

Aside from these visions when the prophet feels himself

consecrated to the mission of God, there is a second kind, like those of Amos 8:1-2 and Jeremiah 1:11-14. They may readily be explained on a psychological basis as revealing the state of mind of the prophet. He is haunted by thoughts of the judgment he believes impending, and everything he sees serves but to recall that one momentous fact from which he cannot get away. For instance, a basket of fruit reminds Amos of his people ripe for judgment; a budding almond twig reminds Jeremiah of his people flowering for destruction. (117) Similarly, a boiling pot with its spout facing the north reminds Jeremiah of the seething ruin which the nation from the north (Babylonia) will bring down upon Judah. This is the real explanation of the prophetic vision. In Ezekiel we seem to meet with an occasional vision more on the style of the older prophets (118), but not among the great prophets (119).

The diviners and the court prophets, the Nebiim and the seers, remained faithful to the state and to the recognized state religion. The real prophets' ideal, however, was the ultimate welfare of the state. The prophet did not wholly ignore the individual, but his interest in him was determined by his value and significance to the community as a whole. The literary prophets were opposed to the recognized state religion, whereas the Nebiim and court prophets who made their living from it loyally supported it and had to support it. The great prophets opposed the national worship because they felt that the people were not sincere; that they worshipped God while guilty of the most immoral practices, and stated that such a worship was but a hollow mockery. The prophets did not oppose religion in itself; they did not oppose the state per se, but they attacked the existing church and state, both of which they regarded as essentially and fundamen-

tally corrupt. This point of view, of course, brought them into violent conflict with the priests and rulers. Their predictions of doom sounded to their benighted auditors as the rankest treason. For this reason Amos was bidden to stop speaking; Jeremiah suffered untold persecution and torture in prison and dungeon, and was often forced to flee for his life. The prophets were impelled by their unflinching sense of duty to set themselves in direct opposition to the current of popular opinion, and they were therefore very often the objects of general suspicion and dislike, often of open enmity.

Yet the real prophets were not demagogues, and the thought of overturning the state never entered their minds. They merely wished to purify the state, to make it realize its divine mission. Ofttimes it made them counsellors of submission to foreign domination, e.g. Isaiah, who, in the famous passage (120), urges his people to have faith in God, to repudiate their pernicious pact with Assyria which he foresaw would eventually lead to their being involved in the meshes of international politics, and to purify their lives. Of course the king, pleased with the protection which his agreement with this powerful foreign power afforded him, and regarding this pact in the nature of a masterly stroke, could not understand what Isaiah meant by this admonition.

The prophets were the rigid upholders of the principles of theocratic law, never members of an unscrupulous hierarchy. Whereas the diviner always retained the possession of the public, because he was in sympathy with the gods of the community and his work <sup>was</sup> is held to be wholly friendly, the literary prophet was forbidden to speak, was branded as a traitor and a rebel, and his following was confined to but a few faithful disciples. Isaiah

alone seems to have been friendly and kindly disposed to the reigning king (after Ahaz), because, from the standpoint even of the Deuteronomist school, Hezekiah was a just and righteous man. It may even be likely that at first Isaiah advised and counselled Hezekiah, but that at the later period of his life he deserted him when he saw that his words were unheeded and his counsels not followed. As a general rule the prophets freely gave counsel to their kings, but they were never heeded.

The element of prediction played a very important part with the diviners and the early prophets. It appears that Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, and others, all predicted individual things and that they were fulfilled <sup>(121)</sup>. Prediction, however, is the least essential element, in fact no element at all, of real prophecy. The prophets' only means to force the people to follow their teachings was by warnings, threats, and predictions of disaster which they saw would come if their words were unheeded. They predicted, not to satisfy curiosity or to reveal the future in idle ways, but always threatening and promising. They resorted to predictions only occasionally <sup>(122)</sup>

and only on moral grounds, to shake the people out of their snug complacency and self-centered contentment. The predictions of the prophets are rather their highest ideals carried over into the region of the future and visualized, as expressions of their sublime faith in God.

The prophets laid no claim to any supernatural occult powers. However authoritatively they declared that the judgment was near at hand, they openly admitted the limitations of their human insight in regard to the attendant circumstances, the how, the time, and the other details. Their predictions of hope, of destruction, of anticipation, are to be considered, not predictions, but political

and moral foresight. Nor were they daunted by the fact that their contemporaries pointed tauntingly to their unfulfilled prophecies and sought to make light of their prophetic gifts (123).

They were serenely confident that the essence of their prophecies, the moral truths which underlay and animated them, remained forever secure and unassailable.

The literary prophets themselves took great pains to deny and disclaim any connection between their revelations and the divination of the official prophets of their day or the divination of the recognized prophetic guilds which was the same divination as was practiced by the older prophets. They had nothing but loathing and reproach for the morbid and artificial vision of the diviner and the phrenetic ravings of the soothsayer. They never let one opportunity go by to bring out clearly the distinction between their own prophecies and vaticination, and to repudiate with contempt and scorn the belief that they had anything in common with the professional prophets. Amos, for example, though perhaps resembling the professional prophets of his day in mere dress and bearing, as evidenced from the fact that Amaziah addressed him as Choze (124) and seemingly could not tell the difference between him and them, yet denies most emphatically that he is a prophet of this type. He states that he is neither a prophet nor a member of the prophetic guilds, but only a plain sycamore trimmer whom the realization of God's divine message had impelled to the declaration of these truths. In point of time Amos was the nearest of all the literary prophets to those excited and frenzied prophetic guilds of the time of Samuel and Elisha, yet he is opposed to all forms of divination and to the guilds of the prophets, even though there are no clear references to this effect. He defines his concep-

tion of the true prophet and implies clearly that he does not recognize mantic possession or artificial inducement of ecstasy as a true means of revelation.

Hosea specifically denounces several forms of divination, and this attitude may be taken as characteristic of his attitude against all forms of divination (125). His pure and moral idea of the relation which should prevail between God and Israel stamps him as radically opposed to the divination and the nebiim of his days. Isaiah it was who attacked divination the most severely of all the great prophets (126), daubing the divinatory practices which appear to have been very wide-spread among the people of the time (740) as heathenish, and as therefore incompatible with the religion of Jahweh. In Jeremiah, living and working one hundred years after Isaiah, the movement against all forms of divination, legitimate as well as official, reaches its crest. He denies divination per se. Possessing the highest possible conception of man's spiritual relation to God, he robbed the idea of divination of all content. He states clearly and unmistakably that man is unable to fathom God's inscrutable will. It is in the moral life only that man may be said to have converse with the Deity, by attempting to realize the moral ideals in life. He rails against all kinds of diviners (127), attacking sorcerers, soothsayers, prophetists, and diviners alike, and denying categorically the possibility of revelation through dreams or any of these other ways. He defines clearly the nature of the true prophet, and states that true prophecy cannot go hand in hand with ecstatic frenzy and possession. We may be sure that the great prophets were attacking existing institutions, for these modes of prophecy which they were castigating had flourished up to and even beyond their time.

Amiah complains that the people resort to divinatory practices and refuse to heed the warnings of true prophecy (128). He characterizes the ordinary prophets as diviners (129). He is even more pungent than Isaiah in his attack upon the Kosemim, and more violent than Hosea in his contempt and scorn for the Chozim. He calls the act of the Nebiim "Keseem", and states that the distinction between the false prophets and the true ones will at some time become clear (130), evidently censuring his contemporaries for their blindness in not being able to distinguish the true prophet from the imitation one.

Zachariah, living at a still later date, states that the prophets (Nebiim) will be driven out of the land. Previously to him Ezekiel had condemned the Chozim and the Kosemim, and attacked seriously the institution of necromancy which had become deep-rooted in Israel's belief, perhaps, as some scholars are inclined to believe, due to the influence of Babylonia at the time, altho it had previously existed in Israel. From all this it will be clear that the literary prophetic schools of J, E, and D, though to a certain extent they had purified the institution and practice of divination, had not been able to purge the nation of it thoroughly. Divination of many kinds and forms persisted to a late date, and seems to have disappeared entirely only long after the exile. The real prophets strove continually against it, combatted it with all the fire of their tongues and pens, and saw that the people could not begin to accept their doctrines as true without first getting rid of their divinatory practices. But despite all the literary prophets seem not to have been able to abolish the entire institution directly and in their days.

Divination finally disappeared from Israel entirely, but

not until long after the fiery denunciations of Isaiah and Jeremiah. The exact time of its disappearance cannot be definitely determined. Its fall was due to the gradual development of the idea of spiritual monotheism and to its gradual infiltration into the minds of the people during the crucible period of the Exile. Its debacle was certain as soon as the prophets had developed their great doctrine of the universal moral God, and its absorption into the belief of the people was from then on only a matter of time. The great postulates of the existence of the One God and that God's revelation requires no physical and material media undermined divination after a long and bitter struggle. Divination declined concomitantly and proportionately with the growth of this spiritual monotheism. From its very beginning divination posited polytheism and polydaemonism, which were incompatible with monotheism, even of a nationalistic type. As a result of the opposition to divination prophecy developed more and more until the former was finally and completely abolished.

Polytheistic beliefs inevitably brought the practice of divination into contempt and degradation. The diviners, conceiving themselves to be the mouthpieces of divinities to which every kind of evil was freely attributed, felt it their bounden duty not to interfere in the struggle of virtue against vice. The early diviners were caught in the meshes of sorcery, magic, and witchcraft. They never dealt with the evils of the social order or presented themselves as ardent champions of the poor and oppressed. A few of Israel's diviners rose above the common herd and finally led up to the development of real prophecy, but the majority of the diviners often and willingly prostituted whatever gifts they may have had for wealth or ambition, they were covetous and

grasping, and the result was that the seers, fortune-tellers, astrologers, and the whole kindred tribe of society's parasites sank into the deepest depths and became the unspared objects of a richly deserved contemptuous condemnation.

Viewed from a historical perspective, divination seems to have been an elaborate system of astute trickery. Whether there was any real belief in it or not, the practice of divination encouraged false methods and turned men's minds away from immediate appeals to the deity and, in general, away from a spiritual conception of religion, which could not develop until divination was abolished. The people themselves may have believed in it, but the diviners themselves evidently were aware of the tricks and the deception they were practising. (131) On the ethical side divination has been of no advantage or benefit to society. It has but produced much deceit, unconscious or conscious, and the result was bad. If the diviners did not believe in their science they only fostered a system of deceit which did not benefit the world. Only in one respect, and this a very dubious one, can divination be said to have been of the least benefit. It helped to maintain the external apparatus of religion, which for ancient life was an important thing, and fostered the observation of the natural phenomena, especially the development of astronomy and anatomy. But divination in its entirety belonged to a lower stage of human thought, and had to disappear gradually before enlightenment.

CHAPTER EIGHTFALSE PROPHECY  
-----

False prophecy is a very difficult phenomenon to describe. We may assert almost without the fear of contradiction that false prophecy did not exist as far as the people themselves went, and we may be almost as certain that the false prophets themselves, while perhaps regarding themselves as a little deceitful, still conceived of themselves as inspired by the deity and may have even persuaded themselves to regard their self deception as the word of the deity. For example, the four hundred prophets of Ahab who predicted to a man that Ahab would defeat the king of Syria (132) were absolutely sincere in their conviction, and even if they were not absolutely sincere, they had no intention of wilfully deceiving the king. Zedekiah, the son of Chanaanah, who confidently predicted by a bit of sympathetic magic that Ahab would gore the Syrians with horns of iron, was certainly rabidly sincere in his prediction, as was Chananiah (133) in his confident assertion that the fulfillment of his prediction would follow before two years had passed. Micaiah ben Yimlah for one moment never denies that these prophets were prophesying in the name of Jahweh, but he asserts that Jahweh has purposely deceived them so as to lead Ahab into ruin.

Hence these so-called false prophets were not regarded as false either by themselves or by the people. Only the later generations, especially the great prophets, considered them as false prophets, because their psychic experiences and declarations were

not the manifestations of the spirit of God but only of the spirit of the people of the times. Their eyes were blinded to the truth and their minds were so wrapped up in the destinies of their nation that they could not but make their ardent wish father to the thought, and they therefore predicted as real and sure to come that which their innermost beings and the innermost beings of their auditors desired. Hence they paid more attention to the counsels of men than to the counsel of God; to the blinding delusions which surrounded them than the immoral conditions and to the inevitable reckoning which was bound to come. Of course many of these false prophets were really false, wilfully deceiving the people. Corruption and degeneration crept in in many ways, as we shall show, and as a result the real prophets branded them all as false, as mere mouthpieces of man and not of God, as declarers of the prevailing mood of their listeners and supporters, and not the advocates of God's moral law.

It is thus only at a later date, at the time of the real prophets, beginning with the time of Amos, that we have the so-called false prophets. There is absolutely no mention of false prophets before this time (740). Even the ones of Ahab cannot as yet be called false prophets, for Micaiah recognizes them as prophets of Jahweh, and at this time there were no real prophets to brand them as false. Surely the Nebiim whom Jezebel killed, the one hundred whom Obadiah hid in a cave, and the prophetic guilds of Elijah and Elisha, cannot be branded as false prophets. The distinction did not exist at this time. Only when real prophecy appeared on the scene was there and could there have been such a thing as false prophets and false prophecy, and even then not in the popular conception of the times, not in the minds of the so-

called false prophets themselves, but in the minds of the real prophets who realized that only they themselves were sincere and were the messengers of God while the other prophets were but the spokesmen of the backward people of their times. The court prophets at the time of Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Micah, of Malachi and Zechariah, these were the actual false prophets, and the reasons for their degeneration we shall now study.

The false prophets began to lose their hold upon divine guidance by making concessions to their desire for popularity, or by cowardly fear for their own personal safety, or by means of the acceptance of gifts and bribes, and likewise because of their greed and ambition. They were dependent for their living on gifts and on the court, and they were thus tempted to give an answer favorable to the inquirer who was at the same time their benefactor. They may have started out thinking themselves prophets of Jahweh, but the prophet who had once tampered with the truth had committed himself to a downward course leading eventually to the lowest depths of hypocrisy and trickery. In the earlier stages of the life history of the false prophet delusions no doubt played a larger part than conscious fraud.

In the second place the false prophet was deceived and misled by the people whom he addressed. They were willing to accept as true the falsehoods uttered to them in the name of prophecy. The vitiated atmosphere produced by the tainted religious life of the people must also be held partly accountable for the individual failure of the false prophet who, seeing that it was the line of least resistance to tell the people and the rulers what they wanted to hear, passed through progressive stages of spiritual blindness and paralysis into a condition of total inability to distin-

guish truth from falsehood. This is the worst state, when unconscious self-deceit and conscious deception of others are so interwoven as to baffle all analysis. The prophet's gradual deterioration from his high endowments, the slackening of his moral fibre, the loss of moral vision, self-deception (134), deception of others, the following of the winds of the times, the consequent adulteration of his message, with base elements, this is the process which false prophecy underwent.

Viewed from the real prophetic point of view, even the prophets of Ahab, the prophets of Baal, Zedekiah ben Canaanah, Chananiah, and the others were all false prophets. Though Ahab's prophets were nominally adherents of the national religion (135) and not in a conscious plot to deceive the king, the issue showed that they were false prophets, and that they deluded themselves and others to their ruin. Chananiah and Zedekiah, though they would have looked with horror upon the assertion or the insinuation that they were false prophets, were really false when we consider the outcome. The prophets of Baal against whom Elijah struggled were really Jahweh worshippers who worshipped a Jahweh whom they had endowed with some of the attributes of Baal. Elijah does not question their sincerity, but tries to show them the real Jahweh and the real Jahweh worship. And yet, in the light of the later prophecy, we may consider them false, for even Elijah would have no such compromise between Baal and Jahweh, not to mention the later prophets.

The difference between false and true prophecy is never more clearly manifested than in the person of Jeremiah himself. Suffering, mental, spiritual, and physical, a constant terrible trial, persecution, and continual danger of death, all these sufferings of

the great prophets proved too untenable a burden for the false ones. Conceivably, some of the false prophets, like, say, Chananiah (136)

or Zedekiah, had started their career by realizing in their heart the absolute need for national repentance and reformation in order to avoid the national catastrophe. They too may have once had visions of the oncoming destruction which should purge the nation of its manifest faults and eventually produce a better one, one in which morality and justice would prevail, the dream of the real prophets. But it was very easy for one who lacked courage or was deficient in the realization of the obligations which his calling imposed upon him to soften his preachments, to restrain the words he may have wished to utter under compulsion, to change his views under the threat of death, to modify them so that they conformed to the ~~stap~~ standard public opinion. His fall was thus due to the contact between his own moral weakness and the spiritual dullness and worthlessness of the people among whom he lived, and he preferred to use the higher knowledge he possessed to curry favor with them rather than to administer to them the deserved admonishment and rebuke.

The prophets whom Amos and his successors denounced as false must have been the greatest of all hindrances to the introduction of higher religious conceptions. They opposed the real prophets bitterly, contradicting their lofty principles and therefore meriting the merciless censure and bitter attacks which the literary prophets heaped upon them (137). They proved a danger to the state and to the religion of the nation, giving ruinously false advice at critical moments of the nation's fortune and offering irreconcilable opposition to the higher teachings of the true spokesmen of the will of God, deluding the people with false hopes (as did

Uhananiah). They hindered, and never helped, the development of real prophecy, and were a continually retarding factor in its history. Lucky for Israel the day upon which the predictions of disaster made by the great prophets were realized. By means of the fulfillment thereof the people were led to ponder carefully over their words, to gain a new idea of their purpose in the world, to obtain an entirely different conception of the reason for their existence as a nation. As soon as the people after the destruction began to read for the first time and to hear within themselves for the first time the words of the great prophets, from this time Judaism became a reality. Without the lofty ideals and concepts of the great prophets, without their sublime faith and purity, we may be sure that Judaism would have been swallowed up in the jaws of despair, of gloom, of impure worship. We therefore owe our continued existence as a people and as a religion to the great literary prophets, the culmination of a period of prophecy which lasted for over six hundred years and carried the nation from the depths of polytheism and immorality to the sublime height of universal monotheism and the most glorious religious conceptions which the mind of man has yet been able to evolve.

## CHAPTER NINE

### WOMAN PROPHETS AND DIVINERS

There remains but one more phase of prophecy to discuss, a phase which, though in the main it does not affect the development of prophecy, we have still deemed it best to include for the sake of completeness. This phase is the question regarding the woman prophets and diviners in Israel. Regarding woman prophets we may state at once that there were none. The literary prophets were all men; the Jahwistic, Elohist, and Deuteronomistic schools of literary prophets were composed entirely of members of the male sex. Even the prophetic guilds did not admit women to their ranks and we have no record which will confirm the belief to the contrary. Of course the tradition exists that there were several prophetesses, for example, Miriam and Deborah, who are commonly supposed to have been real and actual prophetesses. However, we shall now try to prove that they were far removed from the prophets.

We need not be surprised at this lack of woman prophets in Israel. It was a common occurrence among all nations wherever prophecy of some kind or other prevailed. The Orient commonly looked upon women as infinitely inferior to men; they prevented them from entering into any of the occupations or activities in which men engaged, and especially in Israel our ancestors felt that women by nature were not holy enough to come into communion with the divine spirit. They regarded women as essentially impure, and had the idea that any contact or relation with women before revel-

ation or prophecy would contaminate the person and render him unfit. For example, when the Israelites were about to receive the law on Mt. Sinai they were commanded to refrain from all relations with their wives (138). The idea was that contact with women defiled, and if ordinary individuals were bidden to keep away from women before revelation, we can imagine how much more prophets of all kinds would consider it their duty to have as little relation as possible with women during their prophetic career. Take the case of the sanctuary likewise. Women were not allowed to play any part at all in the conduct of the official religion. Priests and Levites had to be of the male sex, and the presence of women in the temple as officiating functionaries was prohibited.

We can therefore see how almost impossible it was for there to have been women prophets in Israel. The early Nebim for the most part were celibates. Most of them seem never to have married, though in one passage, which I believe is the only one, in II Ki. 4:1, it is stated that some of the Nebim had wives. The majority, however, especially those who lived at the time of Samuel, lived apart from women in separate settlements and never married. Elijah and Elisha never married, because they and the Nebim felt that they could not devote their full energies to their pressing religious duties if they burdened themselves with wives. From this alone it would be evident that the existence of women prophets in Israel is a myth. (139).

As far as women diviners go, however, there seem to have been several in Israel, even as there were among the other nations. Their number, however, was very small. The priestess of Apollo at Delphi, the priestess of the deity whom Virgil mentions in the Aeneid, and the Sibyl who appeared to Tarquin on three occasions

are the <sup>best</sup> most well known examples of non-Hebraic diviners. The objections which generally prevailed against women becoming diviners seem to have been overruled in the few cases of women who were recognized as possessing great supernatural and occult powers, and even these cases were very limited in number. Let us consider separately the cases of all the women who are mentioned as having been prophets or diviners in Israel and try to analyze their real significance and value.

(1) Miriam. She is called a Nebiah <sup>(140)</sup> or prophetess. The same passage states that she and all the women of Israel took harps and timbrels and danced while they sang the refrain of the Song of the Sea. A second passage <sup>(141)</sup> states that Miriam was a sort of revealer of revelations and that Jahweh spoke through her. That she was a real prophet is of course entirely out of the question. Even Moses was not a prophet in the real sense of the word. He is called a Nabi only as a complimentary term bestowed upon him by the later generations. We have already showed that not until the time of Isaiah did the word Nabi come into vogue as designating a real prophet, that up to Isaiah's time the terms ordinarily used were Roeh, Choze, and Ish Elohim, and that any mention of a Nabi in the preceding times was to be understood as a compliment given to several extraordinary persons by the later writers who considered them a little above the ordinary diviners of their day. Hence from a historical standpoint Miriam could not have been a prophetess. She <sup>may have been</sup> was however a diviner, and what was more natural than that, when the subsequent prophetic literary schools transformed Moses into a great traditional prophet, they should transform his sister Miriam from a common diviner into a prophetess or Nebiah. It is likewise poss-

ible that Miriam may have partaken somewhat of the character of the old battle maidens of antiquity whose duty it was to go out before the soldiers playing stirring music and inspiring them to deeds of valor. Miriam's playing of the musical instruments certainly reminds us of the old Nebiim. But of course it is entirely out of the question that Miriam could have been a prophetess.

(2) Deborah . The same argument regarding the discrepancy as to time may be applied to Deborah too. Though she too is called a Nebiah (142), we may regard this in the nature of a compliment given to her by the later writers as recognition for her great military services to the nation. It appears from the passage just quoted that Deborah was nothing more than a sort of tree diviner (cf. Ju. 9:37, the oak of the Meonenim), rendering decisions before the people. Though she is called a judge we know that the functions exercised by the so-called judges do not correspond to those of the modern times. By reason of her splendid victory over Sisera later writers forgot or ignored the fact that, at the most, she was a woman diviner, and bestowed upon her the lofty title of prophetess.

(143)  
(3) The witch of Endor. She was purely a diviner, her specialty being the conjuring up of the spirits of the departed. That she practiced deception is of course a matter of common sense. Notice that in the passage above cited Saul does not see the spirit of Samuel. Saul is unable to see, and he asks the witch to tell him what she sees, and she thereupon proceeded to describe the general characteristics of any old man, though she was probably familiar with the appearance of Samuel anyway. While Saul is bowed to the ground in abject fear the person (accomplice of the witch) who took the part of Samuel speaks to him. Naturally this

speaking "Samuel" was the accomplice of the witch whom Saul did not dare see, for this would have laid bare the deception. By keeping the room unlighted (it was night) she could easily conceal her confederate from the eyes of the king. Dark places were always chosen for such acts of calling up the dead (Is. 65:4). This is the only logical and rational explanation of the scene. The diviner of Endor has no other significance for the development of prophecy. (144)

(4) Hulda. She is called a prophetess in two places.

She appears to be a theocratically minded woman who received divine revelation like a prophet in the earlier sense. She seems likewise to have been, if not a member of, at least in league with, the Deuteronomic prophets who wrote the book of Deuteronomy and pretended to have found it, that they might induce Josiah to carry out the reforms they wanted. Though if this be true she would seem to contradict our previous statement that no women belonged to the literary prophetic schools, we may take it that she was rather well known at the time, with a reputation as a sort of prophetess, her word being recognized even by the king, and that for this reason the Deuteronomic prophets easily persuaded her to give the answer to the king's inquiries and to play the part they wanted of her, so as to impress the king with the gravity of the situation and the necessity for the immediate execution and enforcement of the laws of the book which the Deuteronomic prophets wished to see done. We can scarcely believe that she was a prophetess, for nothing else is ever heard of her. She played her part well and that was all. That she was a diviner is almost entirely out of the question, because the Deuteronomic school of prophets were inalterably opposed to divination of all kinds and they would never have appealed to a well known feminine

diviner to set through their book which was inalterably opposed to divination. Her character really constitutes a great puzzle, since it is altogether impossible to determine exactly what she was.

(145)  
(5). The Wise Woman of Tekoa . She is called an Ishah Chachamah, a wise woman, though it is nowhere stated that she is a diviner. Perhaps the application to her of the adjective Chachamah may indicate that she was regarded as possessed of divinatory powers. At any rate the story in which she figures has nothing to do with divination, and it seems entirely problematical and immaterial whether she was a diviner or not.

From the foregoing brief analysis we have seen that there were several woman diviners in Israel but no woman prophets. (146)  
The number is so small that we may be sure that legitimate and officially recognized woman diviners were a rarity. Nevertheless we have evidence that many unofficial and illegitimate women diviners existed among the Israelites at later times. All the previously mentioned woman diviners, with the exception of Huldah, who was not a diviner, lived before the time of the establishment of the kingdom, when divination was still regarded as legitimate. However, as soon as the war against divination was begun, woman diviners, of whom there seem to have been quite a few, were likewise prohibited. J and E (147) legislated against them, showing that woman diviners must have existed between 800 and 690. (148) Ezekiel likewise rails against them. Leviticus too (149) prohibits woman diviners, showing that they must have persisted till the Exile, the time when Leviticus, a part of the Priestly Code, was written. In other words women diviners, though in smaller numbers, persisted as long as their male companion diviners did,

and finally came to an end when divination in general was abolished from the life of the people, after the exile. The women diviners exerted no influence on the development of prophecy. Who of themselves they form an interesting study, they are of negligible importance.

CHAPTER . XXVNOTES

(1) Genesis 44:5

(2) Genesis 44:15

(3) The story of Joseph seems more like a drama of fiction and not a historic record. Most scholars are inclined to regard it as such and to state that Joseph never existed.

(4) cf. Ez. 21:21, where Nebuchadnezzar is represented as determining by means of divination the road which he is to take.

(5) cf. Dt. 6:4, "Hear Oh Israel, Jahweh our God is One Jahweh", implying that previously he had been more than one, i.e. that the people had hitherto worshipped more than one. This passage is a product of the secondary Deuteronomic writer.

(6) cf. Genesis 28:16; 16:13; I Sam. 4:8; the word Elohim; the story of the golden calf, etc.

(7) Saul is represented as having banished and eradicated all diviners and witchcraft workers, though it is evident that he retained the legitimate ones. Perhaps at his time it was begun to draw the line between the legitimate and the illegitimate diviners and divination.

(8) I Sam. 14:41, reconstructed text.

(8a) cf. Joyce, "Inspiration of Prophecy"-The conception of "seeking God" by consulting the oracle belongs to a lower level of religious thought, when the presence of God was conceived as connected with the holy place and with the ministrations of the seer in some mysterious way.

(9) Ju. 18:5-6

(10) Ju. 7:9:15

(11) Likewise among the Greeks. The oracle at Delphi was presided over by a priestess.

(12) Ju. 7:4-6

(13) It is a matter of dispute whether the original P source recognized the Urim and the Tummim as legitimate means of consulting the Deity. If it is true that these references are not a part of the original P but of a later redaction, it would be entirely in keeping with P's attitude of denial of divination. But

it is likewise possible that the priestly code would taboo all other modes of divination while retaining such a specifically priestly one as consulting the oracle.

(14) Dt.18:10-11 .This passage,condemning divination,is likewise the product of approximately the year 621 B.C.E.

(15) cf. Gen.28:10 ff;Homer,Iliad,I,63

(16) Kosemim at first was used as a designation for a specific kind of diviner.Other types or special names are Yid-onim ,Baal Ov ,Menachesh ,Meonen .The literary prophets subsumed all the diviners under the categorical term Kosemim,which may therefore have been the general term applied to all diviners.An exact parallel of this is the fact that while the Canaanites were only one of the seven nations of Palestine which the Hebrews were supposed to destroy,nevertheless the general name Canaanites in a different sense included them all.As such the term Roeh would have followed logically upon the term Kosem.

(17) In Arabic the word Cohen means seer.Probably at first the seer and the priest in Semitic peoples were identical, cf.Samuel,though a seer,performed priestly functions (I Sam. 9:12) and must therefore be regarded as both a seer and a priest.Among the Greeks priests and prophets are not so far apart.The priestess to whom Virgil refers in the sixth book of the Aeneid is sometimes called vates (prophetess) and other times she is called Sacerdos (priestess).It is the priestess at Delphi who divines and makes known the will of the gods.Either we are to believe that the priests anteceded the seers and had slightly different characteristics,or that formerly they were identical and later on became differentiated.At any rate it cannot be gainsaid that among the Hebrews the prophet is a development out of the old diviner(not out of the priest ) who knows the will of the god and is thus able to answer questions and to predict the coming events,which was certainly one of the characteristics of the seer.However,the Hebrew prophet,originally a seer,rose higher and higher and in the course of time became a preacher of ethical religion.

(18) Hence implying prediction in a certain sense,or the telling and foretelling of events not too far off,which seems to have been one of the seer's traits.cf following note.

(19) I Sam.9:6. The companion of Saul states that every thing which the seer says will come to pass.Perhaps this is to be taken as a naive statement on the part of the lad;perhaps the people of the time actually believed it.How the seer could foretell these things we do not know.

(20) It is exceedingly difficult to indicate the boundary lines between divination and early prophecy. The epoch-making transformation,the great crisis,when the diviner made way for the first and earliest prophets was accomplished within the compass of a few years,but the change had been long in preparation.

(21) I Sam. 9:7. The use of the term Ish Elohim in this verse as likewise in the preceding verse, synonymous with Roeh, indicates that the seer worked in the name of the local deity.

(22) II Ki. 5:15

(23) I Sam. 9:9

(24) e.g. A.B. Davidson in "Old Testament Prophecy".

(25) I Sam. 9:6; I Ki. 12:22; 17:18; II Ki. 4.

(26) II Chron. 10:7-10. The Chronicler retains it out of his love for archaisms. At the time the Books of Chronicles were written the term Nabi had entirely supplanted it, cf. I Sam. 9:9 which was written long before Chronicles.

(27) I Sam. 9-10:10

(28) I Sam. 10:5; 10:11; 10:12 etc.

(29) Because of the frequency of the use of the word in I Sam. 10 it seems best to believe that the term existed coevally with the term Roeh, at least for a few years before the time of Saul's meeting with Samuel, and that it designated the ecstatic prophets. See Chapter III for further discussion of this point.

(30) Joshua, of course, is but a later legend and so accepted by modern Biblical critics. The Book of Joshua was written at the time when Israel was already a nation possessing national traditions and a national consciousness. The true story of the entrance into Canaan is therefore to be found in the first chapter of Judges and in the fierce struggles depicted throughout the entire book.

(31) cf. Ju. 3:3

(32) I Sam. 10:5

(33) The Assyrian, Babylonian prophet, diviner, or soothsayer was always of the priestly class and connected with the shrine. In this respect he differs from men like Amos and Micah but furnishes an exact parallel to a seer like Samuel who combined in himself the functions of seer, priest, and prophet.

(34) It is practically impossible to give an accurate account of the character of Samuel (and also of Elijah). The narratives concerning him are few in number, comparatively late in date, full of mutual contradictions, and therefore of doubtful worth. Our characterization of the man was made only after a careful study and consideration of every verse in which he is mentioned.

(35) I Sam. 9:6-10

(36) Samuel was of an exceptionally high moral standard.

-----

He was singularly free from avarice and ambition, vices so common among the professional diviners (I Sam. 12:3). He was satisfied to stand aside and let Saul rule, believing that he himself could accomplish more as his religious supporter. He set forth the idea of a theocratic kingdom, in which the king was subject to God. He made Saul realize his responsibilities as the anointed of the Lord. Samuel, of course, was anxious to make Saul the ruler. The statement that the anointing of a king was displeasing both to God and to Samuel and that Samuel complied with the people's wish only under compulsion is the judgment passed by later writers after the kingdom had been firmly established and the authors had witnessed the reigns of some of the worthless kings. Certain it is that the people at the time of Samuel joyfully accepted Saul as their king and leader.

(37) Jeremiah couples Samuel with Moses and therefore possibly there belongs to him the honor of being the savior of the religion which Moses founded. Samuel injected into the prophets of his time the Jahweh element, the idea that they were fighting for Jahweh.

(38) I Sam. 11:1-11

(39) I Sam. 11:7

(40) I Sam. 11:15

(41) M. Battenwieser differs radically from this point of view. cf. Chapter VI, where this question is discussed at greater length.

(42) I Sam. 10:11-12

(43) ibidem

(44) Budde, who states that the words "Ume Avēhem" imply that they are stray vagabonds without pedigree.

(45) I Sam. 10:11

(46) I Sam. 10:5, the first mention thereof.

(47) II Ki. 2:3

(48) II Ki. 2:5

(49) I Sam. 19:20

(50) I Ki. 18:28

(51) I Sam. 10:10

(52) I Sam. 19:20-21

(53) I Sam. 10:11

(54) I Sam. 10:18-20

(55) II Ki. 2:3; 2:3;4:38

(56) I Sam. 19:20

(57) I Sam. 19:18-20. The proper reading of the word is Havoith, and not Hailoith, as the Kesiv has it. Ramah itself was the name of a city, and if we take Havoith likewise to have been a city the sense would be unintelligible, for we would have to understand the prophets as dwelling in a city within a city, surely something quite impossible. The word Havoith means clearly "dwellings", from the singular Haveh or Havah, rude huts in which some five or ten and perhaps a few more of the prophetists dwelt, the entire collection of cottages forming the prophetic community. Note likewise that in I Sam. 9:22 Saul, dines with Samuel and a group of thirty guests (undoubtedly members of the guild who were there at Samuel's orders for the purpose of impressing Saul) in the chamber (Lishkah) of the high place, additional evidence that the main headquarters of Samuel's prophetic guild was at the sanctuary in Ramah.

(58) The two men who Samuel predicted would meet Saul and tell him that his father's asses were found (I Sam. 10:2) ; the three men who Samuel predicted would offer Saul food (v.4); and the thirty guests with whom Saul and Samuel dined at the high place (9:22-24) were unquestionably members of Samuel's guild who had received specific instructions as to the part they were to play.

(59) I Sam. 19:18-20

(60) Kuenen, Kraetzschmar, Battenwieser, Batten, Budde, Knobel, Paton, etc. Davidson does not admit that it was founded by Samuel as an adoption from the Canaanites. Joyce is doubtful, inclined a little toward both opinions. Kuenen states that both its name and its features of abnormal and contagious excitement clearly prove its Canaanitic origin, explaining that such symptoms (together with the worse ones which Samuel eliminated when he took it over) would more naturally arise in the worship of natural like Baal and Astarte than under the influence of the religion of the severe and holy Jahweh.

(61) Davidson and Cornill.

(62) e.g. Cornill and Davidson. Davidson states that prophecy was founded by Samuel but not the prophetic guilds.

(63) The elders appointed by Moses (Nu. 11:25) are said to have prophesied when the spirit of God rested upon them, Eldad and Medad likewise in the same passage. The same word (Mishnabin) is used as in Samuel and Kings. The book of Numbers, however, is a composite product of a period long after the prophetic schools as such had ceased to function, and the verse cannot be taken at face value, to indicate actual raving and excited demeanor such as the prophetists of Samuel engaged in. The

prophesying referred to in these verses is represented as having the approval of Moses, and must therefore have been orderly, more like the traditional prophecy of Moses himself.

(64) J. F. McGurday (Article "Prophets and Prophecy", Jewish Encyclopedia, still takes the traditional orthodox view. He quote him, "The historic order of Hebrew prophecy begins with Moses (1200 B. C.) . His claim to be considered the first and greatest of the prophets is founded on the fact that he introduced the worship of Jahweh among his people and gave them the rudiments of law and a new sense of justice wider and deeper than that of the tribal system. All later true prophets kept Israel in the same right course along the lines of religious and moral development".

(65) II Sam.24:11; I Chron. 29:29; II Chron.29:25

(66) II Chron.35:15

(67) I Chron.25:5

(68) ibidem v.1-3

(69) II Chron. 35:15

(70) I Sam.22:5

(71) ibidem

(72) I Sam.25:1-3

(73) II Sam.12:1; II Chron.29:25; I Ki. 1:8, and passim.

(74) In II Chron. 29:25 Nathan the prophet and Gad the seer are mentioned together as having jointly appointed the Levites, with the sanction of David, to take charge of the house of the Lord, with harps, cymbals, and psalteries. The unhistoricity of this passage is obvious.

(75) I Ki. 11:29

(76) In I Ki. 12:3 it states, "And they sent and called him (Jeroboam) from Egypt". Who is meant by "they" is doubtful. Perhaps it means the partisans of Ahijah, though nothing is certain about this. Perhaps it means the people who were waiting for Solomon's death. At any rate nothing is certain. It would seem hardly likely that at the time of Solomon and Rehoboam there existed anything but individual court prophet-seers, though, as we have already stated, there may have existed a prophetic group at this time.

(77) I Ki. 11:29; 14:2; 14:18

(78) I Ki. 14:1-18

(79) I Ki. 12:21. In II Chron.12:5,16 he is called Babi.

In II Chron. 11:3 he is called Ish Elohim. The title Nabi is not correct, while Ish Elohim is his real title.

(80) I Ki. 13:1-32

(81) The words "Josiah will be his name" may be a later insertion. The length of the story and its obscurity may indicate that it is authentic, if difficult to understand. Perhaps, as seems most likely, we may recognize the Deuteronomic hand in the story due to the mention of the name of Josiah, and it would then appear that the Deuteronomic writer took over the old obscure legend and impregnated it with the moral teaching it now contains. This Ish Elohim is the only prophet who is mentioned as having come from Judah up till the time of the great prophets.

(82) I Ki. 16:1-4; II Chron. 20:34; 19:2; cf. II Chron. 16:10. If we believe the statements of Chronicles Jehu ben Chanani seems to have been a court historian of Jehoshaphat, as well as the court prophet of both him and Baasha., cf. II Chron. 19:2, where he is called the Chozei of Jehoshaphat and gives him advice.

(83) I Ki. 22

(84) e.g. Batten, "Hebrew Prophecy".

(85) I Ki. 19, especially verses 9:14

(86) I Ki. 18:4

(87) II Ki. 2:3-5

(88) II Ki. 1:1-4

(89) II Ki. 1:3

(90) II Ki. 1:10-12

(91) I Ki. 18:46, cf. likewise I Ki. 17:1, 18

(92) That Elijah was commonly known as an Ish Elohim and not as a Nabi is proved likewise from I Ki. 17:18, 24, where the woman whose son he restored to life calls him Ish Elohim.

(93) II Ki. 2:3, 5

(94) II Ki. 4:38

(95) cf. II Ki. 5:22, evidence of the existence of a prophetic guild at Mt. Ephraim.

(96) I Ki. 20:38 ff. This verse is likewise valuable as indicating the existence of prophetic guilds at the time of Elijah.

(97) I Ki. 4:39; for presents see I Ki. 4:42

(98) Micah 3:11

(99) Ezek. 22:25

(100) Amos 7:12;13

(101) Micah 3:7

(102) Is. 29:10

(103) I Ki. 15:11-15; II Chron. 14:1-4

(104) II Chron. 14:3. "And Asa gave orders to consult the Lord God of their fathers", i.e. they were to consult only Jahweh and his oracles and not foreign gods and diviners. This is evidence of the gradual process of distinguishing between official (legal) and unofficial (illegal) divination.

(105) Nu. 10:29-32. A few of the verses in Exodus 34 do not belong to the original C 2 code, or the first code of the covenant, but are a product of the later J school (eg. Ex. 34:1-5).

(106) Ex. 20:23-23:19 (omitting various later addenda) and Nu. 10:33-36

(107) Elijah may have been a member of this literary prophetic school.

(108) Dt. 18:10-11; cf. II Ki. 17:17

(109) I Sam. 28:3

(110) Jer. 8:8

(111) Is. 7:11

(112) Dr. Battenwieser expatiates on his theory in his admirable book, "The Prophets of Israel", as follows, "The religious advance marked by such a conception of inspiration (of the literary prophets) must seem all the more marvellous when it is remembered that even Plato, a couple of centuries later, had not outgrown the primitive pagan conception of revelation but conceived of it as a necessarily irrational and subnormal phenomenon. Between the religious beliefs which prevailed in Israel up to the time of the literary prophets and the religious views of the prophets there is a gap which cannot be bridged by any logical process. The idea of God which held sway in Israel at the time of Amos' appearance did not even remotely approximate a monistic conception of the universe. The people believed in one God, the God of Israel, but they granted the existence of other gods for other nations".

(113) cf. Nu. 24:4. Balaam did not know in advance what his utterances would be. They were in fact contrary to what he expected and desired. cf. likewise in the Aeneid, VI, 47 ff, an excel-

least illustration of prophetic ecstatic convulsion. The prophets whom Saul met were frenzied and mad, like Virgil's priestess. The words "Os rabidum, fera corda tument" indicate that under possession by the deity the priestess frothed at the mouth, her breasts heaved convulsively, and she then entered into a state of complete bodily exhaustion.

(114) cf. II Ki. 9:11, where the prophet who comes to Jehu is called this "madman".

(115) Kuenen states that the prophet had no supernatural authority, only the influence possessed by any man of commanding genius. He regarded the prophets as no more than great moral teachers with a moral and profound conviction of the moral purpose and government of the world, and he attached little importance to their narratives of supernatural visitations. Joyce, however, stoutly asserts that the inspired insight of the prophet is the natural power of spiritual vision raised to a high intensity and operating in a realm whither the ordinary man has no access. Joyce stresses the element of the supernatural and states that the whole prophetic process cannot be reduced to the level of a natural event. However, he maintains that visions were employed mostly by the earlier prophets and that they play but a small part in the revelation of the literary prophets. The view quoted in the text is that of Prof. Battenwieser, in which I fully concur.

(116) We are quoting almost verbatim from Prof. Battenwieser, since we believe we could not express ourselves on this point, which coincides exactly with his, any more beautifully and succinctly than he has done.

(117) Perhaps one of the points of Jer. 1:11-12 is the play on words evident in the Hebrew but which cannot be reproduced into English. Shakayd means, as a noun, almond. As a verb the root means to be eager or watchful.

(118) e.g. Ezek. 11:24. In former prophetic times the people assigned great importance to the power of the vision. All revelation was at first conceived to take place in a trance or vision, and even after the words Chozen and Roeh fell into disuse the word Chazon is still used in prophetic writings to denote a vision, though of the higher type, as we have explained. Visions in general came to Ezekiel the most frequently.

(119) A vision is occasionally mentioned in Isaiah (visions apart from the consecration vision of Chap. 6) but these passages are generally accepted as late glosses. Even the traces of prophetic ecstasy which most authorities say are to be found with Ezekiel do not correspond in any radical sense to the unconscious frenzy of the early Nebiim.

(120) Is. 7:9; 28:15

(121) I Sam. 9:6-10; II Ki. 8:12, 13; I Ki. 17:1; 18:1, 41; II Ki. 4:10; 7:1-2. Of the earlier days of Hebrew prophecy it is safe to state that their chief concern was with the future.

(122) Many so-called prophetic predictions are not real ones, cf. Is. 44:28; 45:1. The prediction about Cyrus is really the utterance of a contemporary (Deutero-Isaiah).

(123) Is. 5:19; Jer. 17:15.

(124) Amos 3:12

(125) Hosea 4:12

(126) Is. 2:6; 3:2

(127) Jer. 27:9

(128) Micah 2:6; 3:8, 11

(129) Micah 3:7-11

(130) Micah 3:5-8

(131) For example, take the case of the witch of Endor, in I Sam. 28. It is evident that the witch, with the assistance of an accomplice who took the part of Samuel, fooled Saul into believing that the spirit of Samuel was actually being summoned up. A suitable dark spot was chosen as the scene of the farce and the credulous and tremulous Saul was actually humbugged into believing that it was a bona fide resurrection. I have expatiated at greater length on this point in Chapter Nine, under "The Witch Of Endor". Any other explanation cannot explain the unusual phenomenon. c.f. likewise the deception practiced by the Greek oracles in their system of ambiguous answers, which showed clearly that the oracle and its attendant knew as little about the supernatural and future matters as the inquirer.

(132) I Ki. 22

(133) Jer. 28

(134) Micah's statement that the prophets were deceived by Jahweh and Ezekiel's statement to the same effect (14:19) are to be explained rationally as due to the process of degeneration referred to above. As the results showed, it was really God Himself who in both cases used the false prophets as an instrument to punish the people faithless to him.

(135) I Ki. 22:12

(136) Thus we may consider there to have been two kinds of false prophets: (1) the type of Ahab's four hundred court prophets, prophesying what Ahab wanted to hear, not preaching, existing in a body, and (2) the type of Chananiah, giving public pronouncements, thoroughly sincere in his belief, but deluded, afraid to say the truth lest he incur odium and punishment, recognized as a prophet, called a Nabi even like Jeremiah, yet lacking the moral courage to see things in their true and proper light and to proclaim them fearlessly. His prophecy is nothing but blasphemy

and rebellion against God in the eyes of Jeremiah.

(137) Micah 3:5; Is. 28:7; Jer. 5:31; 14:14; 23:32; 29:9

(138) Ex. 19:18. Prophecy itself or divination did not exclude marriage.

(139) Hosea and Samuel, for example, were married. If the Nebiim and Elijah and Elisha did not it was because of their fanaticism.

(140) Ex. 15:20

(141) Nu. 12:2

(142) Ju. 4:4

(143) I Sam. 28:7 ff.

(144) II Ki. 22:14 ff; II Chron. 34:22, the second passage being practically a verbatim repetition of the first.

(145) II Sam. 14:1-5

(146) In Neh. 6:14 mention is made of a woman prophet Noadiah. That she was not a prophetess in the real sense of the word is clear, for real prophecy had ceased before Nehemiah's time. She no doubt was a member of Nehemiah's party, to see that the law was obeyed and that the reforms of Nehemiah were carried out.

(147) Ex. 22:17

(148) Ezek. 13:7-23

(149) Lev. 20:27