THE RELATION OF PRIEST AND PROPHET IN THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL BEFORE THE EXILE.

THAT Prophecy, as developed among the Hebrews, has proved a world-force no one can well deny. Dr Cornill has aptly said 'Through Prophecy Israel became the prophet of mankind'.[1] Any question, therefore, which concerns itself with the history of Hebrew prophecy is *eo ipso* worth the asking. The very fact that the Prophets are held in such high estimation amongst us nowadays only makes us the more anxious to ascertain all that we may as to their relation to their immediate environment.

How did the Prophet strike his contemporaries? How far did he fit in with the ordinarily recognized institutions of his day, and what was his attitude towards them? Was he an original and essential factor in the life of the nation, or was he the creation of external and abnormal circumstances? Was Prophecy a necessary element in Israelite religion, or was it a protest against the official worship of the day? All these are problems which call for a solution, and that solution may probably best be found, not in abstract theories, but in the personal relations of Priest and Prophet in the national life before the Exile.

To discuss the relation of any one class of persons to any other it is necessary not only to view them as they appear to us at a given moment of their history, but also to try and discover something about their origin and early circumstances; for we may find that the earlier period of their connexion will to some extent explain what at first sight seems inexplicable in their subsequent relation. A further elucidation may also be obtained if we consider and compare the relation of such classes or types in other places and times than those of Old Testament history. Our method, then, must be at once evolutionary and comparative.

First, as to origins. It is commonly said that in remote

[1] Cornill *Hebrew Prophecy* p. 17.

antiquity priest and prophet are identical, the sorcerer being the ancestor of both alike. Thus Réville tells us: 'Dans les pays de la non-civilisation le sorcier, ou l'homme en rapport personnel avec les esprits, condense en quelque sorte en lui-même les éléments dont la divergence fera plus tard le prêtre, le prophète, le médecin, le juriste et même le philosophe et l'artiste.'[1]

And primitive Semitic antiquity is apparently no exception to this rule, for there, we are told, 'the priest and the prophet started from a common base',[2] and 'the Arabian kâhin was both seer and priest'.[3]

But if there is a common origin, it is soon lost sight of, and, even in the most primitive races, priest and sorcerer are not identical. A differentiation of function takes place. Thus amongst the Zulus we find witch and witch-doctor, and 'black' and 'white' shamans in Siberia. And amongst the Arabs magic is still divided into 'high' and 'low', 'Divine' and 'Satanic'. The reasons for this differentiation may be variously explained. Dr Frazer would make the distinction between religion and magic responsible.[4] Lord Avebury supposes difference of race to be the cause.[5] Dr Jevons perhaps more rightly says as to the two types: 'The one class derive their powers from the god who protects and is worshipped by the community, the other from spirits who are bound by no ties of fellowship or goodwill to the community.'[6]

But whatever be the cause, the fact remains that 'une régularisation et une transformation de la sorcellerie primitive'[7] is what really constituted the priesthood. In early times, also, the connexion between temporal and spiritual chief was always very close. Among primitive races priest-kings are still found, being considered, perhaps, as representatives of the national deity.[8] In Babylonia and in Egypt alike the king was head-priest of

[1] Réville *Histoire des Religions* i 105.

[2] O. C. Whitehouse in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* iv 598[a] s. v. 'Soothsayer'.

[3] A. B. Davidson *ib.* iv 109[a] s. v. 'Prophecy'.

[4] Frazer *Golden Bough* i 64–69.

[5] Avebury *Origin of Civilisation* 5th ed. p. 375 'the lower races of men have no priests properly so called'.

[6] Jevons *Introduction to the History of Religion* p. 289.

[7] Réville *op. cit.* ii 74.

[8] Cp. Frazer *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* pp. 12 ff, 378 ff.

the nation, and amongst the nomad Semites the sheik was the chief-priest of the tribe. Amongst the Israelites, however, the two types are by degrees separated, and when the king appears he is not merely the head of the national cult, but a warrior who delegates most of his inherent sacerdotal powers. So then there was a gradual crystallization of the priesthood, as it became differentiated alike from ruler and from sorcerer.[1]

Now two points are to be noticed in regard to this process, which apply to Israel no less than to other nations.

First, priests tend to be an aristocratic body, as being recruited from the better born and more intelligent members of the community. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the poor are never priests. Secondly, a residuum is left of unauthorized 'religious' persons and practices which may be ultimately either abandoned, or absorbed, or perhaps allowed to exist on sufferance. Such a residuum is generally inferior to the 'established' order or cult, but yet, by its very freedom from recognition and from consequent restraint, possessed of great potentialities. This mass of undeveloped material lies ready for use by any new religious force or enthusiasm with which the authorized priestly body declines to be associated.

Such is the origin of priesthood, an institution which at the outset provides the opportunity for the growth and developement of an independent prophecy. Let us see how this is illustrated by the history of the priests and prophets of Israel in their various relations to one another.

A word of warning is first necessary, however. We should remember that value does not necessarily imply dignity of origin; and secondly, that, even when we strike the roots of prophecy, we cannot always trace its subsequent growth continuously. Prophecy is full of sudden inspirations, in which 'the Spirit bloweth where it listeth', and neither can we, nor could the priests of Israel, or even the prophets themselves, ever wholly explain its phenomena.

[1] That the priesthood should retain certain 'magical' characteristics is only to be expected. Thus R. Smith in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* s. v. 'Priest' says: 'The *opus operatum* of the priest has the power of the sorcerer's spell.' In the figure of Balaam, the foreign (or perhaps Kenite) seer, prophet, priest, and magician all seem to be blended.

1. A discussion that concerns itself with the history of Israel must necessarily begin with Moses, the founder of the nation. The actual existence of Moses can scarcely be denied. Even if we allow to the utmost for 'tendency writing' in the various accounts of him which we possess, yet there must surely be a historical personage behind it all. The Exodus was the birthday of Israel and could never fade from its remembrance, and the events of the Exodus 'demand for their explanation such a personality as the sources give us in Moses'.[1] But granted the existence of such a person, what attributes may we legitimately predicate of him? Is it true to say that Moses was both priest and prophet, and that in him these two types found a real union? That Moses was a religious sheik or prince-priest after the manner of the Midianite Jethro seems fairly certain.[2] That he was the father of the priests is probably a historical fact, and best accounts for the origin of the priestly 'tribe of Levi'.[3] But is it strictly accurate to speak of Moses as 'both priest and prophet',[4] and as being the father of prophecy? In one sense Moses was certainly a prophet, for through him Yahweh was revealed to Israel. But to speak of Moses as a prophet, and the first of a continuous line of prophets, is something of an anachronism. The prophets of the eighth and following centuries preferred to think of Moses as a prophet rather than a priest, because in their eyes prophecy was the most direct medium of revelation. It is not unfair to say that the more important the individual prophet becomes in the history of the religion of Israel, the more is this position reflected in the accounts of Moses which we possess. The priest and the prophet have 'contended for' the person of Moses. The means which, according to the oldest tradition, Moses appointed for the perpetuation of the national worship of Yahweh as the God of Israel was not prophecy, but the priesthood of Levi[5] and the priestly oracle of

[1] Kittel *History of the Hebrews*, English translation, p. 239.

[2] Cp. Cheyne *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* p. 523: 'the prevalent North Arabian form of government was probably the theocratic, in which the ruler was God's viceroy and therefore also God's priest.'

[3] Cp. Wellhausen *History of Israel* p. 397 n. 1 and p. 438.

[4] W. R. Smith *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* p. 303, &c.

[5] Cp. Judges xvii 13, with its preference for 'the Levite' Jonathan-ben-Gershom-ben-Mōsheh.

Urim and Thummim. From the decisions of this oracle to the later Corpus of Jewish Law we can trace a gradual and continuous developement. The priests, then, by means of the sacred oracle were to be the 'teachers of Israel'.[1] It is their failure in this respect which is denounced by the early writing prophets. But such failure was largely the result of degeneration, and not of inherent weakness. Mr Montefiore in his Hibbert Lectures strongly insists upon the importance of the priests in the early period of the settlement in Canaan. 'The one means by which the higher teaching of Moses could be maintained and handed down was the agency of the priests.' 'No other institution makes an impression of being so purely Israelite as the priesthood and its Torah. It is with good reason that they are referred back to Moses as their founder.'[2] Budde too gives the priests of this period an honourable place amongst the Champions of Yahweh.[3] The fact that the worship of Yahweh was kept alive in the new territory says something for the priesthood of the day. No doubt the Ark of Yahweh was the centre of the best Mosaic tradition, and it is at Shiloh, the resting-place of the Ark, that we are introduced to Eli, who holds an important position as priest-in-charge of the Temple of the Ark.

But in the days of Eli we reach a transition period, and the tradition of the misconduct of his sons is probably a genuine intimation of undue Canaanite predominance in the worship of Israel.

2. The priests were, no doubt, assisted by the warriors of Israel in the continuance of Yahweh worship, for Yahweh was a God of war, and warfare in the name of Baal would have been impossible.[4] 'Religious' and 'national' were synonymous terms. Every war of the invaders was a holy war in the name of Yahweh, who came from Sinai to help His people in their battles. It is easy to see that religious enthusiasm and military success were inseparably connected,[5] and that a decline in adherence to the national God impaired the national efficiency. It was important,

[1] Cp. Deut. xxxiii.

[2] Montefiore *Hibbert Lectures* pp. 56, 71.

[3] Budde *The Religion of Israel to the Exile* iii.

[4] Cp. 'Song of Deborah,' Judges v.

[5] R. Smith, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* s. v. 'Prophet', says: 'It was perhaps only in time of war, when he felt himself to be fighting the battles of Jehovah, that the Hebrew was stirred to the depths of his nature by emotions of a religious colour.'

then, to keep alive at all costs a trust in Yahweh as the God of Israel. In times of national depression, the priesthood seems to have proved unequal to the task. Deborah, an inspired woman,[1] was the soul of the Israelite revolt against the oppression of Sisera and his allies. And later it was not the priesthood but another religious force which roused the national enthusiasm to resist the Philistine supremacy. How was it that the priesthood was thus found wanting, and that nascent prophecy supplied a solution of the difficulty?

In the first place, the 'local' character of the priesthood was no doubt responsible. In old days when Israel was nomadic, this localization was not without its advantages. The priest was the settled servant of the sanctuary, and amid all the restlessness of the nomadic life he remained fixed to his post. But in Canaan this advantage ceased, and the increase in the number of religious centres tended to promote disunion. The old tribal organization, also, was beginning to disappear, and no proper territorial system of government was yet in force. Every town and village had its shrine and priest in attendance, and mountains, springs, and trees might all be 'places of worship', while festivals were local rather than national. Centralization both religious and political was sorely needed.

Secondly, the priesthood was not only local, it was rapidly becoming Canaanite. 'The seats of ancient Canaanitish heathenism had power to master the Israelitish conquerors of Canaan, who had from the very beginning been accustomed to a worship which was not dissimilar to that of the conquered.'[2] But it is scarcely true to speak of the Canaanites as yet 'conquered'. Many of the principal towns were either in the hands of Canaanites or still contained a large native element in their population.[3] The Book of Judges lets us into the secret that the country was only very

[1] The later prose version of Judges iv makes her both 'prophetess' and 'judge'.

[2] Cp. Curtiss *Primitive Semitic Religion of To-day* p. 58.

[3] Cp. Marti *Religion of the Old Testament* p. 104: 'In the case of the Israelites it is exceptionally easy to understand how the Canaanite culture came to be taken over. They learned agriculture from the inhabitants of the country, and naturally, at the same time, also the cultus which was so intimately connected with it.' For a somewhat similar 'superimposition of cults' we may compare the case of Greece with its Achaean and Pelasgian, Olympian and Clithonic deities—strata in religion corresponding to strata in population; vide Miss Harrison *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* passim.

gradually and very partially conquered, while excavators are now shewing that there is no violent break between the 'Canaanite' and 'Early Israelite' periods of the history of Palestine. The Philistine supremacy doubtless favoured the enemies of Israel, and there seems to have been a definite alliance between Canaanite and Philistine against the uncivilized invader. Of the oracles of Israel many were in the hands of the enemy, others were more Canaanite than Hebrew, while some perhaps, knowing the enemy's strength, cautiously 'Philistinized'. And last, and perhaps most important of all, the Ark, which was venerated as something more than a mere symbol of Yahweh's presence, fell into the hands of the enemy. The official religion must necessarily have come into disrepute, and the priest have declined in popular esteem.

Tradition tells us that it was Samuel[1] who changed all this, who rescued Israel from the Philistine, and restored the national religion. But, as in the case of Moses, we have to treat the later accounts with great caution. Three points, however, stand out clearly as regards Samuel: that he was a Seer, that he gave Israel a king, and that in his days the *benê nebi'im* first came into prominence. Seer, king, and prophetic guild were all in their degree signs of 'the same Spirit',[2] an awakened religious and national enthusiasm. The exact relation of Samuel to the new movement is hard to determine. The oldest account represents him as a local 'seer' of the Ephraimite hill country,[3] to whom Saul has resort when he fails to find his father's asses. When visited, Samuel not only tells Saul that the asses are found, but that he is destined by God to be king over Israel.

The anointing of Saul as king is in this narrative the act of Samuel the Seer, as the result of a direct inspiration. In the later account, Saul is elected king by lot, in spite of Samuel's warning. This election by lot is possibly in accordance with the view of the narrator that Samuel was a priest,—the chief function of the priest being, as we have seen, the handling of the sacred lot or oracle.

[1] Cp. Lord Cromer *Modern Egypt* ii 63 (of Mahdiism): 'A period of political hurricane, whether the scene be laid in savage Africa, or in civilized Europe, generally brings to the front some *individual* who appears to embody in his own person the genius of the principles which it is sought to assert.'

[2] The Books of Samuel, like Acts, are the Acts of the Spirit in the early Church.

[3] The name of the town is not mentioned.

Now in the same way that we were compelled to ask the question whether Moses was really prophet as well as priest, so also we must enquire whether Samuel was priest as well as prophet. The later narratives imply that he was a priest in the full sense of the word. Are we to reject such a tradition entirely? When much smoke is seen, it is generally explained by the existence of some fire, however small; and it may be that this later tradition embodies a certain truth, when it tells us that Samuel was a temple servant at Shiloh under Eli. If this is fact, it throws some light on the position of Samuel with regard to the formation of the prophetic bodies, and probably signifies that, knowing the 'inner workings' of the official priesthood, he deliberately turned to the sons of the prophets from a reasoned preference for the newer institution.

It is probable that both Canaanite and Israelite sanctuaries contained a more numerous *personnel* than we have been wont to suppose. If Samuel was 'given to' Yahweh as a child born of the sanctuary,[1] his service may not have been of the dignity of Eli's, or even of that of Eli's sons. It seems probable that there were degrees of priesthood and 'minor orders', even in the earliest Israelite ministry.[2] Possibly the giving of the oracle was a privilege only of the few.

It is to be noticed that there is a 'prophetic' element even in Samuel's official ministry at the Temple of Shiloh. While sleeping in the sacred precinct he receives a divine message, probably in a dream.[3] Perhaps Samuel was not the only

[1] For 'children of the shrine' cp. Frazer *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* p. 81 ff, with reference to the burials in jars at Taanach, Jericho, &c. Possibly Jer. ii 27 and 1 Sam. x 12 contain allusions to the practice. Cp. also Curtiss *op. cit.* p. 153: 'One thus consecrated becomes (nowadays) a dervish if a Moslem, and a monk if a Christian.'

[2] As to 'degrees of priesthood' cp. Cheyne *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* p. 523 f: 'A Môsheh-clan arose which attached itself to the tribe of Levi, the tribe which combined religious enthusiasm with warlike energy, and became the guardian of the sacred objects. The higher priesthood existed side by side with the lower. The work of the former was to report divine oracles, and give decisions in the name of God; that of the lower, to attend to the cultus, to guard the holy vessels, and, if need were, to fight. Môsheh, as has been noticed by Nielsen, represents the higher style of priest, Aharôn the lower. Both are connected by E with Levi.' It is worthy of notice that Samuel is to Eli as Joshua was to Moses.

[3] For 'dreamers' cp. Strabo xvi 11 35 (Jerusalem). Sleeping-places for dreamers have been discovered on Sinai.

'young man' who 'dreamed dreams' in the sanctuaries of that day.

When we first meet with Samuel in the older narrative, he is an independent seer or 'man of God' resembling in many respects the later Elijah or Elisha. But even now he is not independent of the sanctuary. He goes up to the high place to bless the sacrifice at the local festival.[1] He lives in the city which was probably on the side of a hill below the sacred *bamah*.

The picture of Samuel the Seer which is thus given us points to the acknowledged existence of 'a man of God' of considerable local celebrity. Saul knows of the existence of such persons and knows how they are usually to be approached, i. e. with money in the hand. That there were professing clairvoyants of this kind need not surprise us, when we remember that from the first the establishment of a regular priesthood leaves very frequently a large residuum of unappropriated material. And if our conjecture be true as to Samuel's service at Shiloh, the official cult was not altogether without such methods. There seem, however, to be hints in the older narrative that the 'seer' was a person beloved of the people, and it may be that the Israelite priesthood of that day was, as is sometimes the case, an aristocratic and 'undemocratic' body.

We have spoken of Samuel at the sanctuary and Samuel as the seer[2]; it now remains to speak of him in connexion with the *benê nebi'im* or Sons of the Prophets. We are told by many writers on Old Testament history that Samuel was responsible for 'the regulation and organization of prophetism'.[3] Such an assertion however depends upon the rendering of a doubtful passage in the Hebrew text. Not only is the reading doubtful,

[1] 1 Sam. ix 12–14.

[2] The relation between 'seer' and priest in primitive Semitism is obscure (cp. Balaam). The seers may have constituted an 'irregular' or decadent priesthood. Cp. the *kāhin* and *kōhēn*. Driver ap. *Priesthood and Sacrifice* p. 19 says: 'The kāhin gradually sank his connexion with *the sanctuary* and became a mere diviner; the *kōhēn* grew in importance, and acquired sacrificial and other functions.'

[3] So Ottley *Bampton Lectures* p. 270. Cp. also Paton *Syria and Palestine* p. 173: 'It is safe to infer that he organized the ecstatics into communities, and thus made their influence more effective.'

but the date of the passage seems to be very late.[1] It may, however, be an independent addition, added by a redactor, but embodying a popular tradition. We may well believe that Samuel gave these enthusiasts his support, as being imbued with 'the same Spirit' which had led him to anoint Saul king[2]; but we cannot go further and regard him as their founder, organizer, and 'Superior'. That there was a distinction between the Seer and the prophetic bands is fairly clear,[3] and no doubt this distinction was permanent, so that even the later Elijah and Elisha, though approving of the sons of the prophets, are consciously upon a higher level. The term *ro'eh*, seer, was applied to Samuel, but not to the prophetic bands, and later the individual prophet and the prophetic guild come into conflict.

The origin and history of these 'Sons of the Prophets' requires a more thorough treatment than it has yet received. The present investigation only takes them into account in so far as they came into contact with the priesthood of their time. That they had some connexion with the ordinary worship of the day we must inevitably suppose. Was their relation to it friendly or antagonistic? Did they merely oppose the official cult, and owe their continued existence to that fact, or were they not rather supplementary to, and gradually organized by, the recognized religious system?

We have already seen that the national depression under the Philistine supremacy required a re-awakening of the religious and national enthusiasm.

Now such re-awakenings in Semitic countries are fairly constant in their form of expression. The Dervish seems to be a common phenomenon of oriental history,[4] and it is probably from a study of the Dervishes that light will come upon the

[1] Stenning in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* s.v. 'Samuel' puts the passage amongst the 'latest additions'. So also Kautzsch in his *Outline of Old Testament Literature* p. 238 attributes it to R, but cp. p. 120.

[2] That the Spirit was abroad and was 'infectious' we can judge from 1 Sam. x 6, 10 (J), &c. Cp. Davidson *Old Testament Prophecy* p. 44.

[3] Cp. Kraetzschmar *Prophet und Seher im alten Israel* p. 23. In modern times also 'besides those Dervishes regularly affiliated with an order there are individuals who travel from place to place, and by feats of strength or sleight of hand manage to earn a livelihood', *New International Encyclopaedia* s.v. 'Dervish'.

[4] Cp. also the outbreak of the Slave War in Sicily when a Syrian slave simulated the prophetic ecstasy.

vexed problem of the origin of the prophetic bands in Palestine. The biblical narratives give several intimations that these were 'nomadic' in appearance and in sympathy, and so presumably in origin. The occasion, then, of their appearance was foreign oppression. But does this also supply an adequate reason for their continuance? Did they remain merely as a 'standing army' of religion,[1] prepared for the emergencies of foreign invasions into the social and religious life of the nation? We do indeed find such a living protest against foreign and civilizing corruption, but that rather in the sect of the Rechabites, who were avowedly nomadic and primitive. If the sons of the prophets had been of such a character, there would have been little room for the Rechabites. It would seem that these prophetic companies gradually lost their 'nomadic' character and came more into line with the ordinary religion of the day.

We know that on their first appearance in the biblical record the sons of the prophets are connected with the service of the high place. They seem to seek their inspiration not only from their musical instruments,[2] but also from the sacred locality. Thus it is scarcely accurate to speak of them as 'wandering freely about the country'.[3] There was something definitely 'local' in their origin, and in this they resembled the priests who were primarily 'servants of the shrine'.

We have already intimated—in our account of Samuel—that the ordinary conceptions of the *personnel* of the Canaanite sanctuaries, subsequently Israelite, require enlargement.[4]

Wellhausen's supposition that 'prophetic bands' existed amongst the Canaanites has been scouted as being unsupported by evidence. It is also said that Israel would not be likely to take over such an institution 'ready-made from her enemies'. But Wellhausen's assertion may be partly warranted by the facts of Semitic civilization.

Amongst the Phoenicians,[5] a race akin to the Canaanites both

[1] Piepenbring in his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* p. 117 calls them Israel's Salvation Army.

[2] Cp. the *zikr* of the Dervishes.

[3] Cp. Frazer *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* p. 68.

[4] Cp. also 1 Sam. ii 36, which seems to contrast the regularly installed priesthood with the hangers-on of the sanctuary.

[5] The Tyrian Baal has both priests and prophets. Cp. 1 Kings xviii, 2 Kings x. Lagrange *Origines Sémitiques* ch. vi 'Les personnes consacrées', quotes an inscrip-

in origin and in civilization, we find a numerous temple 'service'. In Ahab's time we have the 400 prophets of the Tyrian Baal supported by Jezebel. We know also from modern travellers in Syria and Arabia,[1] that there are many 'holy men' who are in attendance at the various holy places in addition to the regular priestly guardians. In Babylonia[2] the priesthood was also a very comprehensive body, and haruspices, exorcists, and chanters all went to swell its ranks.

Does this evidence lead us to suppose the identification of 'sons of the prophets' and the *kedeshim*[3]—those persons who are represented in the Old Testament[4] as marking the climax of heathenish worship? Such a conclusion is by no means inevitable. What we may say, however, is, that we have sufficient evidence for supposing that the sons of the prophets as an institution were favoured by the official priesthood, and may in some sense be regarded as supplementing that body. The Israelites had within their knowledge many precedents for adopting inspired persons or 'holy-men' amongst the personages of their religious cult. We saw at the outset how the history of religion involves a gradual authorization of the media for ascertaining the Divine will, and how the Israelite priesthood and sacred oracle owed their existence to such a 'recognition'. But we are nowhere told that the priesthood 'spoke in ecstasy'. Their methods would be almost entirely mechanical, and the answer by Urim seems to have been either 'Yea' or 'Nay'. The phenomenon of 'possession' required official acceptance, if it was to prove of national utility.[5] Such recognition was

tion of Citium as including priests, barbers, scribes, sacred women, and '*qedéchim*' = ? chiens, cp. Deut. xxiii 18; but he questions the identity of *kalabu* and *kemarim*. Lucian mentions Syrian prophets in connexion with the temples.

[1] Cp. Curtiss *op. cit.* for Syria, &c.

[2] For Babylonia cp. Lagrange *op. cit.*, and Jastrow *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*. Ebers *Aegypten und die Bücher Mosis* p. 341 f notes the existence of prophets amongst the Egyptian priesthood.

[3] Professor Kennett seems to so identify them, ap. Frazer *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* p. 64 n. 6.

[4] Only by the Deuteronomist, cp. 1 Kings xv 12, 1 Kings xiv 24, xxii 47, 2 Kings xxiii 7; cp. also Deut. xxiii 17, 'wages of a dog', and Josiah's reformation in 2 Kings xxiii 7.

[5] In Greece the Pythoness of Delphi became the established oracle. At its best period that oracle was 'the conscience of Greece'. It is noticeable that

actually given in the support and approval of the regular established ministry. So then, whatever their origin, the sons of the prophets became an integral part of the religious system of Israel. The children of the Spirit became in their turn an institution, and no doubt, by so doing, declined in some degree from their original virtues.[1]

3. We have said that king and prophetic guild were both manifestations of the same spirit of awakening, and king and prophet are very often found in contact throughout the history of Israel.[2] Saul bears many signs of affinity to the wild sons of the prophets, and no doubt they worked together for the salvation of their country.

With the priests Saul's relations were not so happy. We have no reason for supposing that the priests objected to the establishment of the monarchy,[3] but it seems that some of them at least transferred their allegiance from Saul. The Urim which had advised him so often in the conduct of his battles gave him now no response, and he could ascertain nothing either by dreams or from the prophets. In despair he turned to the 'black magic' of the wise woman of Endor, but only to be assured of his defeat.

While Saul was deprived of the support of the priestly oracle, we find that David was answered by it through Abiathar, the survivor of the massacre at Nob.[4] And after Saul's death David is told by the oracle to go up to Hebron,[5] and again, to wait

Apollo, the god of War and Inspiration, has many attributes in common with Yahweh.

[1] In Asia Minor an interesting parallel is to be found. Cp. Ramsay in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* s. v. 'Religion of Greece' on the *Hieroi*: 'The peculiar relation of the *hierodouloi* to the *Hieron* gave a power to the latter which was alien to the Hellenic spirit. . . . The relation of the *hieroi* to the *Hieron*, and their service at the *Hieron*, seem to have been more a voluntary matter.'

[2] In Phoenicia there was a close relation between the monarch and the temple cultus (e.g. Hiram). Frazer *op. cit.* p. 67 gives an instance of inspired royal pages at Byblus in the narrative of Wen-Ammon. The king was a sacred personage, and the prophets also were 'men of God'.

[3] The priesthood at Nob shewed David hospitality because he was 'on the king's business', 1 Sam. xxi 2.

[4] 1 Sam. xxx 7–8. David seems to have been the favourite of the priesthood as against Saul, the elected of the prophets, and it is possible that Levi and Judah were always connected, as being 'N. Arabian' tribes.

[5] 2 Sam. ii 1.

for the rustling of the mulberry trees before attacking the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim.[1]

The establishment of the Ark at Jerusalem was a masterstroke of policy on the part of David, for the Ark was at the least a symbol of Yahweh's presence. The recovery of this ancient object of veneration was the occasion for an outburst of religious enthusiasm on David's part not unlike that which had numbered Saul 'among the prophets'. David gave his support to priest and prophet alike. Gad the Seer, Nathan the Prophet, Abiathar and Zadok the Priests are all under royal patronage. David takes Nathan's advice on the subject of the building of the Temple—though the exact form of the advice is hard to determine[2]—and it was Nathan who rebuked David for his sin with Bathsheba. The priestly oracle seems to have been responsible for the blood-revenge taken upon Saul's sons, as the cure for the famine[3]; while 'the prophet Gad, David's seer', discovered the cause of a pestilence in David's numbering of the people.[4] The anointing of Solomon was performed by both 'Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet'.[5]

So at Jerusalem the priest and the prophet seem to start on equal terms,[6] both under the patronage of the reigning monarch. But the subsequent actions of the monarchy must have been largely responsible for the breach between priest and prophet soon to come. The royal patronage was not an unmixed blessing. The priests became the servants of the king.[7] This sometimes

[1] 2 Sam. v 24.

[2] 2 Sam. vii 1–12, 14–29. 'Deuteronomistic redactor perhaps founded on an exemplar furnished by the Jerusalem-Source', Kautzsch *Literature of the Old Testament* p. 239.

[3] 2 Sam. xxi 1–15 (Jer.).

[4] 2 Sam. xxiv 1–25, 'a passage of unknown origin', Kautzsch *loc. cit.* Budde attributes it to the oldest source.

[5] 1 Kings i 45, 'from a Judahite history of David of the tenth or ninth century', Kautzsch.

[6] But note that in Judah, although we have individual prophets and seers, there is no mention of 'prophetic guilds'.

[7] In Jerusalem the king seems to have been regarded as specially sacred. Perhaps there was a Canaanite tradition to that effect. The strange figure of Melchizedek may represent the old Canaanite priest-kings of Jerusalem. So David, making Jerusalem his capital, secured a like veneration for the Davidic dynasty. Professor Kennett has suggested that the *Molech* of 2 Kings xxiii 10 may have originally been the human king regarded as an incarnate deity. Cp. Frazer *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* p. 401 ff.

brought them high political office, as under Solomon; but the kings often treated the priesthood arbitrarily; probably, however, with some good political reason. Thus Solomon changed the family of the Jerusalemite priesthood, and Jeroboam made his own arrangements for the royal sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. It is not easy to see what was the exact relation of these 'royal' sanctuaries to the rest, but the king's preferential treatment would have great weight with the nation at large.

The prophets also were correspondingly affected. With the royal patronage of a portion, at any rate, of the priesthood came a similar patronage of some part of the prophetic guilds. So best can we explain the royal prophets of Ahab who joined in opposition to Micaiah the son of Imlah. The prophets in the king's pay would naturally try to please their patron, and their prophecies would tend to be merely the reflexion of his wishes, in anticipation of his rewards. So then, in the prophetic guilds we probably get the starting-point for the 'false prophets' denounced in the canonical prophetic writings.

4. The division of the kingdom was not without its relation to prophecy.[1] The Ten Tribes had prophetic approval when they abandoned Judah to its despotic king with his synthesis of religions. Both the actual separation and the fact that Judah did not go to war with the new kingdom are attributed to the inspiration of the prophets, in the one case to 'Ahijah, the Shilonite', in the other to 'Shemaiah, the man of God'.[2] These were probably individual prophets of some renown, and Ahijah seems to have been the Samuel of the Northern Kingdom. We hear of him again in connexion with the sickness of Jeroboam's son.[3]

If, then, the Northern Kingdom was founded with a more or less definite charter of liberty, we can well understand that the king would never be allowed to assume the absolute power of an oriental despot without considerable opposition. He could never entirely disregard either the religious or the social traditions

[1] Cp. Kent *History of the Hebrew People* ii p. 47: 'The prophets favoured the division, because they hoped in the new kingdom to be able to realize their ideals.'

[2] 1 Kings xi 29, xii 22. There is considerable doubt about the date of these narratives in their present form, but the evidence seems to be cumulative.

[3] 1 Kings xiv 1–18.

of his realm. It is in connexion with the resistance to such an attempt that we next meet with prophetism in the Northern Kingdom. The disaffection under Ahab and Jehoram differed only in degree from that under Solomon and Rehoboam. In Elijah the Tishbite we have a solitary figure,[1] consciously isolated from the official religion of his day, but not by any means the sole survivor of Yahweh worship in Israel. He rebuked the reigning monarch not only for his religious but also for his social policy. Of his relation, however, to the regular priesthood of the kingdom we are told nothing.[2] We can surmise from his complaint that 'the children of Israel have thrown down God's altars', that he was lamenting a persecution of those priests who remained faithful to Yahweh; while his mention of the slaughter of 'the prophets' must surely refer in part to members of the prophetic guilds—for we know that Obadiah at this time hid no less than 'an hundred men of the Lord's prophets', to save them from Jezebel's persecuting zeal. No doubt there were many amongst the priests and amongst the prophets who refused to recognize the Tyrian Baal, or combine his worship with that of Yahweh. The appearance of the foreign god produced a division in the ranks of cultus and people alike, and it was Elijah who realized that a *via media* with state support was impossible for true religion.

Whatever estimate[3] we may form of Elisha, it is obvious that his methods were very different from those of Elijah.[4] This, no doubt, was due to the fact that active persecution had ceased, and that Elijah's principles had gained some acceptance. His revival had been at any rate partially successful. The air was cleared by the storm, and the still small voice could now be heard.

Some would see in the 'call' of Elisha by Elijah a graphic

[1] Elijah bears many points of resemblance to a modern Mahdi. Note that he is not called *nabhi* except in 1 Kings xviii 22.

[2] Elijah still seems to hold a 'local' idea of Yahweh, and goes to Horeb as Yahweh's favourite sanctuary.

[3] Dr Cornill is very bitter against Elisha, calling him 'demagogue, conspirator, revolutionist, and agitator', *Hebrew Prophecy* p. 33.

[4] Elisha, like the prophetic guilds, was an adviser in war. Cf. Lord Cromer, of the Mahdi Wad-el-Nejumi: 'He was the Khalid of the Prophet's wars. He it was who prepared the stratagem which annihilated Hicks. He it was who crept silently round the shallow mud beyond the crumpled ramparts of Khartoum', *Modern Egypt* ii 65.

illustration of the ordinary manner of admission to the prophetic guilds.[1] On such a view these communities were nothing else than disciples of great individual prophets, and owed their existence to that fact. But this theory obviously does not cover all the circumstances of the case. Elisha was chosen not only to be a disciple, but also to be the successor of Elijah.[2]

That Elisha came into close contact with the prophetic guilds is plain from the Biblical narratives.[3] They recognized him as the successor of Elijah, of the same spirit, though outwardly differing in many respects. The sons of the prophets do not strike us as being flourishing communities in Elisha's day. Perhaps their poverty was due to the fact that the royal support was now withheld from them. They still appear in connexion with local sanctuaries, and they seem to have been residential corporations.[4] No doubt after the persecution of Jezebel they required such careful encouragement and supervision as Elisha could give.

Of the priesthood at this period there is no mention.[5] It is probable that Yahweh's altars were not yet all restored, and the dispossessed priests may have joined in the disaffection against the ruling dynasty.

The revolution of Jehu had for its excuse the extermination of Baal-worship, and so was able to draw upon the more rigorous worshippers of Yahweh for their allegiance and support. Thus Elisha sends 'one of the sons of the prophets' to anoint Jehu to be king over Israel. And Jehu himself actively solicited the support of Jehonadab the son of Rechab.[6]

Amongst those whom Jehu slew in Jezreel are mentioned 'the priests of Ahab'.[7] These may not have been actually servants

[1] Cp. Sanday *Oracles of God* p. 90: 'A group of young men would gather round some commanding figure—a Samuel or an Elisha—and would not only record or spread the knowledge of his sayings and doings, but seek to catch themselves something of his inspiration.'

[2] In 2 Kings i the sons of the prophets do not say 'our master' but 'thy master'. Cp. 1 Kings xix 16 'to be prophet in thy room'.

[3] The modern 'convents' of Dervishes are obedient to a Sheik or Elder; and in 2 Kings iv 38 and vi 1 we read 'they sit before Elisha'.

[4] Their connexion also with war is still preserved. Cp. 'the Ahab source', 2 Kings xx 13, 35.

[5] That Elisha took part in religious festivals may be perhaps inferred from 2 Kings iv 23 'Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new-moon nor sabbath'.

[6] 2 Kings x 15, 16.

[7] 2 Kings x 11.

of the Tyrian Baal, but only those who allowed his worship to co-exist with that of Yahweh. In the account of the 'solemn assembly for Baal' at Samaria 'all the prophets of Baal' and 'all the priests of Baal' are said to have been put to death.[1] Perhaps also amongst these were included the lukewarm adherents of Yahweh who bowed themselves in the house of Baal.

The Elisha narratives might lead us to suppose that the relations between prophet and prophetic guild in the Northern Kingdom were always most amicable; but there is another side to the picture. The story of Micaiah, the son of Imlah,[2] is only further significant of what we have already suggested, that prophetism in Israel was now 'divided against itself'.[3] On the one hand, we have the servile company of royal prophets with one voice urging Ahab to go up to battle, and emphasizing their advice with extravagant symbolism. On the other hand we see the solitary prophet uttering his gloomy warning, only to be relegated to a dreary confinement.

Now it is to be noticed that, whereas Ahab was obviously persuaded by the prophetic band, yet Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, declined to be so deceived. Perhaps he detected the note of uninspired adulation in their unanimous prophecy. We may well ask, however, what was his experience of prophetism in his own kingdom? Jehoshaphat himself was a more loyal adherent of Yahweh than was Ahab,[4] and the question naturally arises whether this was not due to the influence of the prophets in Judah. But history gives us no information as to the state of

[1] 2 Kings x 17–28. [2] 1 Kings xxii.

[3] Skinner, *1 Kings* (Cambridge Bible), says on xxii 8: 'The passage is important, as the first instance of *a cleavage in the ranks* of the prophetic body, which runs through the whole subsequent history of the movement.' Note further in the anecdote of Eldad and Medad Num. xi 17, 25 ff (E, perhaps of this period): (1) 70 elders are thrown into a condition of rapture; cp. the nebi'ismus; (2) Eldad and Medad are inspired 'in the camp', i.e. away from the sanctuary; (3) the prophecy has a practical purpose, a national utility. This narrative probably represents the birth of a new prophecy distinct from the old cultus prophecy. The controversy as to the status of this new inspiration is settled by the reply of Moses in v. 29: 'Art thou jealous for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them.' So there may have been an 'irreligiosa sollicitas' for the established prophecy in Northern Israel.

[4] It is possible that he was compelled to join Ahab in the expedition as being a vassal-king.

prophetism in Judah at this period. The Chronicler has sought to remedy this defect by inserting occasional notices of prophetical advisers to the monarchy.

Two points, however, are to be noticed in regard to the slight history of this period. First, we read that Asa undertook certain religious reforms in the course of which 'he put away the *kedeshim* out of the land'.[1] Secondly, in the revolt against Athaliah, the daughter of Jezebel, it was the priesthood of the Temple that took the leading part, and not, as in the Northern Kingdom, the prophets. The inference to be drawn from these two facts is that the ordinary Temple cultus at Jerusalem was too powerful to allow of the existence of such guilds of the prophets as we meet with in Northern Israel. Possibly also in the earlier period their place was taken by the *kedeshim*.[2] The Temple was built according to Phoenician models, and Tyrian fashions may have been in vogue from the first. Asa put away the *kedeshim*, and his son, Jehoshaphat, realized the value of the true prophets of Yahweh. Possibly the two facts are not entirely disconnected.[3] It is not unlikely also that while the Temple worship was of such a character, there was, as in the days of Eli, no 'widespread' or 'open vision'.[4] It is not certain, however, that the abuses which Asa did away with were connected with Yahweh worship.[5] They may have been merely the accompaniment of foreign cults.

But at least this is clear, that the priesthood was responsible, aided by the king, for the gradual improvement of religion in Judah. We are not told that Jehoiada met with opposition from his fellow-priests, or that he was unique in his desire for reforms. It must be remembered, however, that the Temple priesthood was not the only priesthood in Judah,[6] and it has been thought that the apparent slackness in repairing the Temple fabric in the

[1] 1 Kings xv 12.

[2] Cp. 1 Kings xiv 23, where *kedeshim* are mentioned with 'high places, pillars, and *asherim*' in the time of Rehoboam.

[3] 1 Kings xxii 47. Jehoshaphat also, we are told, 'put away the remnant of the kedeshim'.

[4] The Judaean narrative is generally assigned to the reign of Jehoshaphat, so that 'prophecy' cannot have been entirely non-existent.

[5] But cp. Deut. xxiii 18, 19, in connexion with Yahweh worship, 'the wages of a dog'.

[6] Deut. refers to 'priests of the high places', and Kings to the *kemarim*, 'the idolatrous priests', and 'the priests out of the cities of Judah'.

reign of Jehoash was due to the fact that the local sanctuaries claimed their share in the priestly dues.

Amos tells us that the shrine of Beersheba was famous even in the northern kingdom. This fact suggests the idea that the separation of the kingdoms did not preclude an occasional union in worship. Amos may have gone to Bethel in a pilgrim company. And it may be also that sacred pilgrimages brought prophetic ideas into Judah in the days of Elijah and Elisha and the prophetic guilds. The priest of the south may have learnt from the prophet of the north.

Before proceeding to deal with the writing prophets of the eighth and following centuries it may be as well to summarize a few of our conclusions. In the first place, we saw that *the priestly oracle* was the regular but not the only means of consulting the Divine will. From early times prophetism is to be found in the individual seer, and in the companies of the sons of the prophets, who come into prominence at a time of national and religious distress. Secondly *a gradual recognition* of prophecy coeval with the transition from nomad to peasant takes place. The prophet comes to be regarded as a necessary part of the cultus. In politics and in war his advice is ever in demand. Royal patronage and official sanction make him too often a mere institution of the palace, or the complement of the ordinary priesthood. Hence a *division* appears in the ranks of prophecy —accentuated in the northern kingdom by persecution—between true and false prophet, between the professional adviser and the man directly raised up by God. From the days of Elijah and Micaiah onwards, true prophecy becomes less magical and institutional in character. Prophecy grows to be mystical and ethical, though it never so far forgets the circumstances of its origin as to lose touch with the national life. The prophet, as we shall see, was no mere quietist.

5. It is certainly true that Amos, at any rate, was no dreamer of the desert. When told by Amaziah, the royal priest, not to prophesy at the king's sanctuary, he gave as his answer, 'I was no prophet, neither was I one of the sons of the prophets; but I was an herdman, and a dresser of sycomore trees: and Yahweh took me from following the flock, and Yahweh said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel'.[1] Reflexion in the prophet's

[1] Amos vii 14.

mind does not, in this case, end with itself, but issues in bold and prompt action, sending the prophet even beyond the borders of his native country.

Two points are to be noticed in the meeting between Amaziah and Amos. First, that the king's priest suspects this strange prophet of being a political revolutionary. There was every excuse for such an estimate, for the reigning dynasty was the result of a revolution in which the prophets, such as Elijah and Elisha, had taken no small part. Perhaps this is what Amos refers to, when he says 'I am no prophet', i.e. his object is directly ethical, and not to be accomplished by the political intrigue that was associated with prophets in the northern kingdom. Amos has received no command for the anointing of kings or for the destruction of dynasties. He is conscious of a higher message to proclaim to Israel. And he is conscious also of a high vocation, being no 'son of the prophets', no member of their guilds. He is no professional prophet to cultivate the art and receive fees for services thus rendered.[1] Such is the apologia of Amos to the king's priest. Like Socrates he had the θεῖόν τι πάθος which differentiated him from the ordinary teachers of the day. And, again like Socrates, he must have had a disciple who wrote down the substance of his teaching.[2]

Let us see what mention these writings make of the priests and prophets in Israel. Looking back over the history of the nation Amos says[3] that Yahweh 'raised up of their sons for prophets and of their young men for Nazirites',[4] but that they 'gave

[1] Cheyne in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* s.v. 'Amos', says that Amos scorns the idea of being one of the *benê nebi'im*. Harper, however, in his *Amos and Hosea* p. cvii says: 'We do not understand that this statement indicates on the part of Amos an utter contempt for the order of *nebhi'im*. . . . He himself uses the technique of pre-prophetism, which had long years been taking form.'

[2] Budde *Religion of Israel* p. 131 regards the 'writing' of the prophets as due to their failure to impress the people by oral speech. By the time of Amos a prophetic diction seems to be already developed.

[3] Amos ii 11–13.

[4] The Nazirites were perhaps included in the companies of *benê nebi'im*. Their origin, no doubt, was martial. Arab warriors still leave their head unshorn during a war of revenge. Samson was not ordered to abstain from wine. Perhaps the later Nazirites undertook to abstain from wine as a 'Canaanite' product, and the consecrated warrior became the ascetic nationalist, as Yahweh became less prominently the God of War. On the sanctity of the head cp. Frazer *Golden Bough* i 362 ff. It seems probable that many of the Hebrew priests allowed their

the Nazirites wine to drink, and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not'. Thus the prophet tells the people that they are responsible both for the perversion of the Nazirite and for the stifling of prophecy, the popular cultus and system of patronage being, no doubt, to blame. Of the priests Amos says nothing directly. He denounces Amaziah, the king's priest, personally, but of the priesthood in general he says nothing in set terms. The sacrificial system, however, comes in for his strongest rebukes, and in this no doubt he is attacking the priests of his day. Sacrifice, as we have seen, was intimately connected with the giving of the oracle.[1] But in the sacrifices which Amos denounced the oracular element was by no means uppermost. They were simply licentious feasts with devotion as their excuse. Hence it is the 'altars' of Israel which are more especially denounced. Finally, amongst the worst punishments which the days to come will bring is a famine—not such as the 'Baals' were supposed to bring—of bread and of water, but 'of hearing the words of Yahweh'.[2]

It was Hosea, however, a native of the northern kingdom, who gave further emphasis to this warning of the earlier prophet. The root of the whole matter, to the mind of Hosea, is that God's people 'are destroyed for lack of knowledge',[3] and it is the fault of the priesthood that this is so. The 'non-preaching prelates' of northern Israel are to be rejected on this very score, and 'it shall be, like people, like priest: and I will punish them for their ways, and will reward them their doings'. Duhm has conjectured that Hosea himself was a priest, and such a conjecture is not improbable when we consider his insight into the religious condition of the people at that period. It was no good merely denouncing the sacrificial cultus or pouring scorn on the Baalim and the calf of Samaria. The real reason was the degeneracy of the priests,[4] who not only neglected the teaching of the people,

hair to grow long. Cp. Ezek. xliv 20, 21 where long hair and abstinence from wine are mentioned together.

[1] 'In primitive times the only public aspect of religion is found in connexion with divination and the oracle to which the affairs of the community are submitted', P. Smith in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* s.v. 'Priest'. This public 'consultation' passed over to the prophetic bodies.

[2] Amos iii 14, ix 1.

[3] Hosea iv 3–9.

[4] The priests of Samaria are called *kemarim* in x 5.

but even profited by their ignorance, 'they feed upon the sin of My people'. That written 'knowledge of the Lord' was actually to be found in existence is demonstrated by the words 'Though I wrote for him my ten thousand *toroth*, yet they are counted as a strange thing'.[1]

If Hosea was a priest, he may refer to the opposition of his colleagues when he says, 'As for the prophet, a fowler's snare is in all his ways and enmity in the house of his God.' But the story of Micaiah-ben-Imlah has already shewn us that the ranks of prophecy were by now divided, and Hosea may refer merely to such division. Of the part played by prophecy in the history of the nation Hosea has the very highest estimate: 'I have also spoken unto the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and by the hand of the prophets I have used similitudes'; or again, 'By a prophet the Lord brought Israel up out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved'.[2] And, no doubt, Hosea hoped that by his own prophecy Israel might once again be delivered from imminent destruction; for, amid all his denunciations, this prophet of the northern kingdom loved his native country with the love of a true patriot.

The southern kingdom, also, had its patriot in the prophet Isaiah. Hosea had hoped, but in vain, to save his country by his warnings. Isaiah, by his words and by his practical efforts, succeeded in preserving the virgin daughter of Zion, for a time at least, from the clutches of the invader. It is worthy of note that the southern prophet—like Jehoiada the priest before him—was a man of good birth, conversant with the court, and knowing well from the inside the social life against which he so strongly inveighed. Isaiah is, in a sense, to Amos what Elisha was to Elijah. The principles which Amos had asserted required not only re-asserting, but bringing into connexion with the ordinary political and social life of the nation. Thus we may hope to learn from Isaiah how the 'new' prophecy was regarded by its contemporaries.

Of the actual relation of Isaiah toward the priesthood we know very little.[3] Uriah, the priest, is summoned by him as 'a faithful

[1] Hosea viii 12. [2] Hosea xii 10, 13.

[3] The elders of the priests are sent to Isaiah in Isa. xxxvii 2, apparently as court officials.

witness', i.e. perhaps simply as a responsible public person, trusted by the people.[1] It is a fact of some significance, however, that Isaiah, like Samuel, received his prophetic call in the sanctuary. It is hardly likely that the prophet would have drawn his inspiration from that sanctuary unless he had at the least approved of it. The inviolable character of Zion was, no doubt, due to the fact that Yahweh would protect His Temple. But although Isaiah thus favoured the Temple, yet there was much in the worship of the day which, in his eyes, called for reform.[2] Possibly Hezekiah's destruction of Nehushtan was due to prophetic influence. And there was much besides that required abolition. In times of national distress there is always a tendency to revert to the most primitive religious practices. Sorcery and witchcraft were rife, to the disparagement, no doubt, of the higher 'mantic' of prophecy.[3] Isaiah describes the nation as 'a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits: get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us'.[4] Note that it is the people, the nation as a whole, whom Isaiah, like Amos, blames for the degeneracy of prophecy. Isaiah himself held a high opinion of prophecy, though he acknowledges that 'the priest and the prophet' of the time 'have erred through strong drink'.[5]

The prophecies of Isaiah are merely emphasized by those of his younger contemporary, Micah, who, by reason of his lower social position, is more vehement against the nobles of Judah.[6] It is probable that these included some of the priestly families,

[1] So Skinner *Cambridge Bible* 1 Kings p. 66.

[2] Cp. his attitude toward sacrifice, esp. in Isa. i 10.

[3] Cf. Isa. ii 6: 'Because they are full of diviners from the East, and of soothsayers like the Philistines.' Balaam came from 'the mountains of the East'.

[4] Isa. xxx 8. It is this perversion of prophecy which leads Isaiah to write down his prophecies and commit them to his disciples.

[5] Isa. xxviii 7: 'These also in Jerusalem reel with wine, and stagger with mead; priest and prophet reel with mead, they are confused by wine, they stagger because of mead; they reel during their visions, they totter while giving judgement. All tables are full of loathsome disgorgements; filth everywhere,'—a sacrificial feast has been held. So Cheyne in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament.*

[6] Isaiah had, however, called them 'rulers of Sodom', Isa. i 10.

and we certainly find that Micah is very bitter against the priesthood of his day, including also the ordinary prophet in his denunciation. Thus he says 'The heads thereof judge for reward and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money'. His reference here is no doubt to 'technical' prophets such as may have flourished in Judah in these troublous times. Micah also mentions the vinous habits of the prophets, while he denounces their avarice: 'Whoso putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him.' The punishment for this is to be, 'the sun shall go down upon the prophets, and the day shall be black over them'. 'And the seers shall be ashamed and the diviners confounded.'[1] There seems at this period to have been a great influx of sorcery and magic into Judah, perhaps from Chaldaea, which was now the ruling power in Western Asia. Throughout his writings we feel that Micah is writing as a man of the people. Hence it is not the people he denounces so much as the priests and the prophets who receive payment for their falsehoods from a superstitious and deluded populace.

The teaching of the prophets in Judah at this period was no doubt responsible for the reforms carried out by the king, Hezekiah. Isaiah would have great influence at court, and he seems to have had a body of disciples[2] who would help to overcome opposition. The preaching of Micah, also, is expressly referred to in later days[3] as having been responsible for some degree of repentance in Judah. But in the reign of Manasseh a reaction set in. All the superstitious cults and practices of the time of Ahaz came back and were established with the royal sanction. Foreign cults from Babylon and Assyria were also introduced. Witchcraft abounded and true prophecy seems to have been persecuted.[4] The 'sins of Manasseh' were regarded by the prophets of a later age as the direct cause of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Captivity in Babylonia.[5]

To this reign we must, in all probability, assign a prophecy, attributed by a compiler to Micah: 'the Lord's controversy with

[1] Mic. ii 11, iii 5, iii 6 ff.
[2] Isa. xxx 8.
[3] Jer. xxvi 17.
[4] 2 Kings xxi 16, 'Manasseh shed innocent blood very much'.
[5] 2 Kings xxiv 3; cp. also xxiii 26.

his people'.[1] Here we have at once an appeal to past history, to the great names of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, to the answer of Balaam to Balak's consultation, and also a powerful rebuke of the present state of religion, referring to the practice, apparently then prevalent, of infant sacrifice. In this prophet we have a concise summary of the teaching of his three predecessors, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah: 'To do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.'

Before proceeding to deal with the Deuteronomic reformation, and the teaching of the prophet Jeremiah, it may be well to consider the general attitude of the prophets as a whole towards sacrifice. Originally sacrifice and the giving of the oracle were closely connected,[2] and 'word' and 'sacrament' might be said to supplement each other. Samuel the seer was wont to bless the sacrifice for the people, and Elisha seems to have been present at the country festivals.

But in the eighth-century prophets we find the sacrifices of the day so sternly denounced that some writers have even maintained that the prophets desired the total abolition of sacrificial worship.[3] Such a view cannot, however, be supported. Even the strongest repudiations of the sacrifices of the day, such as we find in Amos and Isaiah, 'may as naturally be understood of a conditional as of an absolute rejection of sacrifice'.[4] And in fact Hosea regards a future cessation of sacrifice as a national calamity,[5] while Jeremiah definitely includes sacrifices in the reformed worship of the days to come.[6] What, then, we may ask, were the objections of the prophets to the sacrificial system of their time? What did they consider noxious in the ordinary theory and practice of sacrifice?

[1] Mic. vi 2 ff. [2] Thus Balaam offers sacrifice, Num. xxiii 1.

[3] Cp. Marti *Religion of the Old Testament* p. 148: 'In almost every one you can read the flat rejection of the cultus'; also Kautzsch in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* s. v. 'Religion of Israel' (extra vol. 685^b): 'There are sayings of the prophets which cannot be understood except as absolutely disclaiming any demand on God's part for sacrificial gifts'; cp. Jer. vii 21, 22.

[4] Cp. Paterson in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* s. v. 'Sacrifice', iv 335^b.

[5] Hos. ii 11. Hosea's words may be taken as representing a calamity in the eyes of the people (Kautzsch). But he himself also may have regarded such a contingency as disastrous.

[6] Cp. Jer. xxxi 14, xvii 24–26. The Exile was not regarded as a divine condemnation of Israel's system of worship. Ezekiel looked for a restoration of the Temple and its ordinances.

First, the sacrifices themselves were wont to be heathenish in character and object, as offered to other gods, or idols.[1] Secondly, sacrifices tended to become too costly in character, as well as too numerous.[2] The priests, no doubt, reaped a profit out of the number of such offerings, and did nothing to reduce 'the multitude of sacrifices'. Thirdly, the sacrificial feasts are those most severely denounced, owing to the licentious practices to which they gave sanction. Such sacrifice was of a joyous character. So Hosea says 'I will also cause her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and all her solemn assemblies'.[3] Drunkenness and licence were not infrequent.[4] Now it is to be noticed that the objections of the prophets are to the 'accretions'[5] of the cultus, such as were natural in a civilized country which was given to agriculture. The joyous worship of the Baals, the 'harvest festivals' of Canaan, were very different from the gloomy rites of desert life. Amos feels the contrast and 'appeals to the first centuries' of Israel's existence.[6] Thus it is not the principle so much as the practice of sacrifice to which the prophets object.[7] But reform in principle was necessary. Sacrifice had become practically co-extensive with religion; a revaluation was necessary. 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams.'

Such a revaluation took practical shape in the *Book of Deuteronomy*, the central portion of which cannot but be the

[1] Hos. xi 2, Jer. xi 12.

[2] Isa. i 11, 'the multitude of your sacrifices'; Amos iv 4, 'multiply transgression'; Mic. vi 7, 'thousands of rams, ten thousands of rivers of oil'.

[3] Hos. ii 11. [4] Cp. Amos ii 7, Hos. iv 13, Isa. xxviii 7.

[5] On Amos v 25 Harper says: 'A prophet who has nothing to say against the use of images will surely not go so far as to object altogether to sacrifice. Moreover, neither Amos nor any other Israelite, preceding the exile, could have dreamed of a period in Israel's history when no sacrifices were to be offered. This would actually have involved a purely vegetarian diet,' *Amos and Hosea*, Intr. cxix. (Harper renders: 'Was it (only) sacrifices . . . ?')

[6] Sacrifice was not the most important duty of the earliest priesthood; cp. Deut. xxxiii. The prophets, no doubt, protested against these 'sacrificing priests' of the peasant sanctuaries, and the *opera operata* of the non-preaching prelates.

[7] Cp. in modern times: 'The spirit of all sacrifices made at the shrines . . . is contrary to Islam. Through them worship is rendered to the saints. As in ancient Israel there is syncretism,' Curtiss *op. cit.* So the Wahabis, the most orthodox of Moslems, took to destroying the local sanctuaries,—in the manner of Josiah's reformation.

'book of the law found in the house of the Lord' in the reign of Josiah. In the finding of this book both priest and prophet had his share, and in its composition priest and prophet have their place. It is perhaps natural, however, that the prophetic element should be predominant. Dr Driver describes Deuteronomy as 'a prophetical law book', while Steuernagel calls it 'the tangible and practicable expression of more than a century's efforts after reform'.[1] The book itself gives expression to a high estimate of the prophet and his work. Moses was only the first of a continuous line of Hebrew prophets.[2] But the priest has some place in the Deuteronomist's conceptions, for the existence of the priesthood could not be overlooked.[3]

In Judah, as we have already seen, the priesthood was capable of great things. Jehoiada of Jerusalem led the revolt against Athaliah[4], and it was Hilkiah, who found the law book in the Temple.[5] But this only concerns the priests of the capital. We are not told that Jehoiada was supported by the priests of the high places, or that Hilkiah's discovery was welcomed by them.

So then, in Deuteronomy we have a literary product of prophetic teaching, sanctioned by the Jerusalemite priesthood. The doctrine of the 'central sanctuary' was acceptable to king, prophet, and city-priest alike. It involved, however, two great and important issues, the reform of sacrifice, and the readjustment of the priesthood.

The central sanctuary was intended to do away with the abuses of the high places. Uniformity would abolish local diversity and would lessen the field exposed to the invasion of foreign cults. A certain prestige, also, was attached to the Temple at Jerusalem, since the destruction of the northern kingdom, and the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib. So the prophets might well hope for better things from the new orientation of the cultus.

The Deuteronomic regulations for sacrifice are of the nature

[1] Vide H. W. Robinson *Deuteronomy* (Century Bible) p. 33.

[2] Deut. xviii 15.

[3] The priest's duty was not to be a mere 'vanum praedicandi evangelii ministerium' (*Conc. Trid.*).

[4] 2 Kings xi. [5] 2 Kings xxii.

of a compromise.[1] The high places are to be abolished, but the joyous nature of worship is largely retained. 'And there shall ye eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee.'[2] The 'mirth' of Israel in its religion is to be regulated, but not abolished.[3] The important point in the mind of the reformers was the change of environment. Sacrifice was to be retained, but not sacrifice on the high places. In olden days the rule had been 'one God, one nation'; now 'one God, one altar' was to be the order.

This unification, however, had one result which was not altogether beneficial. It divorced 'religious' and 'secular' in the life of the people, and tended to accentuate the distinction between clergy and laity, and even ultimately in some degree to 'take God out of the world'. No longer was every meal a sacrifice, and the village place of worship was now closed. Sacrifice became a matter for the expert, and the priest lost his character of teacher, becoming a mere skilled official. The 'parish-priest' was now a person of the past, though there is reason to believe that he was often long in dying.[4]

The abolition of the local sanctuaries inevitably meant a reduction in the numbers of the priesthood. Deuteronomy, in accordance with its general principles of humanity, recommends the dispossessed priests to the charity of the community, allowing them also to officiate at the central sanctuary, if so disposed.[5] But this seems to have been somewhat in the nature of 'paper legislation' and not carried out in practice.

The functions of the priest in Deuteronomy are clearly set forth: to bear the Ark, to minister to the Lord, and to bless in His name.[6] This definition seems to include both oracle and sacrifice, though the oracle is not expressly mentioned. The judicial powers of the priest are insisted upon,[7] and disobedience

[1] Deuteronomy regulates rather than directly encourages sacrifice (Kautzsch).

[2] Deut. xii 7.

[3] Cp. H. S. Holland in *Priesthood and Sacrifice* p. 85: 'The process by which the sacrifice is *moralized* is, not by dropping the external offering, but by raising the moral quality of that which it expresses.'

[4] 2 Kings xxiii 9.

[5] Cp. Deut. xviii 7 and 2 Kings xxiii 9.

[6] Cp. xviii 5, &c.

[7] Deut. xvii 9 the civil judge and the priest are co-ordinated.

is to be visited with death.[1] Leprosy is made a matter of priestly jurisdiction. The sacrificial portions and dues are to be sufficient support for the priests, who are to have no portion nor inheritance in Israel.

We have already remarked upon the high regard of Deuteronomy for the prophet's mission. Three points are noticeable in the treatment of prophecy. First, it is the antidote to witchcraft, sorcery, and heathenish divination. Secondly, the prophets are to be men of renown, of national importance, such as Moses. Thus they must necessarily be native-born Israelites, 'of thy brethren', to the exclusion of all foreign soothsayers. Thirdly, the test for prophecy is fulfilment. This requirement is not of such an ethical character as we might expect, but it is nowhere implied that prediction is the sole duty of prophecy. Moses, the model prophet, though in Deuteronomy he legislates for the future, is far more than a mere prognosticator.

The relation of Deuteronomy to the writings of the prophet Jeremiah is most complicated, and does not immediately concern the present investigation. It is sufficient to say that while the prophet bears considerable resemblance to the Deuteronomic author in style, yet he cannot have been wholly in sympathy with the reformation of Josiah as it actually took place. Jeremiah directly opposes the doctrine of the inviolable sanctity of the temple,[2] and is recognized in this as the successor of Micah. The impression conveyed is that Jeremiah knew Deuteronomy and did not altogether approve of it.[3] The resemblance in style may be accounted for partly by the common diction of the period, partly by the fact that the Book of Jeremiah seems to have gone through several redactions.

We have said that Deuteronomy was in some sense the joint product of prophet and city-priest. Jeremiah was of priestly family, from Anathoth, possibly descended from Abiathar. On this account he may have disliked the Jerusalemite priests—'the sons of Zadok', as Ezekiel calls them in later days. Certainly he met

[1] Deut. xvii 12 'that man shall die'.

[2] Jer. vii 4, xxvi 18. The doctrine had probably been perverted by some of the disciples of Isaiah.

[3] Cp. Jer. xxxi 33, 34, esp. also viii 8: 'How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of Yahweh is with us? But, behold, the false pen of the scribes hath wrought falsely.'

with considerable opposition from the priests of the capital, as was only to be expected when he persisted in prophesying the overthrow of 'the Temple of the Lord' in which they ministered.

The degeneration of religion which followed the death of Josiah is vividly reflected in the pages of Jeremiah. 'Both priest and prophet are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord.'[1] 'A wonderful and horrible thing has come to pass in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule at their hand; and my people love to have it so.'[2] Prophet, priest, and people all have their share of rebuke.[3] In Jeremiah's day it would seem that prophecy was no corrective to the degenerate priesthood, but rather was in the priests' employ. Jeremiah definitely compares the prophets of his day to 'the prophets of Samaria',[4] and no doubt there was much to warrant such a comparison. The *entente* of Deuteronomy had merely stilled the voice of prophecy by its prophetic concessions. Prophecy was won over, but prophetic reforms were not yet carried out. The false prophets denounced by Jeremiah seem to have been very numerous, having no direct vocation from God.[5] They pretended to see visions, and to dream dreams.[6] Finally, they are directly associated with the temple: 'Yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord.' Jeremiah lived to see 'the false prophets' discredited, and in the last days of the siege he asks the question, 'Where are now your prophets which prophesied unto you, saying, The King of Babylon shall not come against this land?' He makes this the basis of his request to be delivered from the house of Jonathan the scribe 'lest I die there'.

Both priest and prophet joined in the persecution of Jeremiah. Pashhur the priest was a person of some secular authority, being chief officer in the house of the Lord, and therefore probably in royal employ. The priestly recognition was given to those prophets who cried 'Peace, peace, when there is no peace', and

[1] Jer. xxiii 11. Possibly, as Dr Sanday says, 'an extreme state of things', *op. cit.* p. 93.

[2] Jer. v 30 f. [3] Cp. Jer. vi 13 f. [4] Jer. xxiii 13.

[5] Jer. xxiii 21 'I spake not to these prophets . . . yet they prophesied'; xiv 13 'the deceit of their own heart'.

[6] Jer. xxiii 25 'I have dreamed, I have dreamed'.

who supported both throne and priesthood by their words.[1] Zephaniah, the chief superintendent of the priests, makes his appearance as a messenger of king Zedekiah. The court had declared against Jeremiah, and king, priest, and prophet were all his enemies. So the prophet Zephaniah, also, denounces the princes, judges, prophets, and priests of Judah.[2] The Church was merely the creature of the court and her leaders were corrupt. Sacrifice under such circumstances was a mere mockery: 'When they fast, I will not hear their cry: and when they offer burnt-offering and oblation, I will not accept them: but I will consume them by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence.' [3]

The Exile closes down upon a very gloomy picture of Church life in Judah; but doubtless Jeremiah had his followers, if not in the royal circle, yet at any rate among those who 'came not to court', and probably the example of that suffering servant of Yahweh did much to inspire the captive Jews in their efforts to preserve their religious unity.[4]

6. Before closing our subject it may be useful to consider what part priest and prophet respectively played in the composition of *the pre-exilic literature*. The preservation of the utterances of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah was probably due to the devotion of disciples, as also in the case of Jeremiah. Deuteronomy, as we have seen, was to some extent the joint product of prophet and priest. What are we to say of the composition of the earlier literature?

It is impossible to determine the exact shares of prophet and of priest in the earliest writings. The Song of Deborah is the song of a prophetess, but it may have been perpetuated in the sanctuary worship of northern Israel. The Book of the Wars of Yahweh may have been written either by the early seers, or composed by the priests who accompanied the Ark. Nothing is in any degree certain. Judges xviii 14 means us to infer that writing was

[1] Cp. Jer. xxi 1, xxxvii 3, xxix 25 f, 29. [2] Zeph. iii 3 f. [3] Jer. xiv 12.

[4] In *Messianic prophecy* the king overshadows both prophet and priest; or, rather, prophet and priest are combined in his person. Thus (1) he is anointed; priests, however, are anointed only in the later literature; (2) the spirit rests upon him, as upon the prophets (cp. Saul, the first king): see Oesterley *Evolution of the Messianic Idea* p. 190 ff; also see above on the Priest-king at Jerusalem, Melchizedek.

disseminated amongst the common people of that day, but no actual proof can be adduced. Kautzsch[1] says, 'It must be acknowledged as possible that as early as this, perhaps at sanctuaries now long famous, such as those at Shiloh and Bethel, amongst a hereditary priesthood of old standing, the writing down of ancient songs or of the histories of these sanctuaries was taken in hand.' The Blessing of Jacob and the Balaam Discourses are in some sense 'prophetic', but their form is very largely oracular.[2] We cannot precisely say what was their origin.

After the division of the kingdom we get definite established centres for a national worship of Yahweh, at Bethel and Dan, and at Jerusalem. Correspondingly we get the 'Hero-stories' of the Book of Judges, and the early 'Saul Stories' and 'David Stories'.

The royal sanctuaries were, no doubt, 'central points where a higher culture could be developed in the midst of an honoured priesthood'.[3] And it is exceedingly probable that the priests played a considerable part in the preservation,[4] if not in the composition, of the early literature of Israel.

This does not, however, exclude the influence of the prophetism of the period. The bands of the prophets were always connected with the sanctuaries, and poetical utterances may have been extemporized at the ordinary popular festivals. In fact the early literature only bears out what we have already seen, that priest and early prophet were both included in the cultus.

The Elijah and Elisha stories are probably the products of the *nebi'ismus*.[5] It is quite possible that they exaggerate the importance of the prophetic orders in the history of the time on this account, and it is not unlikely that they were composed within the limits of those orders which in those days assumed a much more institutional character.

The question is even more complicated when we come to consider the relation of priest and prophet in the composition of the

[1] *Outline of the Literature of the Old Testament* p. 10.

[2] Deut. xxxiii seems to be a poetical product of a northern Israelite sanctuary, temp. Jeroboam II.

[3] Kautzsch *op. cit.* p. 18.

[4] Curtiss tells us that in Syria and Arabia the priest is 'the repository of the legends of the shrine'. *op. cit.* p. 149.

[5] Their miraculous character may point to a popular rather than to a sacerdotal origin.

two earliest strata of the Pentateuch. A few points are worthy of consideration.

First, as we have already intimated, the priests at the local sanctuaries may well have been the historians of those sanctuaries.[1] Secondly, royal patronage tended to increase the importance of Bethel, Dan, and Jerusalem, and it may have been at these centres that the traditions of the local sanctuaries were collected and compiled. Thirdly, the prophetic element is much greater in E than in J. Personalities are of more importance, and the interest is much less tribal. Prophetism was always more prominent in the northern kingdom. Prophetic influence at the sanctuary may have been due to the fact that the prophet was generally to be found in its vicinity. Lastly, the sanctuaries were responsible for the formulation of the early law code.[2] Even in the time of Deuteronomy the judge and the priest are not entirely differentiated. The tendency of the priestly torah was to become less mechanical and more ethical and judicial in character.

Such is an outline of priestly and prophetic influence in the pre-exilic literature. A more detailed treatment is not relevant to our purpose, i. e. an account of priest and prophet in the history of Israel. It is well to remember, however, that in the 'Historical Books' of the Old Testament as we now have them, the prophetic element almost everywhere predominates, owing to their redaction by the Deuteronomist. And in the Bible generally we may say that, apart from the definite Priestly Code, the prophet has prevailed over the priest. Or it is truer, perhaps, to say that in the

[1] Note that, although the interest in both J and E to a very large extent centres in the high places of Palestine, yet the diction is not, as we might expect, 'hieratic'. There are very few priestly formulae or technicalities in either J or E. Possibly the pre-exilic priests were not formal or technical in style. But it is almost impossible to decide what is priestly and what prophetic in the two narratives. Thus Harper *Amos and Hosea* p. lxxxii, says: 'E possesses a larger interest in priestly matters than J, but this is wholly subordinate in comparison with his prophetic tendency.'

[2] The sanctuaries, with the exception of Shiloh, were situated on the main roads and trade routes. Hence they were readily susceptible of foreign influence in the codification of laws, world-myths, ethnologies, &c. As to the composition of the laws cp. Kent *Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents* Introduction. Harper, however, *op. cit.* p. xciv, says: 'The early codes contain no reference to a priest; the whole matter is custom, not law.' Cp. also 1 Sam. xxx 23, 24, where the framing of the law of Booty is not ascribed to the priests but to David, and see H. P. Smith *in loco.*

pre-exilic literature the prophet predominates, in the post-exilic the priest.

Such, then, is our account of the relation of prophet and priest throughout the history of Israel down to its extinction as a nation at the Exile. We have noted how the priest became the regular medium of consultation, and how at times he proved insufficient for his task. Then again we have seen how prophecy itself became 'recognized', and so deteriorated. Lastly, how the 'new' prophecy was a protest against the old which had allied itself with both priest and king—an alliance which not even the book of Deuteronomy could render effectual—the true prophet being from the first, consciously or unconsciously, a protest against the priest.

The priest as the guardian of the shrine and the interpreter of the oracle might have proved himself independent of the prophet. But it is only in accordance with human nature for the priesthood to be conservative, being by its very nature an unelastic body. The attempt to restrain the Spirit within the personages of the official cultus was also a failure. The conflict between 'official' and 'charismatic'[1] has not yet been solved. But this much is certain, that it was to the Prophets that Israel owed its greatness as 'the holy nation',[2] by means of whom the world was to be taught religion. If the Priest was only a foil to the Prophet, he was something. But he was more than that in intention,[3] and probably often also in fact. The Prophet's complaint against the Priest is not that he is essentially valueless, but that he has degenerated from his true function to bring God to the people, and the people to God. Both Priest and Prophet are really personifications of that ideal 'Mantic' which 'fashions the friendship between God and Man'.[4] That a higher Personification was required in the Person of our Redeemer, who is both Priest and Prophet in His work for us, need not deter us from giving our due respect to those by whom 'God spake in divers manners' by word and oracle.

E. F. MORISON.

[1] It is obvious that the 'psychopathic' temperament is not a matter of office (priesthood), or of cultivation (prophetic school), but rather of the individual (whether priest or prophet).

[2] The prophets were, in some sense, the national 'sub-consciousness'.

[3] Cp. Deut. xxxiii.

[4] Cp. Plato *Symposium* 188 c Ἔστιν ἡ μαντικὴ φιλίας θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων δημιουργός.