



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series V: Writings, 1909-1963, undated.

Reel
171

Box
62

Folder
17

Divination in ancient Israel, 1915.

Cincinnati, April 23, 1915.

To the President and Faculty of the Hebrew Union College:
Gentlemen:

Mr. Abba Hillel Silver's thesis, "A Study of Divination in Ancient Israel," is a very praiseworthy piece of work. Mr. Silver has made a diligent and intelligent study of the literature on the subject, and shows himself thoroughly conversant with the method of scientific research. His presentation of the subject is both lucid and systematic.

In the course of the work there are a number of statements which call for criticism.

For example, Mr. Silver finds reference to divination and the practice of divination where there is absolutely no trace of it, as in the test to which Gideon submits his warriors (Judg. 7:4-7), in the sign for which he asks in confirmation of his mission, (16.5:36-40), in Jonathan's device for informing David of Saul's hostility (1Sa. 20: 18ff.), in Hos. 6:9 and in 4:5--in the latter case he offers the impossible emendation of ^{ד'ל'ל} for ^{ד'ל'ל}. (see pp. 12, 24, 28, 34f 47) His conclusions in this respect are no doubt due to some extent to the influence of some of his authorities, particularly of Jastrow, who, e. g., infers from 1Sa. 9:25f.--a text which is perfectly plain in the reading of the LXX--"that the specific kind of divination practised by Samuel was probably astrology" (p.54).

The story of Nu.16 of the destruction of Korah's partisans by fire is not a case of ordeal (p.30).

The Talmudic phrase ^{ד'ל'ל} cannot possibly be taken as a proof that "the ^{ד'ל'ל} or the ^{ד'ל'ל} was represented in the form of a dove" (p.16). The phrase has its origin in the corresponding Biblical figure of Deut.32:11, Ru.2:12,

Ps.17:8, 91:4, and other passages. Neither does *אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* permit the inference that "the dove is the omen bird of Israel" (p.17). As in the case of *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת יְיָ* (Sabb. 85a etc), its explanation is to found in the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs.

There is no proof that "the narrator of Gen.31 supposes that the Teraphim were images of Yahweh," rather the opposite seems to be the case; nor does Hosea (3:4-5) identify them with Yahwen (p.37).

The distinctions which Mr. Silver tries to establish between *אֱלֹהִים*, *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ*, and wherein he likewise depends unduly on Jastrow, have no basis in the sources. He has failed to see that in Is. 30:10 Isaiah uses the terms, *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ*, of prophets of his own type, and Micah in scoring the official prophets of his day, his antagonists, (3:5-7) not only speaks of them as *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* & *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ*, but also as *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ*, that God is in Isa.22:5 *merely* spoken of as *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, and that no inference whatever can be drawn from the chronicler's use of the terms, *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ* and *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*.

In conclusion I wish to restate that the criticism made in no wise reflects on the value of Mr. Silver's thesis as a whole. His thesis not only compl^etes fully with the requirements of a graduation thesis, it is far above the average.

I, therefore, recommend the same heartily for your acceptance.

Respectfully submitted,

Moses Battenwieser, Referee.

Julian Morgenstern, Co-referee.

Apr 11, 1915.



DIVINATION IN ANCIENT ISRAEL.

Introduction.

- I. General Terms for Divination.
- II. Kinds of Divination.
- III. Places of Divination.
- IV. Agents of Divination.
- V. Prophetic Yahwism vs. Divination.



Jevons	Journal of Bib.Literature Vol.XIX and XXVIII.
McNeile	Comparative Religion.
Moore	"Exodus", Westminster Series.
W. Muss-Arnolt	"Judges" Int. Crit. Comm. Series.
Nöldeke	Amer.Jour.Sem.Lang.Vol.XVI.
Skinner	Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie. Vol. I.
J.M.P. Smith	"Genesis" Int. Crit. Comm. Series.
H. P. Smith	"Zephaniah" " " " "
W. R. Smith	"Samuel" " " " "
Stade	Religion of the Semites.
Toy	Journal of Philology, Vol. XIII and XIV.
Tylor	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentl.</i> Wissenschaft Vol. XV.
Wellhausen	Introduction to the History of Religions.
Wiedemann	Primitive Culture.
Zimmern	Prolegomena Reste Arabischen Heidenthums.
	Religion of The Ancient Egyptians.
	Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Babyl. Religion.

INTRODUCTION.

Definition. It is probable that divination, like magic, originally passed through a non-religious stage. On the principle of sympathetic magic, it interpreted omens not as messages from superior powers, but as causalities in themselves. "Originally; says Mr. Jacobi, "divination (Indian) seems to have been practiced chiefly with the intention of obviating the evil consequences of omens and portents". (Hasting's Enc. Rel. & Eth. IV.p. 799, cf "Encyclopedia Biblica" article "Magic"). But we are not so much concerned with the origin of this pseudo-science. We wish to study it as a phase of the religious life of a people.

We may then accept Mr. Rose's definition of divination as the most comprehensive of all. Divination is "the endeavor to obtain information about things future or otherwise removed from ordinary preception, by consulting informants others than human." (Hasting's E.R.E. IV p.775) Mr. Toy's definition of divination as "the science that seeks to discover the will of the supernatural Powers by means of the observation of phenomena". (Introduction to the History of Religions, p.406) is somewhat imperfect and incomplete.

The primary function of divination was not to discover the will of the deity, but to obtain information on matters past, present or future which none but the supernatural powers possessed. Spirits may be consulted even when it is evident that their will can have no practical consequences on the matter at hand. Again, information may be obtained without the observation of phenomena. A spirit would often give the required information by entering into and taking possession of a subject and by speaking directly through him. The element of phenomena observation is ~~practically~~ a negligible one also in oneiromancy and, in general, ^{all} autoscopic forms of divination.

Psychology of Divination. It is not a mere natural inquisitiveness, which prompts primitive man to attempt to learn the unknown things. Divination, like magic, serves a very practical purpose. "Sie (die Divination) befriedigt nicht die Neugier und den Wissensdrang, sondern sie zeigt den weg, den man einschlagen muss, um zum Ziel zu kommen" (Wellhausen, "Reste Arabischen Heidentums" p.200). Divination helps man to solve the many practical and pressing problems, which confront him daily. He must discover the cause of the death of his relative or kinsman, for mortality as a natural necessity is unknown to primitive man, (Frazer, "The Belief in Immortality" Index, "Divination"); he must know beforehand the success or failure of a hunt or a battle; the guilt or innocence of a member of the tribe, accused of the infraction of a social custom, must be established in order to avoid the dire visitations of the enraged deity (Of, The Story of Achan; and that of Jonathan, and the very interesting account of the trial of Thutmosis, priest of Amon, given in Erman's "A Handbook of Egyptian Religion, pp 167-8); and disputes among tribesmen must be decided equitably i.e. with divine guidance. The general supposition underlying the practice of the art of divination is that the spirits, with whom the social group has established a covenant, are endowed with superior knowledge and, accordingly, know the events of the past, present and future. ~~For as~~ Mr. Ames well remarks, "the life of the tribe is registered in its sacred object. When the tribe attains some social history, preserved in oral traditions, and various monuments, then the God is credited with long life in the past. The sense of the future and of power to plan for it is expressed in the God's knowledge and control of the future." (Psychology of Religious Experience," P.113). For the preservation of the life of the tribe, a knowledge of the significance of ^{events} ~~phenomena~~ ~~attending it~~ and of the things which the future holds in store for it is essential. The community, therefore, attributes this important

faculty to its deity, who is the "corporealized" expressions of its life. It is likewise assumed that the spirit or spirits are willing or can be coerced, to impart the information which they possess. The medium by which this information is communicated is, of course, the whole of reality, i.e., the physical environment of man, or those segments of it which have come into the horizon of his experience and interest, and his inner world; for the objective reality of such psychic phenomena as dreams, visions and hallucinations, is unquestioned by primitive man.

The Logic of Divination.

The science of ^{divination} ~~interpreting these~~ significant phenomena man learnt from actual experiences by subjecting ~~them~~ ^{these} to a logic which was vitiated by what Mr. Rose terms "A glaring fallacy of an 'ambiguous middle'". This fallacy it shares in common with sympathetic magic. "Man", says Mr. Tylor, "as yet in a low intellectual condition, having come to associate in thought those things which he found by experience to be connected in fact, proceeded erroneously to invert this action, and to conclude that association in thought must involve similar connection in reality. He thus attempted to discover, to foretell, and to cause events by means of processes which we can now see to have only an ideal significance." (Primitive Culture, Vol. I, p. 116.) But divination as a branch of sympathetic magic, is not sufficient to explain the very complex ^{which developed} divinatory systems. Many other elements entered into the construction of this elaborate pseudo-science. Totemism, probably, underlies the practice of augury and haruspicy. In general, the symbolic and religious (i.e. omens as divinely-inspired) interpretation of omens contributed much to the art of divination.

Divination in Israel.

Divination is universal in its practice. It is the spontaneous creation of all peoples in the earlier stages of their development. While certain kinds of divinatory practices may be foreign in their origin, yet divination as such is indi-

genous in Isreal as among all other peoples. "By the word of Yahweh would the children of Isreal set out for a journey and by the word of Yahweh would they encamp" (Num.9,18) Substitute any number of Gods or Spirits for "Yahweh" and any undertaking ~~at all~~ for "a journey" and you have an idea of the prevalence of divination in Isreal during the earlier stages of its religious evolution. The very strenuous endeavors of authoritative religion to eradicate the practice testify to the firm hold which it had upon the people. In the earlier polydaemonistic or polytheistic stages, divination was wide-spread, unchecked and unchallenged. It was with the rise of monotheism that divination was first called upon to defend itself. The fundamental implication of divination is the existence of many spirits, whom man may invoke for guidance and help. The rustling of the tree-tops was ominous only as long as the tree is the habitation of a Spirit, and the water-ordeal ^{is as meaningful} ~~is efficacious~~ only in so far as the water is from a sacred well -- the dwelling place of another Spirit. ^{True} Monotheism, ^{is} thus ~~proved~~ the ~~deadly~~ enemy of all forms of divination. ^{primitive}

Divination, like magic, was never fully eradicated from the popular religion of Isreal. The Bible, Apocrypha, Talmud and Mediaeval Jewish Literature bear ample evidence to this fact. But at the hands of the ^{official} ~~authoritative~~ religion ^{and especially the hands of the} it fared very badly, indeed. In this, Isreal differed from Egypt and Babylonia. In the religions of Egypt and Babylonia, divination was not only countenanced but ^{recognized and} encouraged. The same religious sentiments, which permitted magic to become part and parcel of the national cult could not discourage ~~the art of~~ divination.

Significance of the Study of Divination for the Science of the Religion of Isreal. An historical study of divination is co ipso a study of the rise and growth of monotheism. It traces the successive stages in the upward climb of a spiritual God-con-

cept and reveals the intense struggle which raged between true monotheism and crude syncretism, culminating in the triumph of the former. While it is true that as regards ^{little} spiritual and moral qualifications the prophet had ~~nothing~~ in common with the diviner, it is also true that chronologically the latter was anterior to the former, and that a process of evolution from the one to the other, can be discerned. A study of divination is thus indispensable to the student of the evolution of religious ideas in Israel.



I. General Terms for Divination.a - Of Legitimate Divination.

Presumably no distinction between official and unofficial, licit and illicit divination originally existed in Israel. All forms of divination, in so far as they were employed by the tribe as a whole or by individual members thereof, were legitimate and recognized. The literary records, however, which have come down to us are products of a much later time and, with few exceptions, draw a sharp line of demarkation between the two.

The comprehensive term denoting official or oracular divination is ק'ח ב'י א'ש , ק'ח ב'י א'ש , ק'ח ב'י א'ש — the latter having the refinement of indirectness. In an exhaustive study of the term ק'ח (Journal Bib. Liter. XIX, 88ff.), Mr. Jastrow establishes the technical meaning of the word to be that of "inquiring" or "consulting the deity". The ק'ח is then the medium employed in consultation, the one who obtains the oracle, the holy man or the priest. Mr. Jastrow identifies the word with the Assyrian sha-i-lu, meaning priest. Frequently ק'ח ב'י א'ש , ק'ח ב'י א'ש , ק'ח ב'י א'ש (or ק'ח ב'י א'ש) is used. It is to be noted, however, that whenever ק'ח ב'י א'ש is used, the implication is that the oracle is obtained through a prophet or a holy man, and not through the priest and the sacred lot (V. infra). The term ק'ח ב'י א'ש is used twenty-three times in the Bible. Nu. 27.21; Jos. 9.14; Jud. 1.1; 18.5; 20.18, 23, 27; I Sam. 10.22; 14.37; 22.10, 13, 15; 23.2, 4; 28.6; 30.8; II Sam. 2.1; 5.19, 23; 16.23; Is. 30.2; I Ch. 14.10, 14. The historical books claim twenty-one ^{of these}. The term ק'ח ב'י א'ש with a positive divinatory implication is used twenty-times in the Biblical writings seventeen of which are in the historical books. Gen. 25.22; Ex. 18.15; I Sam. 9.9; I K. 14.5; 22.5; 7, 8; II K. 3.11; 8.8; 22.13, 18; Ezek. 14.10; I Ch. 10; 14; II Ch. 16.12; 18.4, 6, 7; 26.5; 34.21, 26. Like ק'ח , ק'ח is very frequently used for the

many forms of illegitimate divination (For נִחֵן cf. D't.18.11; Hos. 4.12; Ez. 21.26 and I Ch. 10.13. For שָׁאָל cf. D't.18.11; I Sam. 28.7; II K. 1.2; 3, 6, 16; Is. 8.19; 19.3; II Ch. 17.3.) The term שָׁאָל in the early stages of its development had assumed new and derivative significance. From its original sense of "consulting", "inquiring of", it soon connoted the act of resorting to, or frequenting a place with a view of consulting or worshiping. D't. 12.5; Am. 5.5; II Ch. 1.5; and, still later, to seek the deity in order to worship him. (cf. D't 4.29; Is.9.12; 31.1 Jer. 10.21; Am. 5.4,6; Ps 9.11 et al.) It is, therefore, sometimes difficult to determine the exact meaning of the term. There are ten or eleven such dubious passages. (Is. 58.2; Jer. 21.2; 37.7; Ez. 14.7; 20.1,3; Hos. 10.12; I Ch. 13.3; 15.13; 21.30. II Ch. 26.5.)

In official divination, the oracle obtained through the priest and by means of the Urim and Thummim (V.infra) in matters of law or ritual was known as the Thorah (תּוֹרָה V.infra) In all other matters, such as the advisability of undertaking an expedition or the confirmation of the guilt or innocence of a party, it was in all probability, $\text{תְּשׁוּבָה מִלְּפָנֵי יְהוָה}$ (cf. Mic. 3.7). תְּשׁוּבָה is the technical term used of God's reply to an inquiry put to him through the priestly Urim and Thummim as well as through other physical media. (I Sam. 9.17; 14.37; 23.4; 28.6, 15; I Ch. 21.28 et al. The Assyrian annu, which corresponds to the Hebrew תְּשׁוּבָה is the technical term for a favorable answer from a deity. (cf. Haupt, Jour. Bib. Lit. XIX, p.71) Instead of תְּשׁוּבָה , תָּעֵן is sometimes used for God's reply. (Jud. 20.18; 23, 28; I Sam. 10.22; 23.2, 4, 11, 12 et al) but never, תָּעֵן

$\text{תְּשׁוּבָה מִלְּפָנֵי יְהוָה}$ is, as a rule, used of an oracle which comes from the mouth of a seer or prophet, through the help of no material things. (I Sam. 3.7; 9.27; 15.10 (of Samuel); II Sam.

7.4 (of Nathan) I K. 12.22, 24 (of Shemaiah); 13.4 (of an anonymous $\square' \bar{n} \bar{\lambda} \pi \psi \bar{\lambda}$); 13.20 (of a prophet at Bethel); 16.1, 7, II K. 15.12 (cf. Jehu ben Hanani, who in II Ch. 19.2 is called $\bar{n} \bar{\lambda} \bar{n} \bar{\lambda}$); 17.2, 8; 19.9; 21.17, 28 II K 9.36 (of Elijah); 22.5 (Jehosaphat asks for an oracle of Yahweh and the Nebim are summoned v.6); 22.19 (of Micaiah ben Imiah); II K. 3.12 (Elisha is said to be able to consult Yahweh $\bar{n} \bar{\lambda} \bar{n} \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}$); see also 7.1); 20.16, 19 (of Isaiah); et al.

$\aleph \psi \nu$ is frequently used of a prophetic oracle especially ~~of~~^{via} the prophecies of Isaiah, Nahum, Zechariah and Malachi. The term had a "materialistic" implication which $\eta / \eta \nu \gamma \alpha \gamma$ did not have. Jeremiah, therefore, commands the people never to use it again. (23.33 ff) $\eta / \eta \nu \eta \aleph \gamma$ in prophetic writings frequently takes the place of $\eta / \eta \nu \gamma \alpha \gamma$. The word may have its counterpart in the Arabic where it signifies "to groan, or "to sigh". $\eta \aleph \gamma$ may, then, have reference to the ecstatic outbursts of the possessed nabi or dervish.

b - Illegitimate Divination.

The generic term for divination is however, not (A) $\{x\psi$, nor (A) ψx but $\square \phi \overline{p}$. The former terms already contain a dogmatic implication viz. that Yahweh alone is to be consulted.

דֹּבֵי, however, is free from any such implication, and may be considered as the ^{earlier and} all-embracing group-term. Originally דֹּבֵי referred to a specific form of divination viz. - sortilege, but to this specific character of דֹּבֵי we shall ^{refer} have-recourse later. From many of the passages in the O.T. it is evident that דֹּבֵי refers to the whole category of illegitimate divination ^{every} practice in Israel. Saul commands the witch of Endor, who practices necromancy. וְיִשְׁׁלַח אֶל הַמְּוִדִים וְאֶל הַמְּכַשְׁפִּים (I.S. 28.8) Balaam is called דֹּבֵי (Jos. 13.22) and yet he divines by אֲשֵׁרֵי אֱמוֹנִים, Num 24.1). LXX, as a rule, translates דֹּבֵי by the all-inclusive term

of *אִי־נִבִּי*.

אִי־נִבִּי is the general opprobrious epithet

hurled by the true against the false prophets. "Thus saith

the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people to err ---

it shall be night unto you, that ye shall have no vision (*לֹא־רָאָה*)

and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine (*אִי־נִבִּי*)

and the seers (*אִי־נִבִּי*) shall be ashamed, and the diviners

(*אִי־נִבִּי*) confounded --- The heads thereof judge for reward,

and the priests thereof teach for hire and the prophets thereof

divine (*אִי־נִבִּי*) for money". (Mic. 3, 5-7, 11.) Jeremiah

couple the false prophets and the diviners together: "But as

for you, hearken ye not to your prophets, nor to your diviners

(*אִי־נִבִּי*) nor to your dreams --- (27. 9 cf. 29.8-9)

Ezekiel speaks of these prophets as "daubing for them with untem-

pered mortar, seeing (*אִי־נִבִּי*) vanity, and living (*אִי־נִבִּי*) lies

unto them, saying, thus saith the Lord, God, when the Lord God

hath not spoken". (23.28) and again "My hand shall be against the

prophets that see vanity and that divine (*אִי־נִבִּי*) lies". (13.9

note also 13.6, 7, 23.)

אִי־נִבִּי had at a very early time fallen into disfavor

among the authoritative representatives of the religion of Israel.

We have noted how the prophets applied the term to those whom they

considered false prophets. It was denounced as an alien product

which had been grafted upon the pure religion of Israel. "And the

Philistines called for the priests and the diviners (*אִי־נִבִּי*)

saying, what shall we do with the ark of the Lord". (1.3.6.2. The

Philistines are regarded as the ^{el} ~~sons~~ ^{of} origo of divination ^{prac-} ~~prac-~~ ^{nces}

tices, also by Isaiah 2.6) The author of Num. 22.7 connects ^{them} with

the Moabites and the Midianites: "And the elders of the Moab

and the elders of Midian departed and the rewards of divination

(*אִי־נִבִּי*) in their hand." Again, the King of Babylon is

made to practice *אִי־נִבִּי*: "For the King of Babylon stood at the

parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination

(לֹא יִיָּדָע)". (Ezek. 21.26) and the author of Num. 23.23 triumphantly exclaims, "there is no observation of omens (לֹא יִיָּדָע v. infra) in Jacob nor divining (לֹא יִיָּדָע) in Israel".

But the term had no such unsavory connotation before the ~~word~~ ^{brand} of official disapproval was put upon it. Echoes of a day when the term was not yet censored are found in such a statement as this: "A divine sentence (לֹא יִיָּדָע) is on the lips of the King; his mouth shall not transgress in judgment" (Prov. 16.10. Perhaps also Is. 3.1-2, but v. infra.)



II. Kinds of Divination.

We have noted that Israel shared the superstition of divination in common with all other Semitic peoples and that while the Israelitish divinatory practices may have differed in kind from those of other peoples, in ~~basic~~ principles they were identical. It behooves us, therefore, to consider now the kinds of divination known in ancient Israel without reference to the attitude which later authorities entertained towards them or, in other words, without subjecting them to the test of legitimacy, which later Israel set up. Later, we shall distinguish between licit and illicit divination, and we shall endeavor to trace the rise and development of this principle of legitimacy. For the present, it will suffice us to classify the many varieties of divinatory practices known in ancient Israel and to analyze them.

We consider Mr. Toy's classification (Int. to Hist. of Rel. p. 409) of the various forms of divination as a very helpful one: "Divinatory signs may be grouped in various classes according as they belong to the outer world or to men's inward experiences and according as they present themselves without or with preparation of man". Applying this principle to Hebrew divination, we may classify all our material as follows:

I. Heteroscopic - (signs belonging to outer world).

A. Involuntary - (without preparation by man).

1. Omens - (ordinary occurrences)

a - augury.

b - astrology.

c - birth omens.

d - dendromancy.

2. Portents (uncommon occurrences)

B. Voluntary (with preparation by man).

1. Sortilege.

a -- belomaney

b -- rhabdomaney or xylomaney

- | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| 2. Hydromancy | 3. Ordeal |
| | 1. Oath |
| 4. Hepatoscopy | 4. Miscellaneous |
| 6. Necromancy. | |

II. Autoscopic (signs belonging to man's inward experience)

a -- Oneiromancy.

b -- Possession.

I. Heteroscopic (Involuntary)

1. Omens.

The Hebrew term for "omen" is נִיח . While נִיח has frequently the meaning of "sign", "pledge" or "token" it specifically denotes an object or an occurrence which may be considered ominous. Miraculous acts are frequently asked from or offered by angels, prophets or holy men, which the petitioner considers, as good or bad omens. Hezekiah asks an נִיח of Isaiah, which will assure him of a speedy recovery (II K. 20.8 cf. Is. 38.22). Ordinary predictions which come true are considered ominous. Thus Samuel predicts to Saul that three things will occur on his journey. These occurrences will prove ominous. "And let it be, when these signs (נִיחֶיךָ) are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion serve thee, for God is with thee". (I Sam 10.7).

An angel informs Eli that his two sons will die in one day and this should serve as an omen (נִיחֶיךָ) of God's displeasure. (I. Sam 2.34 See also II K. 19.29; Is. 37:30; Jer. 44.29). The manner in which the Philistines greet Jonathan and his armor-bearer is considered ominous (נִיחֶיךָ I. Sam. 14.10). The phrase נִיחֶיךָ (נִיחֶיךָ) נִיחֶיךָ used nine times in the O.T. seems to have a technical meaning: "this thing or this coming occurrence you may look upon as an omen".

The term which embraces divination from all natural phenomena accidental or otherwise is probably נִיחֶיךָ . Two biblical passages point directly to this interpretation of the term.

Joseph divines by means of a cup. The practice here referred to is probably hydromancy. The term used is $\psi\chi\iota$ (Gen. 44.5, 15.). Balaam is said to go in quest of $\mu\upsilon\sigma\chi\iota$ (Num. 24.1). He is among mountains and he is probably observing natural phenomena and interpreting them; hence his statement to Balak, "Stand by thy burnt offering and I will go, peradventure the Lord will come to meet me". (Num. 23.30). The Septuagint renders $\psi\chi\iota$ $\delta\iota\omega\upsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$ and $\mu\upsilon\sigma\chi\iota$, $\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}$. Now, $\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}$, while originally referring to divination from the flight of birds, came to apply in due time to the entire field of divination from natural phenomena. The Peshito, however, under the influence of LXX, translates Lev. 19.26. $\text{לֹא תִחְזָקוּ בְּכַף יָדְכֶם}$, "ye shall not divine by means of winged creatures", thus retaining the earlier connotation of $\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}$.

Talmudic literature seems to be almost unanimous in this explanation of the term.

Thus:

ת'ר מנהל; זה האמר פגו נפלה ג' פה, ע קאן נפלה ג' פה, 151
ק'א א מאמח, ז'כז ק'א א לכו דבסיקא 237, ת'חט ג' פה,
ולא ולמחל, ס'א ח'חט ב, למחוט ב'א, ר'ח ב'א, ג'א, ג'א, ב'א

"The Rabbis taught -- A *losh* is one who says" his crumb fell out of his mouth; his staff fell from his hand; his son called him from behind his back; a raven croaked at him; a deer cut the way off before him; a snake crawled on the right side of him or a fox on his left; do not begin with me, for it is early morning or New Moon or Saturday evening" (San. 35 b ff. cp. the Sifre. Ed.

Friedmann P. 107a where some slight variations to the above are found). And again: *לֹא יִנָּבֵא מִדְּבַר חַיָּה וְלֹא מִדְּבַר שָׁמַיִם* "Ye shall not divine" -- like those who divine from a weasel, from fowl or from stars" (Sifra, Ed. Weiss, P. 90 a et b. The version in S⁹a. 66a, has *מִדְּבַר דָּג* "from fish" instead of *מִדְּבַר שָׁמַיִם* "from stars")

to be Noah's informants, and that the ravens are appointed by God to bring food to Elijah (I.R. 17:4-6). Some have found also in Eccl. 10:20 "for a bird of the air shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter" a reference to divination by means of the flight of birds. (cf. Jew. Encyc. s.v. "Augury"). But we shall not be justified in concluding that because of its apparent absence from the Bible. Augury (in its restricted sense) was unknown in ancient Israel. Augury in Israel may have shared the same fate as in Assyria and Babylonia. While Assyrian - Babylonian literature abound in animal - divination, in haruspicy and hepatoscopy, the institution of bird-divination is very rarely represented. Mr. Jastrow offers an explanation which in principle may be held to apply to Israelitish augury as well. "Es ist daher wohl möglich, dass das Fehlen von direkten Andeutungen auf Vogelwahrsagung in den Annalen und sonstigen historischen Inschriften der babylonischen und assyrischen Herrscher darauf zurückzuführen ist, dass diese Unterart der Vorbedeutungslehre durch die Bevorzugung der Leber - und ⁴Himmelschau für offizielle Zwecke, um den Göttlichen Willen und das Vorhaben der Götter im voraus zu bestimmen, in den Hintergrund ⁴zurückgedrängt wurde" ("Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens", II, 800). Augury was a very common practice among the Arabs (Wellhausen, Heid. p. 202 and Hastings E.R.E. s.v. "Divination" (Muslim), the raven especially being looked upon as a bird of omen.

The dove was endowed by the ancient Hebrews with a sacred character. W. R. Smith remarks that "the fact that the dove was not used by the Hebrews for any ordinary sacrifice involving a sacrificial meal, can hardly be, in its origin, independent of the sacrosanct character ascribed to this bird in the religion of the heathen Semites". (Religion of the Semites, p. 219 Note 2). The natural complement to the idea of the sanctity of an animal or fowl is its power to give information on matters

otherwise obscure.

The dove continued to retain its sacred character down to a very late date in Jewish history. The $\psi\gamma\eta\ \eta\ \nu\lambda$ or the $\eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$ was represented in the form of a dove and the $\eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi\ \eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$ are frequently mentioned. (cf. Sab. 31a; San. 96a; Sifre Deut. Ed. Fried. 147a; Sotah 13b and the story of the baptism of Jesus: "And Jesus when he was baptized, went up straight way out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him". Matt. 3.16; M'k. 1.10 Luke 3.21-22) The entire community of Israel is identified with the dove (San. 95a; Git. 45a; Shir ha Shir R.I.) The Talmudists are well acquainted with this form of divination and while they frequently attribute its origin to the Arabs (e.g. Pesik. 33b, Commenting on "And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the men of the East" (I.K.5.10) the Rabbis remark: "What was the wisdom of the men of the East?" and the answer is given: "They knew astrology, $\lambda\tau\theta\alpha\ \eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$ and augury, $\eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi\ \eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$) it is evident that the practice was widespread and of great antiquity. While it was officially frowned upon by the Rabbis who included it among the heathen practices. ($\eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi\ \eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$ See e.g. Sab. 67b: "if one says to a raven, croak, and to a she-raven, shriek and turn thy tail towards me, this is one of the $\eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi\ \eta\ \nu\lambda\ \psi$), it was frequently resorted to even by the scholars themselves. Thus the story is told of R. Ilish who, while sitting one day next to a man who understood the language of the birds, heard the croaking of a raven. Upon interrogating his neighbor as to what the raven was saying, he was impressed that it was saying "Ilish, escape!" "Ilish, escape!" But Ilish would not hearken to the warning, contending that the raven was lying. Soon, a dove came and called unto him. Upon in-

quity, he was informed that she, too, was saying "Ilish, escape! ,
 "Ilish, escape!" R. Ilish took this warning to heart and escaped
 for he said: *לִישׁוֹן הַיָּדוֹשׁ הַזֶּה הוּא הַיָּדוֹשׁ* i.e. the dove is the
 omen bird of Israel. (Git. 45a cf. also the story of R. Joshua
 ben Levi and the heretic (or Sadducee) Ber . 7a. to this Ab.
 Zarah 4b and San. 105b) The Samaritans were accused by the
 Rabbis of being dove-worshippers: "R. Nachman b. Isaac said,
 The effigy of a dove was found on Mt. Gerizim which they (Samaritans)
 worshipped." (Hul. 6a and J.Ab. Zar.V. 44d) Among those
 who are disqualified to serve as judges and witnesses are the *הַיָּדוֹשׁ*
הַזֶּה those who bet on the flight of doves. (San. III, 3. See
 also San 25a) Two references to augury in the pseudepigrapha
 may also be given, the one attributing the reintroduction of augury
 in Israel to Manasseh, ("The Martyrdom of Isaiah," II,5) and the
 other, prompted by a spirit of *understanding* *390* ~~overzealousness~~ for the cause which
 he is propogating, maintains that the Jews "do not consider the
 portents of sneezes and birds of augury". (Third Sibylline Book,
 line 224).

b - Astrology.

"Among the Semites", says Smith, "The worship of sun,
 moon and stars does not appear to have had any great vogue in
 the earliest times. Among the Hebrews there is little trace
 of it before Assyrian influence became potent, and in Arabia it
 is by no means so prominent as it sometimes supposed". (R.S. p.135
 Note 2). And so Wellhausen: "Auf Himmelszeichen wird weniger
 geachtet, die eigentliche Astrologie war den Arabern fremd ----
 (Heid. P. 204].

But long before the Assyrian influence had been directly
 felt, Israel had come into close contact with the Canaanitish
 religion in which the celestial nature of some deities was greatly

form to the present day. The new moon is still greeted by the Arab. (Doughty, "Arabia Deserta", I 336,455 cf. the Jewish custom of blessing the new moon, q.v. J.E. s.v.) and it is undoubtedly true that "the religious observance of the new moon with festal rejoicing and sacrifice belongs originally to a lunar cult". (Encyc. Bib. p 3355. An old Talmudic legend seems to suggest the same idea Hul.60b.)

Speaking of the reaction which set in under Manasseh, J.M.P. Smith correctly remarks that "it did not introduce sun-worship as a new cult, but rather revitalized a worship which had long been known in Israel, though it had lain more or less dormant, or had been confined chiefly to the rural population, having had no official recognition". ("Zephaniah", P.188 Inter. Critical Comm). The historical books abound in references to this form of idolatry. (e.g. II K 17.16; 21.3,5; 23.5.12.) In the period of the prophets, the worship of "the hosts of heaven", was prevalent in Israel and the prophets, from Amos down, exerted themselves to the utmost to suppress it. Amos and Isaiah denounce it. (Amos 5.26; Is. 17.8). Zephaniah (1.5) and Jeremiah (7.18; 8.2; 19.15; 32.29) inveigh against it. Deuteronomy is strenuous in its opposition (4.19; 17.3) but it is doubtful if the reformation succeeded in putting even a temporary check to this idolatry. Nor did the Destruction ^{of the Temple}. Jeremiah makes condemnatory mention of it (6.6; 8.16). Deutero-Isaiah indirectly fights this idolatry by insisting that Yahweh ^{the Creator and Lord of all the hosts.} is ~~autonomy~~ ^{is} to them (40.26; 45.12). Job speaks of it. (31.26-7). The practice in some form or other survived throughout post-exilic times and traces of it are found in very late Talmudic sources.

In C.T. literature there are few direct references to the practice of astrology, but the mass of evidence pointing to the prevalent worship of the hosts of heaven, points conclusively to the fact that astrology in some form was practiced in ancient

Israel. Jeremiah urges the people

לֹא תִירָאוּ מִלְּאֵלֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם

"be not afraid of the signs of the heavens" (10.2). He calls this practice of studying the heavenly signs ^{וְלִמְדָם} ^{וְלִמְדָם} "the custom

of the heathen", but the prophets are always tempted to as-

cribe to Israelitish idolatry a foreign nativity. According to

P. the sun and the moon were created ^{וַיֵּצְאֵם} ^{וַיֵּצְאֵם}

(Gen.1.14) and ^{וְלִמְדָם} has been interpreted by some to mean "astro-

logical portents". (But see Skinner, "Genesis", p.25, Int. Crit,

Com.) The most direct reference to astrological divination in the

Bible is found in Deutero-Isaiah. "Thou art wearied in the multi-

tude of thy counsels: let now those that observe the heavens, ^{וְלִמְדָם} ^{וְלִמְדָם}

the star-gazers (^{וְלִמְדָם}) the monthly prognosticators

(^{וְלִמְדָם}) stand up, and save thee from the things that shall

come upon thee (47.13) The prophet speaks of Babylonian astro-

logy. ^{וְלִמְדָם} is probably corrupt. ^{וְלִמְדָם} has been suggested.

Also ^{וְלִמְדָם} ^{וְלִמְדָם} (Amer. Jour. Sem. Lang. XVI p. 223-224).

Hitzig (Comm. on Isaiah) suggest ^{וְלִמְדָם} ^{וְלִמְדָם}

"die Himmelskundigen." Haupt (Jour. Bib. Lit. XIX, p. 67) would

read it, ^{וְלִמְדָם} (perfect Qal of ^{וְלִמְדָם}). "Who observe the

heavens. Most all would connect it with the Babylonian bara,

"seer". Divination from the movements of the planets and prom-

inent stars and constellations was a most common practice among

the Assyrians and Babylonians (see the copious texts given in

Jastrow's Rel. u. As. Vol. II 612-749). Prognostication from

the appearances of the new, full and old moon occupied the most

important position of Assyro-Babylonian astrology (see ibid II,

457 - 577). The ^{relation} ~~connection once caused~~ of misfortune and

catastrophe ^{to} ~~with~~ the eclipse of the moon or the sun fully

acknowledged in Assyro-Babylonian astrology, is evidenced from

the picture drawn of the "Day of Yahweh" in Is. 13.10. "For

the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not

give their light. The sun shall be darkened in his going forth and the moon shall not cause her light to shine". (cf. Is. 24.23; Joel 3.4). References to astrology are found in N.T. literatures (e.g. the story of the Magi who learn of the birth of the Messiah from "a star in the east", and in the Talmud.

c - Birth Omens.

Divination through the observation of signs noted at birth ~~in infants~~ was one of the three chief methods of divination among the Assyrians and Babylonians (see Jastrow, "Babylonian-Assyrian Birth-Omens" P. 28-41. also his Rel. Bab. u. Assy. 891 f.) We suggest that an echo of this practice is found in the story of the birth of Esau and Jacob. (Gen. 25.21-26) ^{the} pre-natal struggle of the infants in the womb of the mother, causes her to ^{regard} ~~consider~~ it an evil omen. She suspects the birth of twins. Now the birth of two males was looked upon as an unfavorable sign. One cuneiform text reads as follows: "If a woman gives birth to two boys, famine will prevail in the land, the interior of the country will witness misfortune, and misfortune will enter the house of their father". Rebekah, therefore, dismayed at the prospect (v. 21) proceeds to consult the deity (v. 22). The answer (v. 23) while encouraging in some respects does not allay her fears entirely. Some misfortune is inevitable. There will be strife and contention among her offspring. They will separate and war with one another until the younger shall subdue the older. Jacob's holding the heel of Esau in his hand at the moment of birth was also considered, at least by the author of the narrative, ominous. (v. 26). So also were the circumstances attending the birth of Tamar's twins (Gen. 38.28), ~~considered ominous~~.

d - Dendromancy.

We need not dwell long on the fact the tree-worship

in ancient Israel. ^{that was worship in Palestine} ~~That it~~ was widespread in pre-Israelitish times is witnessed by the fact that there existed many cult-centres, scattered in and around Canaan, whose cult object was a sacred tree. The cities or places of Hebron (Gen. 13.18), Shechem (Gen. 12.6), Gibeah (I Sam. 22.6), Gibeath Hammore (Jud. 7.1), Elin (Ex. 15.27), Elath (P.T. 2.8) Elen (Jos. 19.43), Emek ha Elah (I Sam. 17.27), Ophra (Jud. 6.11) Baal Tamar (Jud. 20.33), Elen Tabor (I Sam. 10.3), Tomer Deborah (Jud. 4.5), Jabesh (I. Sam. 31.13) owe their sanctity to the presence of some sacred tree or trees in their midst. The עֵץ הָאֵל , עֵץ הָאֵל , עֵץ הָאֵל or עֵץ הָאֵל mentioned so frequently in the O.T. is undoubtedly a sacred tree, inhabited, presumably by a numen. "Es wird also dabei bleiben, עֵץ הָאֵל , עֵץ הָאֵל , עֵץ הָאֵל und עֵץ הָאֵל sind Bezeichnungen des hlg. Baumes ohne Rücksicht auf ihre spezielle Gattung. Alle diese Wörter sind von עֵץ herzu-leiten". (Gall, "Altisraelitische Kultstätten, p. 28). The sacred character of the tree would naturally lead to divination. The deity would give information and indicate his will through the movements and rustlings of the branches and leaves of the tree. David divines from the sound in the tops of the mulberry trees the proper moment to attack the Philistines (II Sam. 5.24). We have mention in the Bible of an עֵץ הָאֵל "tree of the revealer near Shechem, (Gen. 12.6) which is also called עֵץ הָאֵל "tree of the spoth sayers" (Jud. 9.37). Deborah sits under a ~~a palm tree~~ ^{reader} a palm tree, and ~~gives decisions, and information~~ (Jud. 4.5-6. (see also, infra, Rhabdomancy and Neomenim).

2. PORTENTS.

Extraordinary physical phenomena were considered ominous. They portented mostly evil. We have seen how the eclipses of the sun or the moon were looked upon as unfavorable omens. God's displeasure was also manifested in storms, thunder, lightning and earthquake. (Is. 29.6 cf. story of the crucifixion of Jesus M't. 27.51 f.). Even the rainbow is ominous. It is called an $\text{קוֹמָחַ$

(Gen. 9.17). It signified that God's anger is past. This attitude ^{towards} the more striking of physical phenomena may be the cause or the consequent of that theology which looked upon fire, lightning and storm as manifestations of the deity or its accompaniment. (Gen. 15.7; Ex. 3; 18.21; 19.18; 24.17 et al.)

B. Voluntary Divination.

1. Sortilege.

Sortilege played a significant role in ancient Hebrew divination and its hold upon the people was so strong that even the official religious ritual retained it until a very late date. The practice was widespread among the heathen Arabs where it is known as *istigam*, and is resorted to before every important undertaking. It was a form of divination by means of a sacred lot, usually headless arrows, originally, perhaps, small twigs, three in number, two of which were inscribed with "Yes" or "No" respectively, the third was blank. The question addressed to the deity was in the form of an alternative, e.g. "Shall we go to war or shall we not?" "Is he guilty or is he not?" The arrows were then ~~probably~~ placed in a quiver and whirled about and the one which first fell out signified the answer of the deity. If the blank arrow appeared, ~~then~~ the lot was recast. (Wellhausen, *Heid.* p.132-3 and Note 5; Smith, *Journal, Philology*, XIII, 273; XIV, 113 f.) In the O.T.

$\pi o \pi$ as have been previously observed, is the generic term for all kinds of illicit divination. But traces are still found of an earlier and more specific connotation: that of a sacred lot by means of arrows. The locus classicus is Ezek. 21.26-27. "For the kings of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination ($\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$), he shook the arrows ($\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$), he consulted the Teraphim, he inspected the live. In his right hand was the divination ($\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$ $\pi o \pi$)

(1.) The actual Urim and Thummim are in the keeping of the priest (v. 36 and also use of וְהַכֹּהֵן v.42), Ahijah ben Abitub (v.3), while Saul addresses the question to God (v.41).

(2) The ceremony is performed in the presence of God (v.36), probably in the semblance of the Ephod, which was carried by Ahijah (v.5).

(3) The Urim and Thummim can decide an "alternative" question only i.e. when there are only two possibilities. Hence all present had to be divided first into two groups, the people on the one hand and the royal party - Saul and Jonathan - on the other. The Urim designated the royal group. The process was repeated and then Jonathan was "taken".

(4) All parties concerned in the rite had to agree before hand as to the manner in which the lot was to be interpreted.

(5) Saul used the official form of address which was employed in cases of divination by means of the Urim and Thummim. $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ (v.41 cf. I Sam. 28.10)

(6) The term לָקַח which is frequently used of "taken by lot" (10.20; Jos.7.14, 16.) is here used in connection with the Urim and Thummim.

(7) The entire ceremony is subsumed under the term $\text{עֲשֵׂה לִּי חֵן וְחַסְדִּים}$ (v.37).

✓ The analysis points conclusively to the casting of a lot probably by means of two stones, the one designated אֶבֶן יִפְתָּח the other אֶבֶן חֵן .

The etymology of the two terms is still a matter of dispute. The Massoretic text clearly implies that אֶבֶן יִפְתָּח is a derivative from יָפֵחַ "light" and אֶבֶן חֵן is the plural of חֵן "completeness", "perfection". The supposition is that the Urim "brought to light" the guilt of the subject, while the

Thummim, established his innocence. (see Hastings, "Dict. of the Bible" s.v.) Some modern scholars have derived Urim from עֲרִיב "curse" and תִּמְמִי from טָהוֹר "be without fault". So Wellhausen, Schwally and Haupt. W. Muss-Arnolt, following Zimmern, would identify the Urim and Thummim with the "tables of stone" and would "connect עֲרִיב with the Assyrian *arû*, an infinitive Piel of *a'aru* from which are derived also the nouns *urû*, "command, order, decision" (usually of the gods) and *têrû* (originally of the same meaning), ----- and תִּמְמִי with *tamû*, Piel *tummû*, verbal forms also belonging to the oracular language" (Amer. Jr. Sem. Lang. XVI p. 193 ff. For a good resumé of the whole subject, see McNeile, "The Book of Exodus" pp. 182-184.)

There is frequent mention of the use of the sacred lot in the historical books of the Bible, although the act is not always called "consulting the Urim and Thummim". Cases very similar to the one just quoted are found in the story of Achan, where the attendant circumstances are very much like those in the case of Saul and Jonathan, (Jos. 7.14-18), and in the election of Saul (I Sam. 10.19-22). In the historical books practically all cases of divination which are introduced by the phrase עֲרִיב וְתִמְמִי

עֲרִיב וְתִמְמִי or עֲרִיב וְתִמְמִי imply the use of the Urim and Thummim. Nearly all cases where עֲרִיב וְתִמְמִי is used, the answer given is in the same phraseology as that used in the Urim and Thummim viz. "Yes" or "No", or some similar expression. (Jos. 9.14; Jud. 1.1-2; 20.18, 26-28; I Sam. 10.22 (?); 14.37 ff; 23.2, 4; 30.3; II Sam. 2.1; 5.19, 23.) The most complete expression of the ceremony is found in Judges 20.26-28, where fasting, prayers and sacrifices precede the act of divination.

The Urim and Thummim are frequently associated with the Ephod. In many cases the association is implied though not expressed, thus in I Sam. 23.6 ff., David is about to question God whether Saul will come against them and whether the men of Keilah will betray him into Saul's hands. He commands Abiathar, the

priest, to bring near the Ephod. The ceremony then takes place and it is evident that the 'modus operandi' is identical with that of I Sam. 14.40 ff. The Ephod is addressed as אֶפְדֹּד (אֶפְדֹּד , אֶפְדֹּד (v.10). Whenever אֶפְדֹּד is used in the historical writing, the use of the Ephod seems to be implied (cf. I Sam. 14.18 (read with LXX $\text{ἐφ' ὅπου ἦτο ὁ ἐφδός}$). The same change may with justification be made in a very similar case, Judges 20.27); I. Sam. 30.7-8. For a study of the Ephod see G.P. Moore, "Judges" (1935) pp.380-399 and the same work in the Int. Crit. Comm. (1910) pp.380-381).

The אֶפְדֹּד in the historical books is the genetic term for the sacred lot. The agent is usually spoken of as אֶפְדֹּד , אֶפְדֹּד , אֶפְדֹּד and אֶפְדֹּד . The root of the word seems to denote "stone" like the Greek $\psi\phi\sigma$ and the Assyrian puru (Heb. אֶפְדֹּד). It is mentioned in connection with dividing land, assigning to service, duty or punishment, determining the guilt of persons, etc. (see "Lexicon", Br. Div. and Briggs, s.v. אֶפְדֹּד).

The Urim and Thummim were known in post-exilic times, but their real meaning had probably been forgotten. The Urim and Thummim according to P were to be put into the אֶפְדֹּד (Ex. 28.30; Lev.8.8.), the pocket or pouch on the breast of the High Priest, which is to contain the instruments for obtaining divine decisions. The tradition of the function of the High Priest to consult the Urim and Thummim is retained in Num. 27.21 and that of the purpose of the Urim and Thummim in Ezra 2.63 cf. Ez. 7.63 and I Es. 5.40. The three last references show conclusively that Post-Exilic Judaism did not have the Urim and Thummim. In fact Talmudic tradition corroborates this statement. (Sotah IX,10; Yoma 31b; Jer. Kidd. 65b).

a. Belomancy.

We may consider belomancy, the art of divining by means

of arrows, under the general heading of sortilege. There are two instances in the Bible where belomancy is resorted to. The one in Ezek. 21.26-27, has been previously considered. The second reference is found in the story of King Joash and the prophet Elisha (II K. 13.14-19. The narrative is fragmentary, two accounts having been apparently blended together. Both are closely related to acts of sympathetic magic). Perhaps a reference to belomancy is found also in the story of David and Jonathan. (I Sam. 20.13 ff. see Hastings's E.R.E. IV, 810).

✓b, Rhabdomancy.

A practice similar to belomancy is rhabdomancy or xylomancy-the art of divining by means of a staff, rod or sticks. Hosea may have had this practice in mind when he denounces his Israel: "My people ask counsel of their wood and their staff declares to them the oracle" (4.13). This practice ~~may be~~^{is} a survival of tree worship (Jevons in Dict. of Bible s.v. Divination). The rod may then be considered as a smaller ashera. (see Smith op cit., p.196, note 5). Omens were derived from the flourishing or withering of rods. In this manner Aaron is chosen. (Num. 17.16 ff.). The planting of Adonis rods as acts of sympathetic magic and divination seems to be referred to in Is. 17.10-11. Mr. Gaster contends that the feeling of the rods by Jacob was an act of divination, which was explained to him by an angel in a dream. (Gen. 31.10-12. Hastings's loc.cit.) but this is doubtful. The rod may be the dwelling place of a deity and may accordingly do things on its own accord seems to be implied in the stories of the rod of Moses (Ex. 4.17), the staff in the hand of the angel who appeared to Gideon (Jud. 6.21) and the staff which Elisha gives to Gehazi in order to revive by means of it the son of the Shunammite (II K. 4.29).

2. Hydromancy.

Hydromancy presupposes river and well deities. That such deities were revered and worshipped in Canaan ~~and~~ⁱⁿ pre and post-

Jahwistic times is attested by the large number of sacred localities which derived their sanctity from the presence of holy waters in their midst. Among these cult-centers may be mentioned Beer-sheba (Gen. 21.30), An holy tree was likewise one of its sacra v.33), Beer Lachai Roi (Gen. 16.14-v.7), Madash (called in Gen. 14.7 ^{gihon} ~~gihon~~ and in Num. 20.13, ~~gihon~~ ^{gihon} (I.K. 1.33), Ramath Lechi (Jud. 15.19) and En Shemesh (Jos. 15.7).

Water oracles were quite common among the primitive Semites in general, e.g. the oracle of Aphaca, where the will of the deity was ascertained from the acceptance or rejection of the gifts thrown into the water. (cf. Smith, o.c. p. 176 ff.) ~~See also~~

Divination by means of a cup is referred to in the story of Joseph (Gen. 44.5 ff.) The practice consisted probably

in interpreting the images reflected on the surface of the cup or in studying the appearance, size, number, etc. of the ^{globules} ~~bubbles~~ formed by oil poured into a goblet of water. Oil and water divination was quite popular in Assyria and Babylonian, although it never attained to the importance of astrology or hepatoscopy. (~~see Easton's Bib. II 749-775, also Hist. of Bible V, p. 558-56~~)

From the scant reference to it in the Bible it is impossible to draw any definite conclusion as to its method of operation or its importance in the scheme of divinatory practices among the Hebrews.)

3. Ordeal.

The ordeal as a means of adjudication is practically universal in its practice. It is a direct appeal to the deity to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused. Among peoples who worship spring or river deities, the ordeal ~~with~~ ^{was} naturally ~~one~~ of water. The supposition is that it is a dangerous thing for an impious or guilty person to be brought into contact with the deity. In cases where the suspect is thrown into the water, the deity, if he is guilty, will reject

him. ~~In~~ the manner of the ordeal is by drinking ~~the~~ holy water, disease or even death might accrue to the guilty one. (~~see Smith op. cit. p. 122, 123.~~) The Code of Hammurabi (par. 2) retains the water-ordeal in the case of a man accused of sorcery. The classical instance in the Bible is the ordeal of the Sotah -- the wife accused of adultery (Num. 5.11 ff.) In connection with this ordeal it is interesting to note the following details.

(a) A sacrifice termed ~~וּשְׁלֹחַן עֵזְרָא~~ (v. 15) accompanies the ceremony. (On the combination of terms, see Stade, Die Eiferopfer, *thora*, in Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft XV, 166-178. (b) The water used in the ordeal is to be ~~וּשְׁלֹחַן עֵזְרָא~~ probably water from a holy spring, ~~with~~ ~~this~~ Others have suggested on the strength of LXX, ~~Q 10~~

~~וּשְׁלֹחַן עֵזְרָא~~ "running water" and adduce Num. 19.17 and Lev. 14.5 f. where running water is used in somewhat kindred rites as proof (See Gray, "Numbers" p. 51, Int. Crit. Comm.) (c) The water is further mixed with dust from the floor of the tabernacle i.e. holy dust. (d) An oath of purgation is administered before it is imbibed. The draught contains the written words of the oath which have been washed into it. The oath in itself ~~is~~ a kind of an ordeal (v. infra) is here coupled with the water ordeal.

While it is true that P attributes the efficacy of the ordeal and the decision to Yahweh, a comparative study of the practice in antiquity proves beyond doubt that the author ~~has~~ interpreted ~~and modified~~ the ^{rule} ~~practice~~ in the light of a latter-day Yahwism.

An ordeal akin to the above in principle is narrated in Num. 16. Korah and two hundred and fifty princes of the congregation have questioned the ^{authority and supremacy} ~~uniqueness~~ of the holiness of Moses and Aaron. (v. 3) Moses entrusts his case into the hands of God. (v. 5) He proposes an ordeal; "This do, take you censers --- and put fire therein, and put incense upon them before Yahweh tomorrow; and it shall be that the man whom Yahweh doth choose, he shall be

holy! (v.6-7). The ordeal takes place and Korah and his associates are destroyed by fire. (v.35). The supposition underlying this ordeal is that only those who possess Levitical holiness and are specifically designated for the task ^{can} ~~approach~~ approach Yahweh with impunity. (cf. the story of Nadab and Abihu, Lev. 10.2 ff.)

It is very likely that in the ^{burial} ~~case~~ Ex. 22.7-8, the decision of Yahweh is given by means of some kind of an ordeal although an oath (ibid v.10) or the sacred lot may have been used. In general, it may be argued, ~~with Smith~~, that the cases which were too hard for men to decide and which were referred to God, were decided, in earlier stages of Israelitish development, by means of the ordeal as well as by the sacred lot and the oath. In this connection it is significant, to quote Smith, "That the oldest Hebrew tradition refers the origin of the Torah to the divine sentences taught by Moses at the sanctuary of Kadesh or Meribah (Waters of controversy), beside the holy fountain, which in Gen. 14.7 is also called $\text{עֵינַן הַיְּדִיּוֹת}$ "fountain of judgment" (opcit, p.181 v. infra "Places of Divination").

(a) OATH.

The oath is, in reality, a form of ordeal. In fact it is frequently, as in the case of the sotah, associated with it. The efficacy of an oath was an indisputable fact in the mind of primitive man. ~~The oath, once administered,~~ The deity would inevitably punish the one who ~~had~~ perjured himself. (cf. Zec. 5.1 ff.) The ~~punitive or~~ judicial oath, like the ordeal was employed only in cases where no proofs or evidence could be obtained. The oath was known as the $\text{שְׁוָא וְכִלְיָוִת}$ (Ex. 22.10). The $\text{שְׁוָא וְכִלְיָוִת}$ was sometimes coupled with an קִלְעָוִת , the curse, which was to fall upon him who perjured himself. (Num. 5.21

Dan. 9.11; cf. the interesting case of Peter's denial of his master. M't. 26.70 ff. At first Peter merely denies

was

that he [^]with Jesus. $\delta \delta \epsilon \chi \rho \nu \acute{\iota} \sigma \tau \omega$ (v.70); when he is accused again he denies with an oath: $\kappa \alpha \iota \tau \acute{\iota} \delta \lambda \iota \nu \chi \rho \nu \acute{\iota} \sigma \tau \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta \rho \kappa \omega \nu$. (v.72) and the third accusation he denies with an oath and a curse.

$\tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon \chi \rho \nu \acute{\iota} \sigma \tau \omega \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon \mu \alpha \tau \acute{\iota} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \epsilon \iota \kappa$ (v.74).

The formula for the oath administered in the case of the Sotah is given in full in Num. 5.19-22. What the formula was in cases of legal disputes is nowhere given. It is possible that it resembled somewhat the form of the ordinary oaths of promise, covenant or adjuration, so numerous in the O.T.; (לך ושלך) followed by the enumeration of the points at issue. (I. Sam. 3.17; 14.44; II Sam. 3.35; I.K. 2.23.)

Judging from Num. 5.19 ff. the oath of purgation was not taken by the defendant but was administered to her by the priest. To this oath the accused subscribes by answering Amen, Amen, thereby rendering the oath valid. Without the accused's expressed consent to the oath the latter is ineffective. (cf. I. Sam. 14.39, where the people refuse to enter into the oath: אנחנו לא נשבע)

Some symbolic act, like the lifting of the hand to heaven (Gen. 14.22; Dan. 12.7) or the placing of the hand upon one's thigh (Gen. 24.3; 47.29) may have accompanied the ceremony.

4. Hepatoscopy.

The examination of the entrails of sacrificial animals is a practice unknown to Israel, as far as the Biblical writings are concerned. If we may use the argumentum e silentio, haruspication was a part neither of the official nor of the popular religion. Hepatoscopy -- the inspection of the liver of the sacrificial animal for purposes of divination -- is mentioned once in connection with the King of Babylon's expedition against Jerusalem. (Ez. 1.26, $\text{וַיִּשְׁאַל בְּהִיּוֹטָא}$ - σκαθὴν ἡσθασθαί) The practice was wide-spread in Babylonia. It was in fact the principle official form of divination (See Jastrow, Rel. Bab. u. Assy. II 213 ff; also his "Hepatoscopy and Astrology" Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. Vol. 47, 646-676;

and his "Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria, pp.147-201). It is true that the Hebrews, like the Babylonians looked upon the liver as the seat of life (Prov. 7.23; possibly also Lam. 2.11). and that they too sometimes identified the sacrificial animal with the deity, but the Biblical data on Hepatoscopy are too meagre to permit us to draw any conclusions as to its practice and vogue among them. The practice was not known among the Arabs and a Rabbi of the third century is aware of the fact that Hepatoscopy was practiced among them. (Eccl.3. 12.7). The liver was also used in magical arts among the Jews (See e.g. Tobit 6.4 ff; 8.2; also Yoma 84a, b).

Mr. Jastrow thinks it significant that the Biblical codes command no fewer than ten times that "the finger of the liver", the $\gamma\lambda\alpha\delta$ { γ $\lambda\iota\mu\beta$ } of all sacrificial animals should be burnt. (Ex. 29.13, 22; Lev. 2.4, 10, 15; 7.4; 8.18, 25; 9.10, 19). "Inasmuch as the Pentateuchal codes abound in protests against customs and rites prevailing among the nations around, the ordinance to burn this part of the liver was clearly intended as a protest against using the sacrificial animal for purposes of divination, the pars pro toto being regarded as a sufficient reminder". (Rel. Beliefs in Baby. and Assyria, p. 173, note 2.). It is, however, safe to assume that hepatescopy, even if practiced in ancient Israel never occupied that position of prominence which it held in the Assyrian-Babylonian scheme of divination. The silence of even the historical books on the subject seems to point to an early degeneration or complete disappearance of the practice in ancient Israel.

5. Miscellaneous.

There is made mention in the O.T. of a few cases of divination which though possessing many things in common with, cannot very well be included among the above-mentioned categories. The first case is that of I Sam. 6.7-12:

"Now, therefore, make a new cart, and take two milch kine, on which there hath come no yoke, and tie the kine to the cart, and bring their calves hence from them. And take the ark of the Lord and lay it upon the cart ----- and send it away that it may go. And see if it goeth up by the way of his own coast to Beth-SheMesh, then He hath done us the great evil: but if not, then we shall know that it is not his hand that smote us; it was a chance that happened to us ----- And the kine took the straight way to the way of Beth-SheMesh, and went along the highway, lowing, as they went, and turned not aside to the right or to the left".

The Philistines are perplexed over the sudden plagues which have come upon them in the wake of the ark captured from the Israelites. They are not fully convinced, however, that the ark is responsible for their misfortune. There is still the possibility that there is no causal relation between the capture of the ark and the coming of the plagues. (v.9) They accordingly consult the diviners. (חֲזִינֵי וְנִחֲזֵי v.2) who suggest to them the above test. The method is apparently a form of sortilege. The will of the deity being discovered in the choice of direction. The deity which is here identified with the ark (cf. Num. 10.35-36; I Sam. 6.6-7), forces the cows, in spite of their inclinations to turn back to their calves, to take the road leading to Beth-SheMesh.

Another illustration of divination by means of alternatives, although these alternatives have no real significance in themselves, is the story of the selection of Gideon's warriors. (Jud. 7.4-6).

"And he brought down the people unto the water, and the Lord said unto Gideon every one that lapped of the water with his tongue as the dog lapped, him shalt thou set by himself, and every one that boweth down upon his knee to drink. And the number of them that lapped, putting their hand to their mouth, was three

hundred men, but all the rest of the people bowed down upon their knees to drink water. And the Lord said unto Gideon, by the three hundred men that lapped will I save thee----- "

Some have attempted to explain this simple act of divination rationally and to interpret the manner in which the men drank the water as symbolic of their characters. (cf. Moore, "Judges", p. 202, Int. Crit. Comm.) In reality, the manner of drinking has nothing to do with the character or the military fitness of the men. The test is simply an act of divination and the means employed are purely accidental and without any ulterior significance.

A case, closely akin to the above is found in the narrative of Jonathan's sortie against the Philistines. (1. Sam. 14.8-10).

"Then said Jonathan, Behold, we shall pass over unto the men and we shall discover ourselves unto them. If they say thus unto us, tarry until we come to you, then we will stand still in our place, and will not go up unto them. But if they say thus, come up unto us, then we will go up, for the Lord hath delivered them into our hands, and this shall be the sign (A/N) unto us".

This test, based on the accidental remarks of the Philistine is an echo of a practice which was very common among ancient peoples especially among the Greeks. It is called, *clodomancy*, divination from the accidental words or answers of human beings.

Another case of divination by means of alternatives is that of Jud. 6.38-40, which differs, however, ^{what} from the above because of the introduction of a miraculous element.

"And Gideon said unto God, if thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast spoken, Behold, I will put a fleece of wool on the threshing floor, if there be dew on the fleece only, and it be dry upon all the ground, then shall I know that thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast spoken. And it was so; and he rose up early on the morrow, and pressed the fleece together and wrunged the dew out of the fleece, a bowl full of water"

But Gideon asked for another attestation of the deity's help. The test is repeated in a somewhat different form to the satisfaction of Gideon.

6. Necromancy

In as much as we have arranged all forms of divination into two general groups, heteroscopic and autoscopic, it is necessary to include necromancy among the former. Necromancy presupposes ancestor-worship and the latter was in vogue among the ancient Hebrews (see E.H. Charles "Eschatology" pp.19 ff. where the subject is discussed at length and copious references are given). Mr. Charles argues that the teraphim were images of ancestors which had become household gods. (ibid pp. 21-23). In as much as the teraphim were used as objects of divination (Ezek. 21.26; Zech. 10.2) it behooves us to discover their true nature and function. From an analysis of the Biblical data bearing on the subject the following facts are evident.

1. The teraphim were idols or Gods (Gen. 31.30; 35.4).
2. They were kept in private houses, (Gen. 31.30; I Sam. 19.13) but also at shrines (Jud. 17.6; 18.17 ff.).
3. They bore a human resemblance. (I Sam. 19.13 ff.).

It cannot be argued from the above with any degree of certainty that the teraphim were ancestral images and household gods. The fact that they resembled a human form is insufficient proof; for the tribal god himself may have thus been represented. Nor would the fact that the teraphim formed part of the usual equipment of a well-to-do family argue that they were ancestral images, for they may very well have been icons of the national or tribal deity himself. Moreover, from Jud. 17.6; 18.17 ff., it is apparent that the teraphim are the objects of worship of a general cult and not of one family only. They belong at first to an Ephraimite. The priest is a Levite and the Danites appropriate it as their tribal deity. The origin of the word is obscure.

Some would connect them with the מִשְׁכָּנִים Schwally would identify the root of מִשְׁכָּנִים with that of מִשְׁכָּלִים "shades" but this is doubtful. Others again take it to be a later opprobrious term, the plural of מִשְׁכָּל "foulness", "obscenity", and was substituted for names of various kinds of idols (cf. Hastings's E.R.E. VII p.141). It is probably a plural of eminence like מִשְׁכָּלִים but the nature of the deity or deities implied is not suggested by the name.

It is possible that the teraphim were the representation of ~~the~~ Yahweh among some tribes just as the Ephod was among others. Originally it may have been, (as, in fact Gen. 31.30, states) an Aramæan deity which an Israelitish clan brought with it to Canaan, but it soon suffered the same Yahwistic interpretation which mostly all heathen rites and deities underwent. In the syncretism, which set in during the period of the judges and the early monarchy, the teraphim were retained along with the Ephod, although the latter possessed somewhat more of an official character. While it is true that the teraphim are also mentioned in connection with the divination of Nebuchadnezzar, it is very possible, as Mr. Margoliouth suggests, (Hastings's E.R.E. s.v. Ancestor worship (Hebrew)) that "the prophet merely expressed Nebuchadnezzar's manner of consulting oracles in terms of Hebrew speech and that Teraphim in the usual O.T. meaning of the word were not actually used by him". The narrator (Jg) of the theft of Laban's teraphim by Rachel, (Gen. 31.) undoubtedly supposes that they were images of Yahweh, else he would not condone the act. Hosea (3.4-5) seems to identify Yahweh with the Ephod and teraphim. It is, moreover, significant that whereas the practice of consulting the dead is everywhere in the O.T. prohibited or censured, the consultation of the teraphim is not.

Necromancy, however, was very prevalent among the ancient Hebrews and the practice survived until a very late day. Isaiah

(8.19) speaks of "the $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ and וַיִּזְכֹּר who chirp and mutter" and again (19.3) "and they (Egyptians) shall consult the idols ($\pi\lambda\beta'x$) and the $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ and the $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ and the וַיִּזְכֹּר Mr. Smith has demonstrated, and we think conclusively, that the oboth were some sort of talisman or fetishes, probably a human skull, or some other part of the human body, which were used in divining. ("Samuel" pp.239-240, Int.Crit.Comm. of also Sam.65b: $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ וַיִּזְכֹּר ; Chalmers, Die "Seabier" II, 150 on speaking skulls; and James Montgomery, "Aramaic Incantation Texts from Hippiar" pp. 256 ff. on the human skull inscribed with a magic text). Yidd'oni might signify the "knower", the "wise spirit". (But it is difficult to find a distinction between the Ob and the Yidd'oni (cf. Driver, "Deuteronomy", p.226 Int. Crit.Comm.) Is.8.19 and 29.4 would suggest that the Ob-oracle was given in a muttering or twittering voice, coming from the ground. LXX in translating $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ by $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$, implies that the oracle was given by means of ventriloquism, the listener thinking that the voices was emanating from the ground.) The classical example of necromancy is that of Saul and the witch of Endor. (I.Sam.28.7 ff.) Saul had previously inquired of Yahweh, through the channels of the three ~~legitimate~~ ^{legitimate} forms of divination, dreams, the sacred lot and the prophets (v.3) but had received no reply. Goaded on by the exigencies of the moment he decided to consult the spirit of the departed Samuel. He sends his servants in quest of a $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ a woman who practices necromancy, and one is located in Endor (v.7). Saul disguises himself and arrives at the witch's place at night. He commands her to divine for him by means of the Ob $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ (v.8), and to bring up the spirit of Samuel $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ $\pi\lambda\beta'x$ v.II) The witch complies, and the ghost of Samuel appears. Saul does not see the ghost. The witch describes him to Saul. (v.13-14). Saul then hears the voice of Samuel, advising him of the terrible defeat that is awaiting him on the morrow. (v.16-19). Saul is overcome by the news: He is also faint from fasting. The witch induces him to partake of some food and then Saul departs.)

that Egypt was already far beyond these conceptions and had elements of primitive religious phenomena, it must be concluded types of dreams are included in the list of the fundamental theory of dreams. "Now, if we admit," with Taylor, that these author deduces from the above is likewise true of the biblical religions." (Hastings, E. R. E. V. 376) and the fact which the playing any of the parts that are so frequent in dreams of other living the past over again, seeing future events, or, in a word, examples of the dreamer going to a distant land in his dream, (II. XIII, 66 ff.) And on the other hand, we have no Egyptian

is nothing of the nature of the interval of psychosis and psychosis. from a distance, announcing an approaching death, etc.); there son taking any part at all in a dream (giving a warning, coming of the cases mentioned as yet do we see an ordinary living person to the biblical one. "It will be observed that in none concept of dreams among the Egyptians is applicable with equal The general criterion which we have set makes on the

Antecedent to Division.

Of and not known. at the hands of the Philistine to the fact that he consulted the CH. 10.12 attributes the death of Saul and the defeat of Israel the temporary suppression (II K. 23.24); and the author of I. (II K. 21.6-11 to the II CH. 32.6); Josiah was instrumental in is condemned for having encouraged the practice of necromancy visitation (62.4). In the historical works, King Jameson "sit in the graves and lodge in the caves" with God's dire of incubation at graves in mind when he threatens those who supply these versions. (21.10-12) - I wish may have the practice tinct occasions to legitimate the practice (16.21; 20.6, 27.12- practice. (16.11). It takes the opportunity on these occasions Deuteronomy is hostile to the demonstration of the

travelled far, in this connection, from the ideas as to the role and nature of dreams, cherished by the majority of contemporary African peoples." While this is true, there are sufficient indications in the O.T. literature that Israel at one time shared in common with the rest of heathen peoples the same notions concerning the validity of all dreams and the methods of interpreting them.

The theory as to the nature and function of dreams undergoes a most remarkable process of development in the Biblical literature. For a better appreciation ^{of} this fact, it were best to arrange the Biblical dreams into two classes:

1. Symbolic Dreams.

Symbolic dreams are such in which miraculous or non-miraculous events or phenomena appear which must be interpreted. Dreams are realities. The realm of the dream is as real to the soul which has separated itself from the body in sleep, as is the realm of sensations to the man who is awake. Just as events and phenomena in the world of his perception may have divinatorial significance, so may the sights and occurrences in the world of his dreams. The O.T. has retained quite a few instances of such dreams and of their interpretation. Of dreams in which the events are of a non-miraculous nature, the dreams of the chief-butler and of the chief-baker of Pharaoh and their interpretation by Joseph (Gen. 40.6 ff.) may serve as examples. Examples of "miraculous" dreams are Joseph's two dreams (Gen. 37.6 ff.); Pharaoh's dream of the lean and fat kine, and of the thin and full ears of corn, and their interpretation. (ibid 41.1 ff.) and the dream of barley bread rolling round through the camp of Midian (Jud. 7.13-15) and its interpretation. (The dreams narrated in Daniel are best to be included among the Apocalyptic literature where similar dreams are numerous. They show decided influences of later times and peoples and cannot shed much light on the sub-

ject at hand). In some instances, the significance of the dream is so apparent that it needs no professional interpreter to explain it. Thus in the case of Joseph's dream, where his brother's sheaves bow unto him, and of the sun, moon and eleven stars bowing unto him, the brothers immediately apprehend their full significance. In other cases a professional or semi-professional interpretation ($\text{לְיֹסֵף עַל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ Gen. 40,41), וְעַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל (Jud. 7.15) is needed. Joseph and Daniel are the only two Israelitish characters that are referred to in the O.T. as possessing the art of dream-interpretation, but it is highly probable that, in as much as the idea of divinely inspired symbolic dreams was entertained by primitive Israel in common with other groups of Semitic peoples, a class of dream-interpreters may have existed or, at least, that dream-interpretation formed one of the functions of some of the numerous classes of diviners, which subsequent ages declared illegal. It is of interest to note that Joseph's brothers, in derision, designate him with the epithet חֹלֵם־חֲלָמִים (Gen. 37.19) just as the professional necromancer is called חֹלֵם־חֲלָמִים (I Sam. 28.7.)

2. Oracular Dreams.

Oracular dreams are a monotheistic edition of symbolic dreams. Just as divination from physical phenomena ultimately gives way to spiritual revelation, so dream - divination based on things and acts develops into dream - revelation which needs no tangible media. The dream was too real, too much of a fact, in the minds of the people to be readily sacrificed to a spiritual monotheism. Prophecy, however, succeeded, as we shall see, in weeding the dream - idea of its more objectionable features, and hence, the Biblical dreams are, by far, of an oracular nature.

Yahweh and his angels are the only "spokesmen" in an oracular dream. In Homeric dreams, the vision often takes the form of a man or a woman known to the sleeper. Not so in O.T. dreams. Yahweh never delegates the dead to be his messengers

This may be due to the conditions of a higher monotheism or more probably, to the fact that Yahweh until a very late days had no control over the nether-world (cf. Charles, "Eschatology" pp.35-36).

The oracular dream may be accompanied by a vision as e.g. Jacob's vision of the ladder ^{Gen.} 28.12 ff., and again in 31.11); but in such cases the apparitions have no specific significance.

The clearest references to divination by means of dreams is found in Num. 22.6,19. The ambassadors of Balak have called upon Balaam and have brought him the message of the King. Balaam is perplexed. He is in doubt whether he should go or not. He finally decides to await an answer from God during night and he accordingly requests the ambassadors to lodge with him for the night. God's answer is given in a dream that night (v.9-12). The same procedure takes place in the case of the second embassy. (v.19-20).

The successive stages in the development of the concept of the oracular dream in Israel we shall consider later.

II. Incubation.

The deity was often coaxed into sending a dream. At certain critical moments when information upon a perplexing situation was imperative and the individual could not very well wait for a chance dream, he would resort to the dwelling place of the deity and spend the night there in the hope that the deity would send him a dream. The ceremony of incubation, common among many primitive peoples, was usually preceded by ablutions, sacrifice and prayer. Incubation was probably resorted to by Saul (1.Sam.28.6) but without success. Sacrifice at the shrine of Gilbeon precedes the dream which Solomon has. (1 K.3.4 ff.). Elijah evidently practices incubation. (1 K. 19.9 ff.) He goes into the cave ($\pi\pi\pi\pi$) and sleeps there (v.9) and receives a revelation. The author speaks of $\pi\pi\pi\pi$ and presupposes that the

reader knows of what he has reference to. This cave like the cave of Trophenius was probably a favorite resort for those who wished to obtain a dream for Yalweh, who in certain localities was regarded as a chthonic deity.

C. Possession.

Mantic inspiration or possession is another means of divination. The subject who wishes to become a channel of revelation prepares himself for it by working himself into a state of semi-consciousness, when, it is supposed, the deity enters the subject and speaks through him. Under the influence of the jinn, the dervish mutters, murmurs and utters inarticulate sounds. His utterances have oracular importance. The root of ק-ח-ל points to such ecstatic utterances of a possessed being.

The Bible has retained quite a few examples of this practice in ancient Israel. The 'lectus claustralis' is, of course, I Sam. 10. 10-24. These *Nebi'im* ^{נביאים} play an important role in the histories of Samuel and of Elijah and Elisha. The guilds of the later period still seem to possess the mantic-nature, which characterized those of the earlier period. (cf. II K. 9. 11 where the nabi-messenger of Elisha is called נביא). They still possess the gift of divining and fore telling (I K. 22. 6; II K. 3. 15) which was possessed by the seers before the days of the monarchy. (cf. I. Sam. 9-10). Even the outstanding figures of Elijah and Elisha who in their ethics and religion ^{morally} approach most ^{nearly} to the norm of the writing prophets of the following century, still retain in some instances, the marks of the old nabi or ro'eh. (I K. 17. 1; 18. 46; II K. 3. 15 et al.). Traces of prophetic ecstasy are to be found with the writing prophets also, especially with Ezekiel, but it is apparent that neither the vision nor any other abnormal psychic state of these prophets corresponds in any radical sense to the unconscious frenzy of the earlier *nebi'im* or *ro'ehim*. The term נביא and רוח is used of prophecy until a very late day (Hos. 6. 12 רוח נביא).

II Ch. 9.29; 15.9) but the term had very early lost its original connotation.

Mr. Smith argues and with much force that the *חֲזַנִּים* were inspired mantles like the old nobim and rehim. But while the latter were exponents of Yahwism, the former were the survivors of a tree-cult, in which they had originally functioned as interpreters of the tree oracles. The word itself may be derived from an Arabic root which means to croon, to hum and the Hebrew *חֲזַנִּים* would refer to the hoarsely humming, soothsayers or diviners. (See Journal of Philology, XIV, 113 ff.). And so Frazer, commenting on the *חֲזַנִּים* remarks that the name "seems to show that a set of wizards or Druids, if we may call them so, had their station at the sacred tree in order to interpret to inquirers the rustling of the leaves in the wind, the cooing of wood-pigeons in the branches, or such other omens as the spirit of the oak vouchsafed to his worshippers." ("Folklore in the Old Testament" in Anthropological Essays to E.B. Tylor p.126.)

III. Places of Divination.

When man wishes to consult the deity, he naturally goes to the home of that deity. The god is bound up with the place of his residence. In many cases, the place is the deity. The O.T., at times, echoes this primitive belief. Yahweh dwells in the burning bush at Horeb. (Ex. 3.2 ff.) A later theology gave Yahweh freedom of locomotion. So Yahweh leaves Sinai to somewhere else. (Deut. 33.2; Jud. 5.4. ff; Hab. 3.3). The devotee who wishes to come into close relation with Him is apt to visit the God's abode. (So Elijah, I K. 19.8 ff.) (In the period of syncretism, when Yahweh expelled the Canaanitish Gods from their abodes and took possession of them, each sacred locality became the מִקְדָּשׁ (sacred place) for Yahweh's manifestation. So Ex. 20.24 declared: "In every place מִקְדָּשׁ where I record my name I will come into thee and I will bless thee". The "recording of the name" is by means of a theophany. This was an attempt on the part of later ages to explain the sanctity of certain localities which were undoubtedly sacred in pre-Yahwistic days.)

In the polytheistic or polydemonistic stages of the Israelitish religion there were many such sacred places, inhabited by spirits. The sacred spots of the Semites are usually rocks, caves, fountains or trees. To these holy places men would resort for purposes of worship or divination. From our discussion of the various classes of divination (Chap. IX) we have seen that the form of divination is determined by the nature of the deity. Thus a rock deity would as a rule be consulted by means of sortilege, using stones for lots; a chthonic deity, through the medium of dreams; a water-deity through the ordeal and a tree-deity through an interpretation of the sounds of the leaves. Each sacred place would then have a characteristic form of divination and, as the sacred spot grew into prominence, and a sanctuary arose on the spot, an official group of diviners or oracle-interpreters. (Dr. Gall (op. cit.) working on the true supposition that "No man Gott" verchrt,

ist eine Kultstätte (p.69) has enumerated over one hundred holy places in and around Canaan whose sanctity was in most cases due to a holy mountain, rock, cave, tree or well. In all these places worship and sacrifice were undoubtedly supplemented by divination. It will suffice for our purpose to enumerate a few of the more prominent Palestinian holy places, where worship and divination were carried on. Of some, clear references to divinatory practices may be found in the O.T., or others, it may be inferred from their name or cult-object.

Bethel was a sacred spot throughout antiquity. It derived its sanctity from the presence of a sacred rock in its midst. (cf. Gen. 28.10 ff. 35.14) The stone was the $\{ \text{בֵּית אֱלֹהִים} \}$ Residence of the deity. Jacob stumbles across this spot and receives a revelation through a dream. The Israelites go up to Bethel to consult the deity concerning the expedition against the Benjaminites. (Jud. 20.16, 27). Bethel is the seat of a prophetic guild. (II K. 2.3.). It is the place of an oracle in the days of Amos. (6.5).

Beersheba gained its prominence from the presence of a sacred well or wells. Gen. 21. Explains $\{ \text{בְּרֶשֶׁת הַוַּיּוֹט} \}$ as the "Wells of the Oath". (Mr. Smith remarks that "it is notable that among the Semites a special sanctity was attached to groups of seven wells" (op. cit. 161). It is at Beersheba that God reveals himself to Hagar. (Gen. 21.14 ff.) to Isaac, (26.23 ff.) and to Jacob (46.1 ff.) in dreams. In the days of Amos, Israelites go to Beersheba to consult the oracle. (6.5; 8.14.). There was also a sacred tamarisk at Beersheba which Abraham is said to have planted. (Gen. 21.25).

Shechem was another sanctuary which retained its sanctity in later days. Its sacra were presumably also a tree and a stone. Abraham is said to come to the $\{ \text{בְּרֶשֶׁת הַוַּיּוֹט} \}$ Shechem to the $\{ \text{בְּרֶשֶׁת הַוַּיּוֹט} \}$ and receives a revelation. Elon Moreh is the "oracle-giving tree-

binth". (This same Elōn is mentioned also in Gen. 35.4; Deut. 11.30 עץ תרבות Josh. 24.26, עץ תרבות Jud. 9.37. עץ תרבות "terobinth of the soothsayers". (We think that this was the original designation of the tree. In later times when the moonenim were illegitimatized, the term עץ תרבות which implies the giving of an oracle by the priests of Yahweh, was substituted). The sacred rock is associated with the Elōn in Josh. 24.26, Shechem in prophetic times was a sanctuary of Yahweh (עין שכם Jos. 24.26) and a band of priests (עשרת בני הכהן Hos. 6.6) who were dispensers of the oracle, was connected with it.

The fourth of the holy places so frequently associated with the names of the patriarchs, was Hebron. It, too, was the center of an old tree-cult. Another sacra of the place may have been a holy cave, the עֶרֶב (Gen. 23.17, 19) Abraham built an altar to Yahweh at the terebinths of Mamre in Hebron (Gen. 13.18). David makes a covenant with the elders of Israel "in the presence of God" at Hebron (II Sam. 5.3). Absalom asks permission of his father to go and "worship Yahweh" at Hebron (I. c. 15.7-8). A sacred well was another of the sacra of Mamre or Hebron. Heathenish rites continued at Mamre far into Christian times and Emperor Constantine endeavored to suppress it. (Smith (op.cit. p. 177), quoting) Sozomen, says that "at the annual fair and feast of the Terebinth, or tree and well of Abraham at Mamre, the heathen visitors, who revered this spot as the haunt of angels (or demons), not only offered sacrifices beside the tree, but illuminated the well with lamps, and cast into it libations of wine, cakes, coins, myrrh, and incense". The casting of articles into a sacred well or river is, as we have seen, frequently an act of ~~expiation~~ ~~expiation~~.

The sanctuary of Kadesh or Meribah undoubtedly derived its sanctity from the presence of a sacred well. The holy water is sometimes designated as the עַיִן הַמִּלְחָמָה "waters of controversy" (Num. 20.13, 24; 27.14; Dt. 32.51; 33.8; Ezek. 47.19; 48.28; Ps. 81.8; 95.8; 106.32) or the עַיִן הַחַיָּה "well of

judgment". (Gen.14.7) Both terms signify the practice of divination for purposes of adjudication by means of the holy water. (v.s. "Hydromancy" and "Ordeal".)

The original sanctity of Sinai or Horeb, originally two distinct places, may have been due to the presence of a sacred tree (cf. the "burning bush" Ex.3) or a rock (γ/δ Ex. 17.6;

Here 33.21. It is significant that Yahweh is many times addressed as γ/δ "rock" (Dt. 32.4,18) and an innumerable number of times likened to one. (The π/ρ "cave" at Horeb, where Moses and Elijah receive revelations has been previously referred to.)

That the deity must be consulted in his own home was a belief that found expression in later days in the fact that judicial cases had to be brought to the sanctuary, to the

γ/δ δ/α or to the Temple in Jerusalem. We are inclined to believe with Zimmern (Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Babyl. Rel. p.88, note 3.) that the γ/δ δ/α was originally the tent where the propitious time for an undertaking was determined. The author traces γ/δ and the Assyrian $\bar{a}dānu$, "proper time" back to the same root. (see also Haupt, Jour. Bib. Lit. pp. 58,70) In other words, the tent was originally a place of divination. Ex. 33.7 declares that "Moses used to take the tent and pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it the γ/δ δ/α and it came to pass, that every one who sought the Lord γ/δ δ/α went out unto the γ/δ δ/α which was without the camp." According to Josh. 19.51, the sacred lot was cast "in the presence of God, at the entrance of the Tabernacle. That piece of rhabdomancy by which Aaron was declared the chosen one of Yahweh was executed "in the presence of God, in the δ/α α/ρ

π/ρ ρ/α (Num. 17.22) Moses cannot decide the case of the daughters of Zelaphchad. He asks the deity so decide. δ/α α/ρ

γ/δ δ/α (v.2)

IV. Agents of Divination.

Some forms of divination need no skilled human agents to interpret them. The individual who perceives a simple omen, for example, can very well interpret it himself according to the generally accepted rules of omnia-hermeneutics. But often-times the science of omen interpretation develops into a minutely-detailed, complex and difficult system, far too elaborate for an ordinary layman to pursue. Again, other forms of divination, such as astrology, require a certain amount of scientific knowledge, which the average man does not possess. There arose, therefore, in due time in practically every locality where divination was practiced specially endowed individuals, who functioned as the interpreters of divinatory signs too obtruse for the non-professional man to understand.

Another factor which would be conducive to the establishment of professional agents of divination is the primitive belief in the sanctity of certain individuals. Some men are in closer relation to the deity than others. These would be more likely to obtain information from the deity and, also to comprehend the manifestations of the will of the deity in the physical world. Hence men would naturally turn to them in perplexity and in doubt. In time, the art of divining^{and} of interpreting divinatory signs would become one of the chief functions of these "godly men".

While it is apparent that the science of omen-interpretation in Israel never attained to that high degree of perfection and completeness, possessed by Assyro-Babylonian or Egyptian divination, it is, nevertheless true, that classes of men, in time, did arise in Israel, whose special function it was to divine and to interpret signs.

Already in the nomadic stage, divination to a very large extent may be said to have become the prerogative of certain men. Among the Beduins, one of the chief functions of the Kahin (Hebrew

/ 𐤀𐤃) is to consult the oracle. The name Kahin signifies a "sooth sayer". (Wellhausen Heid. p.131 ff.) Along side of the Kalihim, there exist unofficial diviners, who possess no hereditary office at any one shrine. They resemble in many respects the Hebrew Ro'h and Ho'zeh. They are sometimes called Hazi (Hob. 𐤇𐤏𐤅𐤁). (cf. op. cit. p. 134).

In Canaan, this tendency towards the concentration of the knowledge and practices of divination in the hands of a few professionals naturally received a great impetus due to the great development of the science induced by Canaanitish and hence, Assyro-Babylonian influence. In the earlier polydaemonistic or polytheistic stages, the deities of various localities were, as a rule, consulted by professional diviner. Thus the Meonenim, as has been remarked above, were probably the professional diviners of a tree-cult. It is unfortunate, however, that the zealous Yahwists of the later day obliterated, as far as possible, all mention of the real nature of those diviners whom they so vigorously denounce. There is a good deal said, however, about the Yahwistic diviners, and if we bear in mind the general tendency of that period of syncretism, namely, to include in the Yahweh worship, as far as possible, the many heathenish practices, we might infer from analogy the nature and constitution of the illicit divinatory classes also.

The O.T. knows of four groups of diviners, originally distinct from, latterly blended into one another:

1. 𐤀𐤃. 2. 𐤇𐤏𐤅𐤁. 3. 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏. 4. 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏.

1. The Priest -

The original function of the priest was two-fold:

(a) To take care of the sanctuary and especially the images of therein. (b) To consult the deity. The offering of sacrifices was not a specifically priestly function. Among the Arabs this original double-function of the priest is still retained. ^Says Wellhausen! "Das Amt des Priesters ist bei den Arabern die Be-

wachung des Heiligtums --- für die Verrichtung des Opfers an
 einem einfachen Steine ist er entbehrlich ---- Die Priester
 werden auch bei den alten Arabern, wie bei den Hebräern, Orakel
 erteilt und auf Befragen Weisung und Entscheidung in schwierigen
 und streitigen Fragen gegeben haben" (Heid. pp.130-131 "cf.
 also article "priest" in J.E., E.B., and Hastings's Dict. of Bib.)
 It is the function of the priest as the consulter of the oracle
 that is of interest to us. We have discussed the method of this
 consultation above (see *Supra*, Urim and Thummim). But in recount-
 ing the occasions upon which the oracle was consulted we omitted
 the principle one, i.e. in the administration of justice. Among
 primitive peoples the deity was directly appealed to in cases of
 legal dispute. The deity in the plenitude of his wisdom was asked
 to decide where man could not. In Israel the practice was common
 (cf. I Sam. 2.26 and even in much later times, the notion survived.
 see e.g. Prov. 18.18.). Ex. 23.7-8; commands that all legal dis-
 putes where no evidence can be obtained, should be brought before
 God. *והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק* Moses brings the case of the
 daughters of Zelaphchad before God: *והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק*
 (Num. 27.5) and God gives the decision in this particular case and
 the general law, which should apply in all similar cases hereafter.
 (ibid vs 6-11). Again, according to Ex. 18.16, the people in legal
 difficulties came to Moses, the priest to consult God through him.
והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק Moses brings the case before God. *והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק*
והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק (v.19) i.e. in the: But the act of
 "approaching God" or consulting him was, as we have noticed above,
 by means of the sacred lot, the Urim and Thummim. Judging from
 the story in Ex. 18.13 ff., all legal disputes were originally
 brought to the priest for decision. But ~~soon~~ the task became
 too heavy for them. Lay-judges were then appointed who rendered
 decisions according to the codes of law already formulated by the
 priests, *והקרב אליו את פסוקו ויחליק* (v.20). Those cases,
 however, which involved new legal points were appealed to the priests

(Is. 30.10).

3. That the Rō'eh meant to designate a specific group entirely distinct from the "gazer" or "prophet" is also evidenced by I. Ch. 29.29. וְדַבְּרִי דוֹד הַשֵּׁלֶךְ הָרָאשִׁימִים אֶת חֲרִינֵיהֶם הֵנֵךְ
כִּתְּלֵבִים צֵל דְּבִרִי שְׁמוֹ אֵל הָרֹאק, וְעַל דְּבִרֵי נֶתָן הַנְּבִיא, וְעַל דְּבִרֵי אֵל הַחֲדָה.

Each man bears the distinct cognomen of his profession.

4. The term seems to have fallen into disuse at a very early date. It is only the older portion of the Book of Samuel (Chaps. 9-10.10) that retains it. The Chronicler, of course, out of his love for archaisms continues to use it to a very late date. Isaiah already speaks with a certain amount of depreciation of the seers. (cf. 30.10 and 28.7) I. Sam. 9.9, a gloss of late origin, evidently tries to account for the fact that the term Rō'eh is no longer used.

Concerning the nature of the Rō'eh, the following may be deduced from a study of the references to Samuel, the seer.

1. He is revered as an הָאֵלֹהִים וְיָהוָה, a godly man. (9.6). and is regarded as speaking in the name of Yahweh. (9.9, 15).
2. He functions also as a priest (2.18 ff; 9.13 ff.)
3. He was paid for his services (9.7-8). It is to be noticed that the pay (שֶׁלֶטֶן אֶחָד) was not large. In this case one-fourth of a silver shekel is deemed sufficient recompense. Now is the information which he is asked to give always of great importance, national or otherwise. He is consulted even in the most trifling cases. In this case it is to discover the whereabouts of Hish's lost asses.
4. He has nothing in common with the howling dervishes, the early except the gift of divination, which he employs three times in the narrative.

The method which the employed in their divination is difficult to discover. Mr. Jastrow maintains that inasmuch as the Babylonian bārū is the exact prototype of the Hebrew בָּרָא,

their etymology and function being identical, "it would seem reasonable to take the $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ in accord with the meaning attached to $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$, as likewise originally an "inspector", who looks at something with a view of obtaining an answer to a given question" (Journal Bib. Literature XXVIII, p.42 ff.) The duty of inspecting was originally limited in the case of the $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ to the liver but, in time, the term came to be the generic designation of all forms of divination. Concerning hepatoscopy, we have previously observed that there is little to prove its existence in ancient Israel. The term $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ when we meet with it in the O.T., already has reached the stage represented by the use of $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ in Babylonian, as the divining priest in general. (cf. op.cit.p.48). The writer, likewise, suggests that the specific kind of divination practiced by Samuel was probably astrology inasmuch as I Sam. 9.26-27 speak of Samuel conferring with Saul on the roof and at daybreak. The time and the place seem to point to an act of divination through heavenly phenomena which the later redactor suppressed.

While in the main, the thesis of Mr. Jastrow is very feasible, we are not convinced that all $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ were priests. Certainly, there are no indications that Hanani was a priest. Even in the case of Samuel, the older document seems to imply that his priestly function is rather accidental than essential. As far as the O.T. is concerned, priestly divination is radically different from that of the seer. The priest's divination is limited almost exclusively to cases entailing national welfare. Under the latter we subsume the administration of justice, the enactment of ritual and moral laws, and the discovery of the will of the deity in great national crises. The $\bar{b} \bar{a} r \bar{u}$ has no official standing. He is associated with no particular sanctuary. He is in charge of no sacred images. He is rather the diviner par excellence, in the interest of the private life of the people. He answers to the need for guidance in the every-day life of the individual and his authority lasts only as long as his guidance proves

helpful, and the information which he vouchsafes, true. He differs, however, from the many other soothsayers of the day, the *neoneim*, say, or the *menahashim*, in being a protagonist of Yahweh, and in speaking in His name and by His authority. It was, therefore, not a difficult matter for the later scribes to confound the Nabi with the Rôch (cf. e.g. I Sam. 9.9^b) but in so doing they overlooked a few radical things differentiating them.

5. The Gazer - $\pi \tau' \pi$

This much may be said with certainty concerning the nature of the *hozeh*.

1 - He was a diviner. Gad is the *hozeh* of David and divines for him. David consults the deity to learn whither he should go next. The answer comes through Gad. (I Sam. 22.5) Again, Gad brings God's answer to David on the occasion of the latter's census-taking of the people. The answer takes the form of three alternatives (II Sam. 24.11 ff.) This corresponds, as Mr. Jastrow well remarks, to the alternative interpretation of signs that we encounter in the various classes of omen-texts of Babylonia and Assyria. "It is only reasonable to conclude", writes Mr. Jastrow, "that the $\pi \tau' \pi$ like the Babylonian *hârû*-priest had recourse to some method of divination by means of which he secured specific answers to inquiries put to him" (Ibid p.52) That Gad is sometimes called $\chi' \beta' \chi'$ is merely another indication of the tendency of later times to compliment all who spoke in the name of Yahweh with the title of $\chi' \beta' \chi'$. That $\pi \tau' \pi$ was the real designation of Gad is evident from such passages as (I Ch. 29.29; II Ch. 29.29.)

2 - The *hozeh*, like the older *Hebim*, often employed external stimuli in the practice of divination. Thus, Heman, Asaph and Jeduthun, who are *hozim*. (II Ch. 35.15), divine by the aid of "harps, psalteries and cymbals" (I Ch. 25.1). The *hozeh* may be the official diviner, attached to the court. The three men just mentioned are called $\gamma' \eta \eta \gamma' \eta$ (II Ch. 35.15 cf. also I Ch. 25.5)

Gad is called גִּדִּי (II Sam. 24.11. cf. also I Ch. 21.9; II Ch. 29.25). His interest would then be centered chiefly in the life of the king and the nation. Herein is one characteristic which may distinguish the *hoseh* from the *ru'eh*. Another distinction may be that the divination implied in רָאָה is voluntary, that "it is a deliberate act of looking at something or looking for something" while $\text{נָחַץ$ implies involuntary divination; it is "a recognition of something that comes to one's sight involuntarily" (Jastrow, *ibid* p. 53). Thus astrologers are called by Deutero-Isaiah $\text{הַנִּזְכֵּרִים בַּכּוֹכָבִים}$ "those who 'gaze' at the stars".)

But נָחַץ like רָאָה , soon fell into disfavor. Both suggested physical means of divination which were incompatible with a spiritual Yahwism. Already in the days of Amos, the *hoseh* was looked upon with a certain amount of contempt. Thus, when Amaziah addresses Amos as נָחַץ (Amos 7.12), there is a note of mockery implied. Micah (3.7) puts them in the same category with the חֲזִיּוֹנִים and contrast them with the true prophet (v. 8. cf. also Ezek. 13.24.)

חֲזִיּוֹנִים , חֲזִיּוֹנִים & חֲזִיּוֹנִים fared better than נָחַץ . The term designating involuntary divination came to include dreams and visions which, with few exceptions, were always considered legitimate means of revelation. The term was more popular in post-exilic than in pre-exilic times. The great literary prophets, fully in keeping with their theory of inspiration speak of it with contempt. Thus Jeremiah in castigating the false prophets, says "a false vision ($\text{חֲזִיּוֹן שֶׁלֹּא מִן־הַיְיָ}$) and worthless divination (נְחָזִיּוֹן) and the deceit of their hearts are they prophesying" (14.14) and at another time he speaks of them as giving "prophecies from their own hearts not emanating from the mouth of God". ($\text{חֲזִיּוֹנֵיהֶם מִלִּבָּם}$, 23.16). And so Micah addressing himself to the false prophets couples חֲזִיּוֹן with נְחָזִיּוֹן in saying: "Therefore it shall be might unto you that ye shall have no vision. (חֲזִיּוֹן); and the sun

shall go down unto the prophets, and the day shall be black over them" (3.6).

4. Prophet. -

We have discussed the early Nebiim-guilds under the heading of "Possession". This much remains to be noticed. In the Nabi, autoscopic divination finds its highest expression. The Nabi requires no physical phenomena to interpret. The information which he obtains is immediate and direct. The agent, however, must be in a certain abnormal psychic state before he is favored with a revelation. This fact constitutes one of the essential differences between the old Nebiim and the later literary prophets or between divination, and inspiration. In the former case a revelation was induced by artificial means and was subject to the wish of the agent irrespective of his moral status, while in the latter case, the revelation as a rule came unsolicited and only to such individuals whose moral natures qualified them to serve as channels of revelation. Whether we entertain the idea that the literary prophets are essentially connected with the earlier Nebiim or whether we hold, with Dr. Battenwieser, that "the inspiration of the literary prophets and the mantic possession or ecstasy of the older prophets are two distinct phenomena proceeding from radically different states of mind, and not, as is widely thought, from a common psychical basis", (*The Prophets of Israel* p.100. For a full discussion of this important subject see *ibid*, part II, Chap. II.), the outstanding fact is that in literary prophecy we are face to face with a phenomenon which can not be discussed under the subject of divination.

While the terms *hozeh* and *roeh* fell into disfavor and disuse because they suggested a form of divination by means of mantic machinations which was very distasteful to the spiritual Yahwist, the term Nabi held its own in the religious vocabulary of the day and was slowly transformed and enriched in meaning and significance. Already in the days of Amos, the *Nabi* is an exalted individual, the chosen mouthpiece of Yahweh and no longer

retains that ecstatic traits which characterized the earlier Nebiim.

Women Diviners. The function of divination among the Israelites was by no means restricted to the males. Women played quite an important rôle in it. In fact, women because of their nervous and more readily excitable natures are exceptionally fit for the task, and they figured prominently as agents of magic and vaticination among ancient peoples. The earliest documents make mention of female magicians in Israel. C_h already legislates against them. *קִדְּשׁוּ אֶת הָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת* (Ex. 22.17). As diviners, women in the O.T. occur principally as necromancers. Thus, Saul commands his servants to find for him an *אִשָּׁה מְשִׁיבַת רֻחַ* "A woman who is mistress of necromancy". (I Sam.28.7) and Leviticus 20.27 states: "A man or a woman, if there should be among them, a necromancer or wizard, should be put to death". As legitimate diviners women figure as prophetesses in Biblical literature. Miriam is called an *נָבִיאָה* (Ex. 15.20) and her name is connected with the singing of songs and the playing of instruments -- the characteristic methods of the old Nebiim. Deborah is not only a prophetess *נָבִיאָה* but also a judge. (Jud. 4.4). She sits under the "palm-tree of Deborah (v.5) which, according to Gen. 35.8, is called *אֵלֹן*. The term *allon*, it has been observed, suggest that the tree was a sacred one and that Deborah's prophecy had something to do with tree-divination. (cf. Smith op. cit. p.196). Again, when Josiah sends men to inquire of Yahweh (*שְׁאֵל בְּנֵי יְהוֹשָׁפָט בְּיָדֵי הָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת*) concerning the newly discovered book of the law, the prophetess Huldah is consulted (II K.14 ff, II Ch.34.22 ff.) Ezekiel finds it necessary to include the women mantics in his general arraignment of false prophets. (13.7-23) Even as late as the time of Nehemiah, there is mention of a certain prophetess by the name of Noadiah. (Ne.6.14).

V. Prophetic Yahwism vs. Divination.

Among practically all the more civilized peoples of antiquity a distinction is drawn between public and official, and private and non-official divination. This holds true of Assyro-Babylonian, Egyptian and Roman religions. So also of the religion of Israel. Some forms of divination, because of their antiquity, became incorporated into the cult while others, of later or of foreign origin, never received official sanction, although they may have gained popular favor. The factor determining the official or non-official character of a divinatory practice is not theologic. In the religion of Israel, however, this new factor is introduced and, succeeded, first in revolutionizing the entire system of divination and ultimately in abolishing it entirely. The ever-evolving Yahweh-concept in Israel waged war, not only upon private and non-official, but, in time, also on public and official divination.. Herein is one of the chief distinctions of Hebrew divination. Official religion outgrew it. But the religions of Babylonia, of Egypt, of Greece and of Rome, never succeeded in freeing themselves from this dead-weight which, in each case, succeeded in obstructing the further development of religious ideas.

The growth of spiritual monotheism in Israel was concomitant with the decline of divination. And inevitably so. Divination at bottom and in its boldest expression, implies polytheism or at least polydaemonism. Only such an object was used in divination, which was of a sacred nature, being the temporary or permanent habitus of a deity. Even in an henotheistic religion, other spirits were consulted. It should be borne in mind that the relation existing between Yahweh and Israel was in the nature of a covenant between Yahweh and the community. The interests of the individuals, as such, were of little concern to the deity. "The contractual obligation of the gods bound them to avert

calamity from the community, but not to protect any particular person from misfortune that affected him alone". (F.B.Jevens, Comp. Religion, p.49.) Man, therefore, in his private needs and perplexities would naturally turn to other supernatural powers and would endeavor to establish a relation with them. Speaking of the social element in the religion of Israel, Mr. Smith remarks: "So much was this the case that in purely personal concerns the ancients were very apt to turn, not to the recognized religion of the family or of the state, but to magical superstitions.--- (for) there was a whole region of possible needs and desires for which religion could and would do nothing". (^{Sem. Rel.} ~~op. cit.~~ p.264.) It was only in the later days of syncretism that an heathenish poly-dæmonism was compressed into an imperfect monotheism. The diviners were then said to consult Yahweh but, in reality, they were even then consulting other deities or spirits. A real monotheism could never tolerate divination, which at bottom, was its direct antithesis. Spiritual monotheism again walked hand in hand with prophetism and the latter introduced a revolutionizing theory of revelation, which invalidated all schemes of divination. The great postulate of prophetism was that no physical and material media are needed for God's revelation. It is self-evident that this doctrine undermines the very foundation of divination.

A study of the historical and prophetic writings as well as of the various legal codes will clearly demonstrate how mutually exclusive spiritual monotheism and divinatory practices really are and how the latter levitates from the centre of religious thought in proportion to the former's gravitation towards it. The history of divination in Israel is in a sense, the history of its religion.

a - The Historical Writings,

The historical writings are the truest gauges in determining the successive stages of development in the art of divination. They reflect the actual practices and beliefs of the day. We are at times permitted to go behind the scenes and witness the gradual transformation or slow suppression of one or another of the divinatory practices and, mindful of the religious movements of the day as expressed in contemporaneous prophetic or legal writings, we can appreciate the cause.

I. Judges.

The oldest historical writing which we may consider is the Book of Judges. While the greater part of the book has suffered later ^{or} reaction, the older stratum can, in most instances be readily distinguished. The book, ^{5th} ~~script~~ of later revision and interpretation is undoubtedly pre-prophetic and it may accordingly help to shed light on the problem of divination in pre-prophetic times. The following facts are noteworthy.

1. Acts of divination to test the deity or to make sure of his presence and co-operation are looked upon with equanimity. (6.17-24; 36-40).

2. Other forms of divination, e.g. 7.4-6, are looked upon as fully in keeping with the belief in Yahweh. It is to be ^{noted} noticed, however, that the source from which information or decision is expected is already Yahweh, himself.

3. The dream is a true source of revelation whether it be sent by Yahweh or by another deity. The Israelites have implicit faith in the dream of the Midianite and in its interpretation. (7.9-15. Especially v.15: "And when Gideon heard the recounting of the dream and the interpretation thereof, he knelt, and he returned to the camp of Israel and said, arise, for the Lord hath delivered into your hand the host of Midian".)

4. The belief is firm in the prognostications of the ^{"Man of} ~~God~~ Monoah and his wife who mistook the angel for an ^{"Man of} ~~God~~ ^{God} (v.16), do not for a moment doubt his word, but merely ask for further instruction. (13.6 ff.)

5. The Ephod and Teraphim are looked upon as legitimate objects of worship (17.5; 8.27b where the Ephod is considered as the cause of Israel's apostasy is undoubtedly of later origin). The Ephod and Teraphim were used in divination. (see supra). Hence divination by means of them was considered legitimate. In fact, the implication of 18.5-6 is that the Levite actually consults one or both of them and this consultation is called "inquiring of God". (~~Ex. 17.5~~ ^{Ex. 17.5}).

6. The oracle (i.e. Ephod and Urim and Thummim) ~~see supra~~ is the official means of divination, but it is probable that this is the product of a later hand. (cf. Moore, "Judges" ad loc.) It is, however, noteworthy that the oracle may give false and deceptive advice in order to serve the purposes of the deity. (20.23-25).

II. The Elohist and Yahwist Documents of the Hexateuch.

But for the more or less monochronic nature of the Book of Judges and the ease with which it can be treated, we might have included it also in our discussion of the J and E documents. These two documents may be treated collectively. Their theologies are on the whole identical. The pervading spirit of both J and E is well expressed in the following summary of Skinner: "Both (J and E) evince towards the popular cultus an attitude of friendly toleration with a disposition to ignore its cruder aspects" ("Genesis", Intro. L. Int. Crit. Comm.) What has been said concerning the attitude of the author of Judges towards divination holds equally good of the authors of J and E.

Acts of divination abound in them, but such acts which are intended to test the presence or power of the deity are condemned. (Ex. 17.17) the phrase ~~Ex. 17.17~~ ^{Ex. 17.17} is char-

acteristic of divinatory questions. Num. 14.22 (J)). Both are convinced that dreams are instruments of revelation. Yahweh himself may appear in a ^{dream} (Gen. 20.3,6; 21.12 (c.f.v.14); 22.1 (cf.v.3); 28.10 ff; 31.11-13. (Esp. v.13 where the original reading is retained ~~הָאֱלֹהִים~~ and v.24), and in a night vision (Gen. 15.1; 46.2; Num. 12.6.). All these references are from E and they show quite an advance over the more anthropomorphic theophanies of J. The Teraphim are looked upon by E, it is true, with a certain amount of contempt (Gen. 31) but it is not at all certain that their efficacy was doubted or that their employment as instruments of divination prohibited. The Ephod is mentioned neither in J nor in E. Whether this omission is intentional or accidental cannot be determined. To these facts may be added the following:

1. Divination through omens ^{nahash} ~~וְהָאֱלֹהִים~~ is not considered reprehensible by J. Joseph practices it (Gen. 44.5) and so does Laban. In neither case is the practice censured. Num. 23.23,

~~וְהָאֱלֹהִים~~ does not belong to J E and is a later interpolation. (cf. Gray "Numbers" p.357, Int. Crit. Comm.) The efficacy of the practice is acknowledged. (Num. 24.1) ~~וְהָאֱלֹהִים~~, ~~לְכָל~~ ~~וְהָאֱלֹהִים~~

2. E's theory of prophecy is noteworthiness. It is concurrent with his concept of theophany. God speaks to his chosen ones in a dream or night-vision. So. Num.12.6 declares: "And he said, hearken unto my words, if there be a prophet among you, I make myself known unto him in a vision, in a dream do I speak unto him". Moses is further contrasted with the ordinary, though true, prophet in that Yahweh speaks unto him clearly and intelligibly and not in doubtful and mysterious terms ~~וְהָאֱלֹהִים~~ (v.8) Such a theory of prophecy is more or less oneiromantic. But it is significant that, already a higher though exceptional type of prophet is conceived in the character of Moses. Moreover, shamanizing as a characteristic of the Habi is acknowledged by E. (Num. 11.25-30)

The description given of the prophetic frenzy which seized the elders of Israel is in no way ^{different} ~~distinct~~ from that of the old Nebiim-guilds in the days of Samuel and Elijah. References to this mantic-possession is found also with Balaam (Num.24.3,4,15,16).

3. There are three direct references in the Hexateuch to the consultation of the oracle. (Gen. 25.22; Ex. 18.15 (both ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ and Jos. 9.14). The first consultation is in the matter of legal disputes; the second, to interpret a birth-omen; the third, to learn the disposition of the deity in the matter of making a treaty with another people. (The deity was always consulted before a treaty-agreement, for he was a party to the contract. c.f. I K 20.33) The process or method of consultation is nowhere indicated. (Num. 27.21, where the Urim are mentioned belongs to P.) In the first instance the oracular response is given in rhythmic form, as was ^{the} customary practice among many primitive peoples (cf. Wellhausen, Heid. P. 135).

III. Samuel.

The Books of Samuel are by no means consistent in their attitude towards divination. This is due to the later recensions which the original documents underwent. Of the older sources the following may be said: They conform, in the main, with the general tendency of J E. No real headway in the direction of reforming or spiritualizing divination is apparent. The henotheistic conception which pervades them (cf. I Sam. 28.19] makes such a reformation impossible. Saul consults the spirits of the dead who are acknowledged to be gods, (I Sam. 28.13) and whose power the author does not for a moment doubt. Yahweh has refused to answer Saul (v.6) He will consult other deities. The author does not rebuke Saul for it as did the Chronicler centuries later. (I Ch.10.13-14.) The Teraphim, moreover, are still in the house of such a zealous Yahwist as David. (I. Sam. 19.13 ff.). The Author's idea of revelation as expressed through dreams, Nebiim, Ro'im and Hozim needs no further expostulation.

But there are striking evidences in the books of a later age and of a truer spiritual monotheism. A later hand had revised the story of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor. He finds it necessary to plead this extenuating circumstance in Saul's behalf that the latter had removed, during the more peaceful days of his reign, all the *Oboloth* and *Yiddhouim* (I Sam. 28.3). His narrative implies that a sinful man cannot obtain an answer from God. This is quite an important and advanced idea. Again he states that there are only three legitimate ways of divining, (i.e. consulting Yahweh) (a) dreams (b) sacred lot (c) prophets. (ibid v.6; v.15 makes no mention of b) While in a sense, this view is still pre-prophetic, it is important inasmuch as it illustrates the tendency to regard all other methods of divination as illegitimate. But a statement such as this: ~~הַמִּלְחָמָה הַזֹּאת הָיְתָה כִּי יָדָהּ יְהוָה בְּיָד דָּוִד~~ *וְהָיָה כִּי יָדָהּ יְהוָה בְּיָד דָּוִד* "Rebellion is as the sin of divining, and stubbornness like idoltary and Teraphim" (I Sam. 15.23) is surely prophetic or Deuteronomic and the imposing figure of Nathan, the prophet who denounces a king (II Sam. 12) seems likewise to be the work of a late ^{er} hand.

IV. Kings.

The hand of the prophetic redactor is still more visible in the Books of Kings. The dream and the prophet (in the older connotation of the term) are now the recognized means of divination. The books nowhere mention the Urim and Thummim and nowhere employ the term *קְדוּשָׁה* which refers to divination by means of the sacred lot. They do use, however, the term *קְדוּשָׁה* which always implies the consultation of the deity through the medium of a prophet. (cf. I Sam. 9.9; I K 14.5; 22, 5, 7, 8; II K. 3.11; 8.8; 22.13, 18; et al.) The preference for the one term over against the other is not accidental. The author is inclined to look with disfavor upon the use of material objects in fathoming the will of the divine. The Deuteronomic hand is also noticeable

meonend
pb and yiddhoni
66.
in the denunciation of the ~~divination~~ and ~~oracles~~ (II K 17.17) of the ~~first~~ and the ~~one who practices with~~ (1b.21.6) the Teraphim (23.24) and, indirectly, of astrology (23.5) The author attributes the suppression of illicit divination to Josiah (Ch.23) and bases the act on the authority of the newly discovered Book of Deuteronomy.

V. Chronicles.

byhwh b'shal byhwh
The author of Chronicles shares the preference of ~~the~~ in common with the author of Kings (with two exceptions, where he is quoting I Ch. 14.10-14). In fact, he substitutes the one for the other (cf. I Ch. 10.14 with I Sam. 28.6). Dreams and prophets are the two legitimate means of divination or revelation. The Chronicler attributes Saul's death and the change of dynasty, to the latter's sin (~~in~~ ^{negat}) in consulting the Ob. (I Ch. 10.13-14). It is significant to note that here as everywhere the Chronicler is profoundly influenced by the Priestly code. P (or rather H) contains three distinct injunctions against necromancy (Lev. 19.31; 20.6, 27.), while all other forms of illicit divination ~~are~~ ^{are} inveighed against but once (19.26). There is no mention of ~~it~~ in P and so Chronicles are silent about it. So also with regard to Teraphim.

b. The Prophetic Writings.

The real intensity and bitterness of the struggle between spiritual monotheism and divination may be grasped from a study of the writing of the prophets. Their concept of the deity, of its spirituality and universality and of its relation to man and, above all, their theory of revelation and inspiration, would inevitably make them the most relentless foes of all forms of divination which endanger the unity and spirituality of Yahweh and which presuppose a relation between man and God other than the moral one.

We may safely assume that already in pre-prophetic times, such forms of divination which were frankly heathenish were banned by the zealous anti-Baalists of the day. The defeat of Baalism resulted in the illegitimization of its entire cultus which, naturally, comprised various modes of vaticination.)

But prophetism challenged not only the illicit, anti-Yahwistic system of divination but also, the recognized, official one. It endeavored to cleanse Yahwism of the divinatory superstitions which had survived from pre-Cananitic days and from those which, under Cananitic influence, had been incorporated into the Yahweh cult. The struggle was a long and bitter one, and success did not always attend the protagonists of ethical monotheism. Nor was their ultimate victory complete. The following outline will help us to gain an estimate of the important contribution of the literary prophets to the cause of anti-vaticination. - Hosea - very page

1. Amos.

1. There are no clear references in Amos, pointing to the fact that he was opposed even to the cruder forms of divination just as there are no indications that he was opposed to the generally prevalent image-worship of his day. (Cf. Harper, "Amos and Hosea", Int. C. XVI, Int. Crit. Comm).

2. He repudiates, however, the insinuation that he is a member of the Nebim-guilds (7.12-15) and defines his concept of the true prophet. This would imply that Amos does not recognize mantic possession as a true means of revelation.

2. Hosea.

1. Hosea is the first prophet who expressly denies the validity of the Ephod and the Teraphim as instruments of consulting the deity: "For it is many days that the sons of Israel shall sit still without king and without prince, without sacrifice and without pillar, without ephod and teraphim" (3.4). The verse lends itself to a double

interpretation, but we are inclined to think that it is more in keeping with the spirit of Hosea to consider his attitude towards them as antagonistic. (For a discussion of this verse see Harper op.cit.p.223). This opposition to the Ephod and Teraphim is fully in keeping with Hosea's general attitude towards idolatry. (12.2 et passim) Hosea denunciation of rhabdomancy ("My people consult their wooden blocks and their staff telleth them the oracle" 4.12), may be characteristic of his attitude toward all forms of divination.

3. Isaiah.

It remained for Isaiah to direct the full force of his powerful invective against divination. He attributes God's abandonment of Israel to the fact: *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת-בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אִתָּם* (2.6). *That they are such sayers like the Philistines* The first half of the verse is obscure. As it reads it lacks an object. We would suggest *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת-בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אִתָּם* The two *וְהָיָה* and *וְיִשְׁכַּח* usually go together. cf. Dt. 18.10; 14. (For Kosem among the Philistines, cf. I Sam.6.2. For a consideration of this verse see Gray, "Isaiah", p.52 ff) Isaiah, in attributing these practices to the Philistines, ~~there~~ daubs them as heathenish. (The people believed in the Kosem and Isaiah warns them that the time will come when Yahweh will remove him, on whom they rely so much, from their midst, (3.2). It is to be inferred from the verse that the Kosem occupied fully as important a position in the esteem of the people as the shofet and nabi and that belief in divination went hand in hand with faith in magic. ("the skilled in magic arts and the expert in charms" v.3).) Isaiah, again, is the first prophet to denounce all forms of necromancy. The denunciation occurs first in a fragment. (8.19 "And when they say unto you, consult the Oboth and Yidd'honim that chirp and that murmur, (ye shall say unto them) should not a people consult its God? on behalf of the living (should they consult) the dead?" (The reading is problematic). (Isaiah 19.3 states that the Egyptians, in

confusion, will consult the Ittim, the Oboth and Yidd'honim, thereby ascribing to this practice also a heathenish origin. It is doubtful, however, whether the passage can claim Isaianic authorship.) There is undoubted reference to necromancy which is bound up with the belief in the spirits of the nether world in the following words of Isaiah. "Because ye hath said, we have entered into a covenant with death, and with the nether world have we made an agreement ----- Therefore thus hath said the Lord Eternal ---- Your covenant with death shall be annulled, and your agreement with the nether world shall not have permanence----"(28.15-18.)

4. Micah.

Micah is even ~~more~~ ^{less} pungent than Isaiah in his attack on the Kosemim, and stronger than Hosea in his contempt for the Hozim. He draws a sharp and clear distinction between them and the true prophet of Yahweh: "Thus has Yahweh said concerning the prophets who lead my people astray, who when they bite with their teeth preach peace but if one puts not into their mouths they declare war against him. Therefore, it will be night for you without vision (חֹשֶׁךְ) and darkness for you without divination, (יִפְּתָח) (חֹשֶׁךְ) (יִפְּתָח) will be ashamed and the diviners

And the seers ~~will~~ ^(חֹשֶׁךְ) will be ashamed and the diviners (חֹשֶׁךְ) will blush and they will cover the upper lip, all of them, because there is no answer from God. But I am filled with might in that I am roused by the spirit of God, the spirit of justice and of moral power. So that I can tell Jacob his transgression, Israel his sin." (3.5-8). While he does not openly attack the priestly oracle, a doubt as to its validity is implied in his accusation that the priests manipulate it for sordid reasons. (3.11). (The act of the Nebiim is called *Kesem* (ibid). Micah joins Isaiah in condemning the moonenim and all kinds of magical practices. (5.11).)

5. Zephaniah.

A word concerning Zephaniah. The prophet's invectives

against the worship of heavenly bodies (1.5), a practice quite prevalent in Israel (II K. 21.3,5,21; 23.5,12; et al), undoubtedly included an attack on astrology. The recognition of astral deities and star-gazing for purposes of divination go hand in hand. Zephaniah ~~Moreover~~, threatens with God's dire punishment all who do not seek God ^{לֹא יִשְׁכָּחוּ} and who do not consult him. ^{לֹא יִשְׁכָּחוּ} v.6)

6. Jeremiah.

In Jeremiah, the movement against all forms of illicit as well as of licit ~~of~~ official divination reaches its crest. Jeremiah's is the fullest expression of the true prophet on the subject of divination. It goes without saying that he is bitterly opposed to practices unmistakably heathenish. He takes occasion to decry the ^{mesmerism} ~~magical~~ along with the ^{ne hashphume} ~~magical~~ (27.9). He denounces those who worship the heavenly bodies and those that consult them. "And they shall spread them out before the sun, and the moon, and all the host of heaven, which they have loved, and which they have served and after which they have walked, and which they have consulted ^{וְהָיוּ} and to which they have prostrated themselves." (8.2. see also 7.18; 19.13; 44.17-25). Again in 10.2, Jeremiah urges the people not to follow the custom of the heathens and be afraid of heavenly signs or portents.

But it is against the official forms of divination that the sharpest barbs of the prophet's wrath are aimed. Jeremiah, in more than one sermon, clearly defines the nature of the true prophet. Ecstatic frenzy and possession are not the concomitants of true revelation. "Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words every one from his neighbor.--- ~~such as~~ and utter oracles". (23.30-31). Such prophets are false (v v.18,21,25 et passim.) (Jeremiah even objects to the use of ^{נאמא} ~~נאמא~~ as designating God's revelation to man. (vv 33-40). The word carried with it the implication of the method by which the frenzied nabi would obtain the oracle.) Jeremiah classes these

prophets along with the Kosemim. (14.14; 27.9; 29.8.)

Jeremiah is the first prophet who definitely denies the possibility of dream revelations. "The prophet that hath had a dream, let him relate his dream, and he that hath received my word, let him speak my word of truth; what hath the chaff to do with the corn? saith the Lord". (23.28) The dream is chaff in comparison with God's true revelation. And again: "I have heard what the prophets that prophesied falsely in my name have said: I have had a dream, I have had a dream!" (v.25). Jer. 27.9 is of interest inasmuch as it enumerates the entire list of diviners which Jeremiah denounced as false. "But ye -- do ye not hearken to your prophets ~~and~~ and to your diviners ~~and~~ and to your dreamers ~~and~~ and to your soothsayers ~~and~~ and to your sorcerers ~~and~~ "-----(cf. 29.8).

It is evident that Jeremiah denies not alone certain forms of divination, but divination per se. With the highest possible conception of man's spiritual relation to God, the idea of divination is robbed of all content. Man cannot and does not fathom the inscrutable will of the deity. Man cannot gain information from the deity on all matters in which he is interested. It is only in the moral life that man, seeking to rise ever higher on the spiritual plane, may be said to hold converse with the deity, and to divine its will by endeavoring to realize the moral ideals in life. This attitude is the natural and inevitable product of prophetism, of an ethical or spiritual monotheism.

See end

7. Ezekiel.

Ezekiel, of course, has little to add to the thorough-going view of Jeremiah. The latter failed, however, as he had failed in so many other instances, in impressing his view on the popular belief of the day; and Ezekiel had practically the same conditions to contend with as had Jeremiah. The Hozim^{wt} and the
A

Kosemim, who parade under the nomenclature of Nebiim come in for a share on Ezekiel's general condemnation of idolatry and superstitious beliefs and practices. (12.24; 13 passim, et al). Ezekiel, moreover, emphasizes this thought; viz. that no one who is in any way tainted with idolatry has a right to consult Yahweh or may anticipate a response from Him: "Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and the stumbling block of their iniquity have they placed before their faces; shall I in any wise let myself be consulted by them?" $\text{אֵלֶי מִי יִשְׁאַל וְאֶתֵּן אֵלֶיךָ אָמַרְתָּ 14.3}$ cf. also vv. 4-11). Even in the mind of Ezekiel, Sheol is a realm over which Yahweh has little power. (26.19-21). It is not to be wondered, then, that necromancy was one of the most tenacious superstitions in ancient Israel. It is noteworthy that most of the Biblical references to the nether-world and its inhabitants are exilic or post-exilic. The belief must have received a powerful impetus in Babylonia and this may account for P's strenuous opposition to necromancy.

8. Other Prophetic Writings.

That the conflict was still raging in exilic and post-exilic times may be deduced from a perusal of the pages of some of the later prophets. Deutero-Isaiah declares: God "frustrates the tokens of the diviners (read בָּרִיָּה Babyl. bārū , for בָּרָא) and confuseth the Kosemim but fulfilleth the word of his servant and performeth the counsel of his messengers". (44.25-26). He derides the entire school of Babylonian diviners: "Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the astrologers (כְּכֹלֵם cf. supra, "astrology.") and star-gazers (חֲזִינֵי כְכֹלֵם) and the monthly prognosticators (חֲזִינֵי חֳדָיִם) stand up and save thee from the things that are to come over thee". (47.13).

The author of Is. 58.2 supplements the view previously expressed by Ezekiel by insisting that the morally unfit have no right to consult God. "Yet me do they ever seek (יִשְׁאַלֵּנִי) day by day, and to know my ways do they always desire: as a nation

SUPPLEMENT.

To Page 29

In dwelling upon the subject of sacred wells and the survival of heathenish rites among the Mohammedans, Goldziher narrates the following: "Bei einer der Quellen macht eine Negerin ein Pfannenfeuer, lässt darin einige Körner Weihrauch oder Benzoin knistern, den Dampf muss die den Zauber veranstaltende Person einathmen; dann werden die mitgebrachten Hühner geschlachtet und in den Sand geschleudert. Wenn die noch lebend sich fort-schleppenden Hühner das Meer erreichen, wird dies als günstiges Omen für die Erfüllung des Wunches, dem das Opfer gilt, betrachtet; der Genius hat das Opfer wohlgefällig angenommen. Sterben aber die Hühner auf dem Sande und können sich nicht mehr bis zum Meere fortbewegen, so versucht man die Ceremonie von neuem, der Genius gilt also nicht besänftigt" (Muhammedanische Studien, p.347).

To Page 25

The pronouncing of the name of the deity was an essential part of the ceremony. The deity was, in a sense, constrained to do the bidding of the worshipper, once His name was pronounced. (On the importance of this act, i.e. pronouncing the hidden name of the deity, among the Egyptians sorcerers and magicians, see Wiedemann. Rel. of The Ancient Egyptians, p. 269.

To Page 54

It is very interesting to note that the title Ro'eh was applied to the Egyptian priests as well. "At Heliopolis", remarks Wiedemann (op.cit. p.10), "the head of the college of priests was known by the title of the "Great Seer" (literal translation, "Great One of Seeings")".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

A rather exhaustive bibliography on the subject of general divination is given in C.H. Toy's, "Introduction to The History of Religions", p.410. Some of these works have been consulted and the fact acknowledged in the body of the thesis. We shall restrict our bibliography to those writings which have been of especial and direct help in the treatment of our subject.

- Ames Psychology of Religious Experience.
- Barth Etymologische Studien.
- Baudissin Studien zur Sem. Religionsgeschichte, Vol. I.
- Charles Eschatology.
- Davies Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbors.
- Dictionaries Hastings's "Dictionary of the Bible" s.v. "Divination" et al.
- Driver Enc. Biblica
Hastings's Enc. of Religion and Ethics.
Jewish Encyclopaedia.
- Erman A Handbook of Egyptian Religion.
- Frazer The Belief in Immortality.

Folk-Lore in the O.T. in Anthropological Essays to E.B. Tyler.
- Gall Altisraelitische Kultstätten.
- Goldziher Muhammedanische Studien.
- Gray "Isaiah", Int. Crit. Comm. Series.
"Numbers", " " " "
- Harper "Amos and Hosea" " " "
- Haupt Journal of Bib. Literature Vol. XIX.
- Jastrow Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens.
Religious Beliefs in Babylonia and Assyria.
Religion of Babylonia and Assyria.
Babylonian - Assyrian Birth Omens.
"Hepatoscopy and Astrology" Proc. Amer. Philo. Soc. Vol. XLVII.