Rô'ēh and Ḥôzēh in the Old Testament

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IT has been customary to regard רֹאֶה and חוֹזֶה as synonyms of נָבִיא "prophet" and as embodying an older usage of a time when visions were supposed to be the distinguishing mark of prophecy.[1] This view rests on two suppositions: (1) that both רֹאֶה and חוֹזֶה convey the idea of "seeing" either in the sense of foreseeing events or of having a vision through which the future is revealed, and (2) that the gloss in 1 Sam. 9 9, "that the *nābî* of to-day was formerly called the *rô'ēh*" carries with it the synonymity of the two terms.

While it is true that the gloss distinctly conveys the view that רֹאֶה is the older term which was subsequently replaced by נָבִיא, it does not necessarily follow that the functions of the רֹאֶה and נָבִיא were always identical. Indeed, the natural course of religious evolution furnishes a presumption in favor of the supposition that the רֹאֶה, belonging to an earlier grade of culture, reflects a more primitive view of the manner in which the will and intention of the gods were to be ascertained than the נָבִיא which, whatever its origin,[2] became in Hebrew usage the term for the one

[1] A. B. Davidson, *Prophecy and Prophets* (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. p. 108), and the same author's *Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1904), p. 81; E. G. Hirsch, *Prophets and Prophecy*, in *Jewish Encyclopædia*, vol. x. p. 213; but see Nowack, *Bücher Samuelis*, p. 41.

[2] See Hoffmann in *ZAW*, iii. pp. 87 sq., who discusses the possibility of a connection with the meaning of the corresponding stem in Arabic of a "rustling" sound, but which he does not regard as satisfactory. Kuenen (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 42) and others connect נבא with נבע "bubble up," either analogous to the use of הַנְטֵף "drip" (Am. 7 16; *Mic.* 2 11) or suggested by the symptoms of an epileptic. See Hoffmann, *l.c.* p. 119 and *Encycl. Biblica*, iii. col. 3853. J. A. Bewer in *AJSL*, xviii (1902), p. 120, compares the Assyrian *nabû*, "tear away, lead forcibly," hence the prophet is (fig.) *carried away* by divine frenzy, ecstasy.

who, casting aside the ordinary means of divination, is the direct mouthpiece of a Deity purified of unethical conceptions, spiritualized and largely also denationalized. If we examine the passages in which רֹאֶה is used, we shall find his functions as a matter of fact to be quite different from those of the later נָבִיא. The רֹאֶה *par excellence* in the O. T. is Samuel, who is thrice called in Chronicles (1 Chr. 9 22, 26 28, 29 29)[3] שְׁמוּאֵל הָרֹאֶה "Samuel, the *rô'ēh*" in a way which indicates that הָרֹאֶה was the title by which he was known, precisely as Nathan was known as הַנָּבִיא (1 Chr. 17 1 29 29, 2 Chr. 9 29 29 25, Ps. 51 2, 1 Ki. 1 8. 10. 22. 23. 32. 34. 38. 44. 45), and as Gad was known as הַחוֹזֶה[4] (1 Chr. 29 29), and Zadok as הַכֹּהֵן (2 Sam. 15 27, 1 Ki. 1 8. 26. 32. 34. 38. 39. 44. 45 2 35 4 2, 1 Chr. 16 39 24 6 29 22). Besides these three passages, רֹאֶה occurs in connection with Samuel no less than four times in the narrative of his first meeting with Saul (1 Sam. 9 9. 11. 18. 19), which according to the critical analysis forms part of the "Saul" document in the Book of Samuel.[5] This narrative, which may be taken as typical of the functions ascribed to Samuel, reveals him to us in the distinct rôle of a diviner. Saul, acting on the advice of his attendant, seeks out Samuel, through whom as an אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים "man of Elohim"[6] (vss. 6. 7. 8. 10) he hopes to find the whereabouts of the lost asses of his father Kish. Samuel enjoys high repute as one who can forecast the future; "whatever he says will surely come to pass," says Saul's attendant, "therefore let us go thither, perhaps he will tell us what road we should take" (vs. 6), *i.e.* he may be able to tell us where the lost asses can be found. On Saul objecting that he has nothing to offer the "man of Elohim," the attendant says that he has one fourth of a shekel of silver which he is ready to give. Samuel is, therefore, viewed as

[3] The latter passage is particularly interesting as embodying all three terms רֹאֶה, חוֹזֶה, and נָבִיא applied to Samuel, Gad, and Nathan, respectively.

[4] See, however, below.

[5] See H. P. Smith, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, p. 59; Kautzsch, *die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, p. 289.

[6] On this term, used as a very general one, see Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 79.

one who carries on divination as a profession, to whom one goes for the purpose of securing an answer to some question and who receives a compensation in return. As a diviner he might still be placed in the category of the prophet, though of a rather primitive type, but in the course of the narrative, brief as it is, he is distinctly portrayed as a priest. Saul and his attendant on reaching the ascents to the city in which the "man of Elohim" was to be found, inquire of some maidens coming out to draw water, "Is the *rô'ēh* here?" The reply of the maidens (vss. 12-13) is significant:

"And they answered them and said, 'He is near by. Make haste now, for just to-day he has come to the city, for there is a general sacrifice to-day (זָבַח הַיּוֹם לָעָם) on the *bāmâh*. On your entering the city you will find him before he ascends the *bāmâh* to eat, for the people may not eat until he comes to bless the sacrifice. After that those bidden may eat,'" etc.

The view of modern commentators, including that of H. P. Smith,[7] that the "blessing of the sacrifice is not a priestly function," but merely a kind of grace,[8] is hardly justified in view of the abundant evidence that among the Semites in general the presence of the priest was essential to a sacrifice. A זֶבַח is a religious rite and the blessing of the sacrifice is clearly a form of sanctification to give an assurance that it has been accepted by Jahweh. Such an assurance can only be given by a priest acting as mediator between a god and his worshipers. The priestly function assumed by Samuel is in accord with other episodes in his career which, however much they may have been worked over by later editors, contain a core of reliable historical tradition. He is an attendant in the house of Jahweh (1 Sam. 3 1), dedicated to the service of Jahweh through a formal sacrifice (1 Sam. 1 24-25). As the "boy" of Eli, the priest, he wears the linen "ephod" (1 Sam. 2 18) — the distinct symbol of priesthood.[9] The

[7] *l.c.* p. 62.

[8] following Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (5 ed.), p. 70. Budde (*die Bücher Samuel*, p. 62) is inclined to regard Samuel's action as an exceptional one, but the context implies rather a regular practice.

[9] Cf. 1 Sam. 2 28, where the phrase "to carry the *ephod* before me" is descriptive of priestly functions.

significant feature in the dramatic legend of Samuel's first vision (1 Sam. 3) is that it takes place while he is in the temple service. Later at Mizpah he appears in the rôle of mediator between Jahweh and his people,[10] and his intercession is accompanied by religious rites; and no less significant is the incidental notice that at Ramah, which is called his home, he built a sacrificial altar to Jahweh (1 Sam. 7 17).[11] There is no reason to question the authenticity of such incidental notices, which show that as a רֹאֶה Samuel performed the functions of a priest in the early stages of worship among the Hebrews. As for the narrative of the meeting of Saul with Samuel, the frequent use of the term רֹאֶה as well as the naïve manner in which Saul and his attendant are represented as going to this רֹאֶה for the purpose of ascertaining what had become of the lost asses of Kish, indicate that the original purpose of the tale was to demonstrate the powers of Samuel as a diviner. For he foretells (10 2-9) three incidents that will happen: (1) at the grave of Rachel Saul will encounter two men who will tell him that the asses have been found, (2) at Elon Tabor he will encounter three men on the way to Bethel with sacrifices for the sanctuary, and (3) at Gibeath-Elohim he will encounter a company of נְבִיאִים, and the spirit of Jahweh will descend on him.[12] It is probable that three independent forecasts, or three versions of a single forecast, have here been combined and brought into connection with the incident of the meeting of Samuel with Saul which, being fraught with such important consequences, would naturally have become a favorite subject for folkloric expan-

[10] 1 Sam. 7 5-6 וְאֶתְפַּלֵּל בַּעַדְכֶם אֶל־יְהוָה. The prayer is accompanied by religious rites such as fasting and libations; and when it is added that "Samuel judged the Benê Israel at Mizpah," it is reasonable to conclude that what Samuel did was to render a "decision" in the name of Jahweh, or in other words to announce the intention of Jahweh, secured as an oracle in some way, in connection with the coming struggle against the Philistines.

[11] The "stone" which he erects after the victory over the Philistines (1 Sam. 7 12) may also have been some kind of an altar.

[12] The "duplicate" of this story in 1 Sam. 19 18-24 is recognized as a late adaptation (see H. P. Smith, *l.c.* p. 181), so that the appearance of Samuel at the head of the band (vs. 20) is a purely fanciful touch and manifestly incongruous.

sion; but for our purposes the main point is the illustration that the three forecasts afford of the popular conception of Samuel as a diviner. That at this time the רֹאֶה was quite distinct from the נָבִיא follows from the description given of the "prophets" whom Saul is to encounter — a band of howling dervishes accompanying their chants with musical instruments.[13] If Samuel is in one passage actually referred to as a נָבִיא (1 Sam. 3 20), this is due of course to the projection of a later conception of a prophet into the past, under the influence of which the title is assigned to all the ancient leaders from Abraham on, irrespective of the specific rôles played by them.

The anointing of Saul by Samuel (1 Sam. 10) in the name of Jahweh shows us Samuel again performing a priestly function, though in view of the fact that the episode has been manifestly introduced as a counterbalance to the narrative of Samuel's opposition to the kingship (chaps. 8 and 12), its only value lies in the tradition that it embodies of the functions ascribed to Samuel, who thus turns out to be essentially a diviner and a priest; and since, as we have seen, the term *rô'ēh* belongs to the older structure of Hebrew culture, we should be prepared to find the *rô'ēh* on a par with priests and diviners elsewhere. One of the oldest as well as one of the commonest designations of the priest in Babylonia is *bârû*,[14] a participial form from the stem *barû*, which is the common one in Babylonian for "to see" or "look at something," used in fact precisely as *rā'āh* is in Hebrew. The *bârû*, this word being formed precisely as *rô'ēh*, is essentially and primarily the divining priest, but the "seeing" involved in his office is of a very specific character. He is not a "seer" in the modern acceptation of the term, as one who can "foresee," but an "inspector," and the inspection implied is that of the liver of the sacrificial animal, through which as the vital organ of the animal, as the soul and seat

[13] Chap. 10 5. See below, p. 51.

[14] See Jastrow, *Rel. Babyl. und Assyr.*, ii. pp. 192 seq., where the various functions of the *bârû* are set forth, but this variety is due to the development of the Babylonian ritual, in consequence of which *bârû* became the "diviner" in general without reference to any special mode of divination.

of life, the will and intention of the god, who accepts the animal and is thus identified with it, are revealed.[15] Through carefully "looking at" the phenomena noted on the liver, each sign being given an interpretation in accord with an elaborate system devised by the *bârû*-priests,[16] the *bârû* or "inspector" obtains the answer to the question put to him. Hepatoscopy is the oldest form of divination known to us among the Babylonians, and since, as has been shown elsewhere,[17] the second grand division of Babylonian divination — the reading of coming events through the sun, moon, planets, and stars — is dependent upon hepatoscopy, the application of the term *bârû* to the stargazer or astrologer, and then to the interpreter of dreams and of signs in general, represents the natural extension of the functions of the *bârû*. In consequence, the word becomes the general designation of the priest as "diviner," irrespective of the means chosen by him for forecasting the future, or what he predicts, or what the questions are that may be put to him.

The Hebrew רֹאֶה, being the exact equivalent of the Babylonian *bârû*, and the *rô'ēh* as exemplified in the narrative of Samuel being a diviner and a priest, it would seem reasonable to take the רֹאֶה in accord with the meaning attached to *bârû*, as likewise originally an "inspector," who looks at something with a view of obtaining an answer to a given question. We have as an interesting confirmation of the correspondence here assumed between the Babylonian stem *bârû* in this specific sense and the Hebrew רָאָה, the passage in Ez. 21 26, where the prophet accurately describes the Babylonian method of divination as רָאָה בַּכָּבֵד, literally "he looked at the liver," but which is to be taken as a compound expression to convey the idea of "liver inspection" or hepatoscopy. While traces of the view upon which hepatoscopy

[15] See a paper by the writer, "The Liver in Antiquity and the Beginnings of Anatomy" (*Univ. of Pa. Medical Bulletin*, January, 1908, and *Trans. Phila. College of Physicians*, 3d Series, xxix. pp. 117–138).

[16] See Jastrow, *Rel. Babyl. und Assyr.*, ii. pp. 244 sq., and the copious illustrations there given, pp. 252–415.

[17] "The Sign and Name for Planet in Babylonian," in *Proceedings of the Amer. Philos. Society*, vol. xlvii, pp. 145 sq.

rests — the liver as the seat of the soul or of life — are to be found in Hebrew,[18] it must be admitted that there are no direct indications that hepatoscopy was practiced by the ancient Hebrews outside of the prohibition to burn the *lobus caudatus* of the liver as embodied in nine different passages of the Pentateuchal codes. The prohibition is aimed against using the sacrificial animal for purposes of divination,[19] and in so far points to the knowledge of this form of divination among the Hebrews. Still it is significant that in the list of various kinds of diviners — Deut. 18 10-11 — there is no mention of hepatoscopy, so that we are not justified in going further than the assumption that the רֹאֶה was applied to a divining priest who looks at or inspects some material object as a means of forecasting the course of events or of furnishing an answer to a question. We are not told how Samuel proceeds to furnish an answer to the question put to him by Saul, but perhaps some significance is to be attached to the detail that Samuel speaks to Saul "on the roof" and according to one version "at sunrise."[20] The time of sunrise is a favorite one for performing incantation rites and for other ritualistic acts.[21] Is the conference "on the roof" perhaps to be taken as an allusion to divination through the heavenly phenomena? It would be natural that in the narrative, which portrays Samuel as a faithful Jahweh worshiper, details contradictory to the spirit of the Pentateuchal ideals and of the prophetical views should be suppressed, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, should quietly disappear from the narrative. If there be any force to this hypothesis, it would indicate that as applied to

[18] Pr. 7 23 "splitting the liver" in the sense of killing, where כָּבֵד is used as a synonym of נֶפֶשׁ. See also Lam. 2 11 "my liver is poured out on the earth," where again "liver" is a synonym of "soul."

[19] See Jastrow, *Rel. Babyl. und Assyr.*, ii. p. 231, note 10, where the proof is given — following Moore — that the יֹתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד (Ex. 29 13. 22, Lev. 3 4. 10. 15 7 4 8 16. 25 9 10. 19) is the *lobus caudatus*.

[20] 1 Sam. 9 26.

[21] See Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babyl.-Assyr. Religion*, pp. 100, 104, 112, 141, etc.; Tallquist, *Assyrische Beschwörungsserie, Maqlû Serie*, p. 83. The time for invoking the spirits is during the night up to the time of dawn.

Samuel, the term רֹאֶה had already reached the stage represented by the use of *bârû* in Babylonian as the divining priest in general.

Outside of Samuel, the title "the *rô'ēh*" is bestowed on one other personage only, namely Hanani, who comes to Asa, king of Judah (2 Chr. 16 7-10), and foretells disaster through wars because the king "relied" upon Aram and not upon Jahweh. The story, to be sure, is found in Chronicles only, and for that reason might be open to suspicion. The use, however, of the old term רֹאֶה instead of the later one נָבִיא may be taken as an evidence at least of the antiquity of the tradition, if not of its authenticity.[22] The occurrence of a רֹאֶה — of one officially designated as such — in the days of Asa is a valuable indication of the continued use of the ancient term to the end of the tenth century. Asa's reign, it will be recalled, began in the twentieth year of Jeroboam, the first king of Israel, and extends, at all events, to the time of Omri, the sixth king of Israel, — but it is not till the days of the latter's son Ahab that a new religious type appears in the person of Elijah. Does this period perhaps represent the border-line, separating the רֹאֶה definitely from the נָבִיא?[23]

[22] The Greek version, it is to be noted, in many instances fails to note the distinction between רֹאֶה, חוֹזֶה, and נָבִיא, using προφήτης indiscriminately for all three. Thus for רֹאֶה we find ὁ βλέπων 1 Sam. 9 9. 11. 18, 1 Chr. 9 22 29 29, but 1 Chr. 26 28 προφήτης and so also 2 Chr. 16 7. 10 of Hanani; for חוֹזֶה we find προφήτης 2 Sam. 24 11, 2 Chr. 19 2 29 30 and 35 15 (plural), but ὁράω 2 Kl. 17 13, 1 Chr. 21 9, 2 Chr. 9 29 12 15 29 25, while 1 Chr. 29 29 ὁ βλέπων. A totally different word occurs once 1 Chr. 25 5. No doubt in some cases the correction to the more legitimate term προφήτης is intentional, just as in the Hebrew text רֹאֶה and חוֹזֶה are occasionally replaced by נָבִיא or the latter is added.

[23] In view of this reference to רֹאֶה in the days of Asa, one is tempted to correct the rather absurd בָּרִפְאִים in 2 Chr. 16 12 to בָּרֹאִים. The verse as it stands "even in his sickness he did not seek Jahweh but the physicians," followed by the statement, "and Asa slept with his fathers," would indicate a peculiar attitude towards the medical profession, which becomes intelligible only if we suppose the purpose of the Chronicler to have been to ironically suggest a connection between the king's seeking medical advice and his demise. If the proposed change appears too radical it seems to me that we ought at least to read: לֹא דָרַשׁ אֶת־יהוה כִּי בָרִפְאִים in the sense of "inquiring of the dead." The phrase דָּרַשׁ אֶת־יהוה means, of course, "to entreat

Turning now to חֹזֶה we find this term of far more frequent occurrence than רֹאֶה and in use to a much later period. It has already been remarked[24] that, just as the title "the *rō'ēh*" attaches to Samuel, so *ḥōzēh* seems to have clung to Gad, who is spoken of as the חֹזֵה דָּוִיד (1 Chr. 21 9, 2 Sam. 24 11) or חֹזֵה הַמֶּלֶךְ (2 Chr. 29 25) or simply as הַחוֹזֶה (1 Chr. 29 29). If, therefore, instead of הַחוֹזֶה we encounter הַנָּבִיא (1 Sam. 22 5) as the title of Gad, this is clearly a scribal correction[25] in order to give him the higher and more legitimate title. The proof for this is furnished by 2 Sam. 24 11, where we find both titles גַּד הַנָּבִיא חֹזֵה דָוִד, and where הַנָּבִיא is clearly a marginal gloss that has crept into the text. Since we never find the combination נָבִיא הַמֶּלֶךְ, it follows that the חֹזֶה was a special attendant — the official diviner as it were at the special service of the ruler. Similarly, Heman (1 Chr. 25 5) and Jeduthun (2 Chr. 35 15) are designated as חֹזֵה הַמֶּלֶךְ, and since both of these as well as Asaf are connected with the temple service as Levites and "singers" (הַמְשֹׁרְרִים 1 Chr. 15 19 Heman, Asaf, Ethan, for which 2 Chr. 5 12 has Heman, Asaf, and Jeduthun; הַלְוִיִּם 1 Chr. 15 17, 2 Chr. 5 12), the prophetic powers associated with them (1 Chr. 25 1 הַנִּבְּאִים בְּכִנֹּרוֹת בְּנְבָלִים וּבִמְצִלְתָּיִם) are, as in the case of the רֹאֶה, not dissociated originally from priestly functions. The term, therefore, likewise belongs to an early period in the religious history of the Hebrews, when divination formed a part of

Jahweh" (*e.g.* 1 Ki. 22 5. 8, Is. 31 1, Jer. 10 21, Ez. 20 1, Hos. 10 12, Ps. 34 5, 2 Chr. 22 9 26 5 etc.), but the verb דָּרַשׁ is also used of inquiring of the dead, *e.g.* Deut. 18 11 (דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים), Is. 8 19 (הֲלֹא־עַם אֶל־אֱלֹהָיו יִדְרֹשׁ בְּעַד הַחַיִּים אֶל־הַמֵּתִים), and since רְפָאִים is a synonym of מֵתִים (*e.g.* Is. 26 14, Ps. 88 11), the phrase admits of the interpretation proposed. The change, which adds but a single letter, may also have been intentional, to avoid the objectionable term in the case of a "good" king. It may, perhaps, not be out of place to suggest also that the reference to the king's sickness at the end of 1 Ki. 15 23 is a late gloss based upon the fuller story in Chronicles and introduced as a reference thereto.

[24] See above, p. 43.

[25] The change of חֹזֶה into נָבִיא is due, of course, on the one hand to the influence of the later view which regarded all legitimate servants of Jahweh as genuine "prophets," and on the other, to the gradual fading out of the tradition which had once differentiated between a חֹזֶה and a נָבִיא.

the priestly office and before the period of the differentiation of the diviner from the true prophet of Jahweh and the concomitant differentiation between "prophet" and "priest." That the prophecy connected with the *Ḥôzim* was of a lower order is indicated by the mention of musical instruments in the passage in 1 Chr. 25 1 as part of the prophetic outfit, which places them in the same category with the singing dervishes whom Saul encounters.[26] The title חֹזֶה attaches also to Jeddo (2 Chr. 9 29) or Iddo (2 Chr. 12 15) in whose case we likewise encounter a scribal correction or gloss הַנָּבִיא. Lastly, Jehu, the son of Hanani, is in one place (2 Chr. 19 2) called הַחֹזֶה, though in the parallel passages 1 Ki. 16 7. 12 we find הַנָּבִיא, while the Greek version also has ὁ προφήτης in 2 Chr. 19 2, and the Vatican Codex omits the designation altogether in 1 Ki. 16 7 — indications that point to the later neglect of once existent differentiations under the influence of the post-exilic view which favored the application of נָבִיא to all the men of the past who were portrayed as speaking in the name of Jahweh. That, however, the חֹזֶה just as the רֹאֶה was at one time sharply differentiated from the נָבִיא is shown by the equally persistent attaching of the latter term to certain personages of the older period of Hebrew history; as *e.g.* Nathan, who is called "the prophet" in no less than fourteen passages. Such a passage as 1 Chr. 29 29, where the three personages

[26] The instruments mentioned in 1 Sam. 10 5 are נֵבֶל, תֹּף, חָלִיל, and כִּנּוֹר, practically the same instruments as in the case of Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun (1 Chr. 25 6) except that מְצִלְתַּיִם as חֲצֹצְרוֹת (1 Chr. 16 42) represents probably a later addition to the outfit. Note also that in the second version of the story of Saul's appearance among the prophets (1 Sam. 19 20) נִבְּאִים is used just as 1 Chr. 25 2, which suggests that the names of the instruments have been suppressed in this version. The existence of an Arabic equivalent *el-Ḥâzî*, designating in the pre-Islamic period a diviner of the same grade as the *Kâhin* and the *'Arrâb*, may be regarded as another proof of the antiquity of the חֹזֶה among the Hebrews; and, like the latter, the Arabic *Ḥâzî* is used for the diviner who predicts the future through the interpretation of external signs, as *e.g.* the flight of birds — not through an oracle directly given to him — and apparently also through the observation of the stars. See Hoffmann in *ZAW*, III. p. 92, and particularly the passage from Ibn el-Athîr, in which *'Arrâb* is explained as *el-munaǧǧim*, "the star diviner." Cf. also Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidenthums*, p. 134.

associated with the careers of Saul and David are given their distinctive titles — Samuel the *rô'ēh*, Nathan the *nābî*, and Gad the *ḥôzēh* — is particularly instructive as pointing to the distinction once recognized between these three terms. Even if the mention of Samuel be regarded as a late gloss, the juxtaposition of Gad and Nathan is justified by 2 Chr. 29 25, where we again find these two personages distinguished, Gad as חוֹזֵה הַמֶּלֶךְ, and Nathan as הַנָּבִיא, and the two represented as the chief assistants to David in the regulation of the affairs of his reign.[27] Taking Gad as the type of the חוֹזֶה, we have distinct indications that he is consulted by David, as Samuel is by Saul, in order to determine what course he is to pursue. Thus when David comes to the king of Moab and asks that his parents should remain there "until I find out what Elohim will do to me" (1 Sam. 22 3), there is clearly implied an intention on the part of David to divine the future, and we accordingly find Gad telling him, "Do not remain in ambush, but get thee to the land of Judah" (1 Sam. 22 5). Again, we find Gad intervening when, after the counting of the people, David is portrayed as having become conscious of having sinned. The king appeals to Jahweh (2 Sam. 24 10), and through Gad the answer comes that one of three things is to happen: (1) seven years of famine, (2) flight from the enemy within three months, *i.e.* discomfiture in war, or (3) pestilence for three days. These utterances are precisely the kind of alternative interpretation of signs that we encounter in the various classes of omen-texts of Babylonia and Assyria, and it is only reasonable to conclude that the חוֹזֶה, like the Babylonian *bârû*-priest, had recourse to some method of divination by means of which he secured specific answers to inquiries put to him. The חוֹזֶה thus comes close to the רֹאֶה, but, if we may judge from Samuel and Gad as the typical *rô'ēh* and *ḥôzēh* respectively,

[27] The verse contains two scribal expansions (1) בְּיַד יְהוָה הַמְּצַוָּה, an explanation which a compiler found it necessary to add in order to indicate that the "commands" of David, Gad, and Nathan were in reality God's commands, and (2) בְּיַד נְבִיאָיו is added to make it definite that Jahweh revealed himself through these two "prophets." The gloss points again to the later abandonment of the distinction between the חוֹזֶה and the נָבִיא proper.

the former is a priest and diviner to whom any one may come and for pay obtain answers to an inquiry, whereas the latter is more specifically the official diviner of the court, accompanying the king on his expeditions. While too much stress must not be laid on such a distinction which may turn out to be accidental, yet it is worthy of note that Asaf, Heman, and Jeduthun, as *ḥôzîm*, are likewise officials, while Iddo and Shemajah "the prophet" (2 Chr. 12 15) in the days of Rehoboam correspond to Gad and Nathan in the days of David.

Is it possible to differentiate still further between the functions of the רֹאֶה and those of the חוֹזֶה? George Adam Smith in his Introduction to the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (p. 17) renders the former as "seer" and the latter as "gazer." The distinction is justified in a measure by the way in which the underlying stems are used, for although in some passages, *e.g.* Prov. 22 29 29 20, חָזָה is used precisely as רָאָה,[28] in general it may be said that רָאָה is a deliberate act of looking at something or looking for something, whereas חָזָה is a recognition of something that comes to one's sight involuntarily. If רֹאֶה is the "inspector" who looks for a sign and interprets it, the חוֹזֶה is the one to whom a sign appears, and who recognizes its meaning when it manifests itself. Hence the common meaning of the word is "to have a vision," *i.e.* to encounter or receive a sign of some kind. Now in ancient divination we find everywhere two classes of signs, one that we may group under voluntary divination, the other under involuntary divination.[29] In the case, *e.g.*, of heptascopy, the liver is deliberately examined for the purpose of securing an answer, whereas, *e.g.*, in the case of reading the signs of the heavens, or the signs involved in the flight of birds, or in the case of dreams or a vision, the signs themselves are independent of one's own volition. Astrology, therefore, and "bird-gazing," like dream interpreta-

[28] Even in these two passages, חזה might be rendered by "encounter," whereas if ראה were used, it might have the force of "seek out."

[29] See the author's paper, "Hepatoscopy and Astrology in Babylonia" (*Proc. Am. Philos. Society*, xlvii. pp. 646 sq.).

tion and visions, fall under the head of involuntary divination. We have one passage, Is. 47 13, where the verb is associated with the stars, הַבְּרֵי שָׁמַיִם הַחֹזִים בַּכּוֹכָבִים[30] and where one could hardly use the verb רָאָה without losing the full force conveyed in חָזָה of receiving a sign through the stars. From the application to involuntary divination, חָזָה would therefore be the proper designation of a vision of any kind that is sent to one, or that one encounters, and it is in this broad sense that the noun חָזוֹן — occurring no less than thirty-five times in the Old Testament — is used. Since the "vision" was associated also with the legitimate prophets, the word חָזוֹן lost its objectionable associations, and Jahwistic pietists had no hesitation in applying the term to the prophecies of Isaiah (1 1 22 1. 5, 2 Chr. 32 32), Nahum (1 1), Obadiah (1 1), and it will be recalled that in the Book of Daniel it is constantly applied to the visions of Daniel (8 1-2. 13. 15. 17. 26 9 21, etc.). But while this is true for חָזוֹן, the term חֹזֶה retained more of its original flavor, and was generally applied in a contemptuous sense by the Jewish zealots to designate the illegitimate נָבִיא. This sense is implied also in the insult offered by Amaziah, the priest, to Amos (7 12), when, addressing him as חֹזֶה, he tells him to be off to Judah and earn his living there. It is more clearly brought out in Is. 30 10, where the prophet, putting himself in the position of those who consult רֹאִים and חֹזִים, rebukes the people for endeavoring to bribe them to announce only agreeable news, "who say to the *rô'îm*, do not see, and to the *ḥôzîm*, do not gaze correct things for us," etc. There is likewise a slur intended in the expression of the Chronicler (2 Chr. 33 18), "and the rest of the words of Manasseh and his prayer to God and the words of the חֹזִים who spoke to him in the name of Jahweh," etc. Manasseh, being a "wicked" king, those who announce decisions to him, though pretending to speak in the name of Jahweh are not

[30] Zimmern, *Beiträge*, ii. p. 85, note 8, suggests the possibility that the Babylonian *bârê* may be concealed here, just as Haupt proposed to read בּרִים for בּרִים in Isa. 44 25. The objection to the conjecture lies in the circumstance that parallel with "signs" and "enchantment" one expects the mention of a *form* of divination but not the designation of a class of diviners.

worthy (from the Chronicler's point of view), to be called נְבִיאִים.

The scribal correction of חוֹזֶה to נָבִיא in so many passages, as above pointed out, furnishes a further proof of the thesis that the term חוֹזֶה had a certain opprobrium attached to it. In Ezekiel also this opprobrium is apparent, since his references to חוֹזִים are in practically all cases to those who deceive the people, as *e.g.* 13 16 הַחוֹזִים לָהּ חָזוֹן שָׁלוֹם וְאֵין שָׁלוֹם, though it should be noted that in the same verse he introduces נְבִיאִים as a synonym of חוֹזִים. The general attitude of Ezekiel, however, is shown by his association of the חוֹזִים with קֹסְמִים "diviners," *e.g.* 13 23 22 28.

The question naturally arises — why did נָבִיא finally come to be the term adopted for the true prophet of Jahweh, seeing that, as the passage in Samuel (1 Sam. 10 5) as well as other references show, the נָבִיא is likewise a figure belonging to the early period in the religious history of Israel, and a figure, moreover, that does not impress one as at one time standing on a much higher grade than the רֹאֶה or חוֹזֶה? Without entering into the vexed question of the etymology of the term, there is one feature which distinguishes the *nābî* even in the early stages of his development from the רֹאֶה and the חוֹזֶה. He does not have recourse to *external* means of divining the will and intention of the gods. Neither hepatoscopy nor the reading of the planets and stars is his province. He does not interpret signs and portents, but lays claim to a direct revelation. Like his modern prototype, — the howling dervish, — the ancient נָבִיא depended merely upon music and singing to put himself into an ecstatic condition and in this condition to obtain the revelation of the divine will.

Despite, therefore, the abyss separating the band of singing dervishes whom Saul encounters from such types as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, they have this in common that they are free from the material means in the exercise of the functions that constitute so essential an ingredient of the equipment of the Babylonian *bârû*, whether in his original capacity as an "inspector" of the liver of the sacrificial animal, or in

his amplified capacity as the "gazer" and interpreter of the planets and stars, or as the one who reads the future through the action of bubbles of oil in a basin of water, or as the one who interprets the flight of birds or what not. The opposition to *all* kinds of divination — voluntary and involuntary — crops out frequently in the Pentateuchal codes,[21] as well as to all kinds of incantations and necromancy, while in the prophets we encounter this opposition at almost every turn. It was natural, therefore, that the רֹאֶה and the חוֹזֶה should have been rejected as unworthy designations for those to whom the distinction was assigned of being the direct mouthpiece of a Deity who was not to be worshiped through any material symbol, and who could not be approached through material devices. The נָבִיא, even in his most primitive form, was at least free from such objectionable associations, and, as a matter of fact, he follows along a line of development diverging sharply after a certain epoch from that of the ordinary diviner. He receives his oracles directly, and does not divine the will of the Deity through interpretation of omens. He is essentially, as Mohammed also called himself, a "warner,"[22] and it is because his warnings necessarily reach out to the future that his utterances frequently become prophecies in the ordinary acceptation of the term — frequently, but by no means always. His main purpose is to speak out in the name of a Deity, to speak forth rather than to foretell. It is therefore a mistaken view of the later tradition which regarded the רֹאֶה as the prototype of the נָבִיא. The *rô'ēh* is a diviner as is the *ḥôzēh*. Both make use of material means to divine the will and purpose of the gods, whereas the נָבִיא was always the direct mouthpiece of a god, and therefore became the type and the appropriate designation of the class of men that embodied the protest against all manner of divination.

[21] See especially the long list, Deut. 18 10. 11.

[22] Sura 22 48 29 49 38 70 46 8 51 50. 51 71 1, etc.