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The Place of Prophetic Intercession in Old Testament Religion was a subject which from the first promised the pleasure of a challenging investigation, but has since far exceeded this promise; for it has led me by an exceedingly interesting study into a new appreciation and, I venture to say, understanding of Old Testament prophecy. The method followed was to examine the cases of prophetic intercession themselves and, without preconceptions as far as possible, to base conclusions upon these. The thesis has grown gradually along the lines of this method of case investigation, and its present form was determined upon only after all the studies had been made. This form is, in brief, to present in an introductory chapter, on the one hand, a brief survey of extra-biblical intercession and, on the other, the Old Testament background of prophetic intercession; to follow this with an investigation of the teaching on this subject in Israel prior to the advent of literary prophecy in the eighth century; then to treat thoroughly in three chapters the three canonical prophets - Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel whose writings furnish the most important and stimulating material for this subject; to follow this again with a chapter on the remaining material on prophetic intercession, and one on the related forms of intercession by priests, the Psalmist, holy men and angels; and finally to give a short chapter of conclusions. The subject's breadth has seemed to justify treatment of teachings which would have been digressions in a theme less comprehensive.
Material bearing upon our subject is found in parts of a great many books, which has necessitated a rather lengthy bibliography. To render this less cumbersome those books which furnished material for separate chapters have been placed in divisions of their own. Notes and references are numbered consecutively through each chapter and are placed in a separate section at the end of each. References to Old Testament books are to the versification of the Hebrew Bible, where this differs from the numbering of the English versions. All Old Testament quotations are taken from the Revised Version of 1885.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The basis of intercession (1), whether social or religious, is a relationship. The intercessor assumes a position between two persons, both of whom he knows, and makes on behalf of the one who has a need a petition to the other who has the power to meet that need. The intercessor must in the first place be acquainted with the need, in the second have access to the person with power, and in the third be on terms of influence and good will with this one of whom the benefit is asked.

1. Extra-biblical intercession.

So fundamental is the need of such a relationship, so natural the desire to receive benefit from others, that we can easily imagine intercession to have had a place in man's social life from earliest times. We may suppose that no sooner were some persons lifted a little above others in power or position or skill than the way was open for the appearance of intercession in its various forms. This we may easily suppose, but to prove so broad a generalization would be an exceedingly difficult, if not impossible thing. We can, however, demonstrate a certain currency of social intercession in ancient times. That Greeks of the Homeric age were familiar with it is shown by the petition of Penelope to Antinous for Telemachus (2).

The Coptos Decree, from the reign of Nubkheprure-Intef of the Thirteenth Egyptian Dynasty, tells of the degradation of a treasonous nobleman named Teti and contains the warning that any commandant or official who dares to intercede for him to the king shall be punished by the con-
fiscation of all his property (3). On the Stele of Intef the Herald, an official of Thutmose III of the Eighteenth Dynasty, along with the usual self-adulation, describes himself as the one "who sends up the words of the people", and as "protector of the seemly, hearer of his prayer, gentle toward the hot-cold one, interceding for him...(4). King Piankhi of the Twenty-third Dynasty, who came to the throne about 741 B. C. (5), in extending his Nubian kingdom over Lower Egypt laid siege to Hermopolis. The city wished to come to terms and sent messengers with costly gifts to Piankhi, who remained unmoved until Nestent, the wife of the King of Hermopolis, went to the women of his harem and won their intercessions for the city (6).

Among the records of Assurbanipal (668-626 B. C.), there is a tablet which tells in the conventional eulogistic vein the story of his life before he became king, and on it appear these words, "The nobles were glad (and) the officials, and they attended upon the words of my lips. Before the king, my father, my begetter, I took their part (interceded for them), to (their) advancement. (7)

Friedrich Heiler, in his book Das Gebet, calls attention to what he terms an obvious tendency in the entire religious life to reproduce the relationships of social life.(8). According to this view, it is to be expected that where we find men with power to intercede with other men we should also find men with power to intercede with divine beings, and lesser deities with power to intercede with high gods. The facts bear out this expectation, for religious intercession is widely current in both primitive and ancient religions. Heiler cites instances of it among Ku-Bushmen, Mkulwe, Ainu, Mulera-Ruanda, the Euahlayi people of Australia and a number of other modern primitive peoples(9). David Livingstone tells of a case which he observed among the Bechuanas (10),
and H. M. Stanley tells how, when in 1875 his expedition was about to set out from Refuge Island in Lake Nyanza after a period of great difficulties, his Komeh Island guide "propitiated the genius of the lake with beads given to him for the occasion, and adjured it by saying: - 'Be kind to the white M'Kama, O Nianja, I charge thee: Give him a safe and prosperous voyage across thy wide waters'"(11).

Intercession had a place in Greek religion as well. In the colorful variety of relations between men and gods in Homeric literature almost every form of intercession appears. Men pray to gods for their fellow-men, as when the Achaeans prayed to Zeus for their champion Aias, before his fight with Hector:

"Father Zeus, ruling from Ida, noblest, most mighty, give victory to Aias, and that he win glorious renown, or if you love Hector also and care for him, grant to both equal might and fame"(12).

Or the prayer of the swineherd of Odysseus to the nymphs of the fountain that his absent master might be brought home, guided by some god (13). There is the prayer of the priest, Chryses priest of Apollo, that the pestilence might be removed which the god had sent upon the Achaeans for a misdeed of Agamemnon (14). In the very human life which the gods themselves lived, we find them interceding with one another of their own accord in behalf of this or that mortal child or favourite, as when Thetis clasped the knees of Zeus and supplicated him for her son Achilles (15). In this community of gods we even find an intercession in which all three parties were deities (16).

From the classical period comes the prayer of Alcestis before Vesta's altar:

"Queen since I go beneath the earth,
In final supplication I beseech thee
To mother my orphaned children; join to him
A loving wife, and to her a noble husband" (17).

An inscription of the second century A. D. bears the petition of an
education official in Cos for the health and virtuous behaviour of boys (18). The Deipnosophists of Athenaeus contains this prayer of the table companions:

"Pallas Athena, sea-born (or Tritogeneia) queen,  
Preserve this city and its citizens  
From sorrows and seditions  
And violent death, thou and thy father"(19).

The people of ancient Egypt have left in their inscriptions some evidence of the place which intercession had in their religion. In an Eighteenth Dynasty inscription of Hatshepsut's reign, Thutmose I prays for this queen, his daughter (20). The favourite of Ikhnaton, Eye, includes in a long record of his life found in his tomb a prayer for the king and queen (21). In the inscription of the high priest Roy, who lived in the reign of Merneptah in the Nineteenth Dynasty, which is typical of those which admonish coming generations to preserve their memorial and good name and either request or promise intercession (22), we read, "O ye priests and scribes of the house of Amon, good servants of the divine offerings, bakers, mixers, confectioners, makers of cakes, and loaves, those who perform their every duty for their lord,... pray for me because of my good and great deeds." And in the same inscription, "Place offerings before my statue, pour out libations upon the ground for my name, set flowers before me when ye enter, bespeak for me his favor with a loving heart for my god, Amon, lord of gods (23).

These ancient Egyptians also believed that the dead could intercede with the gods for the living. A tomb inscription of the Fifth Dynasty reads, "I have made this tomb as a just possession, and never have I taken a thing belonging to any person. Whosoever shall make offering to me therein, I will do (it) for them; I will commend them to the god for it very greatly...."(24). In the Great Abydos inscription, after telling what an exemplary son he has been, cherishing and supporting the memorials
of the deified Seti I, his father, Ramses II, prays to him to make intercession to Re on his behalf (25). The mortuary Papyrus Harris, which was placed in the tomb of Ramses III by his son, Ramses IV, contains the lists of all the offerings which were made for the deceased to various gods, and each list ends with a lengthy prayer by the late king for his son and successor. One is addressed to Amon, one to Re, one to Ptah and one to the "great ennead" of gods (26). These examples prove that intercession was both known and used in the religion of ancient Egypt.

The same use can be demonstrated in Assyrian and, by inference, in Babylonian religion. Marduk-nadin-ahê, the scribe of king Assur-uballit (c. 1380 B.C.), wrote a memorial tablet telling of the building of his new house, and at the end made this prayer, "And to my lord, to Assur-uballit, (who loves me), the king of the universe, my lord, length of days may the lord of fulness and abundance (i.e. Marduk) grant"(27). The Assyrian inscriptions which have survived are nearly all crude self-eulogies of the men who made them. But under the vulgar boastfulness one detects fear that when they are gone the buildings and memorials which perpetuated them will be allowed to fall to pieces or will be destroyed. An endeavor to prevent this is found in many an inscription, in the form of imprecations and prayers to the gods to deal furiously with all vandals (28). Less frequently intercessions are made for those who will keep the buildings and stelai in repair. Thus we read on one of the four clay prisms which Tiglath-pileser I (c. 1100 B.C.) deposited at the corners of the temple of Anu and Adad which he built at Assur:

"In the future days in days to come, let (some) future prince, when that temple of Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords, and these temple towers, shall grow old and shall fall into decay, repair their ruins. Let him anoint my (stone) memorial tablets and my (clay) prisms with oil, let him offer sacrifices, and restore them unto their place. Let
him inscribe his own name by the side of mine. 
Even as (they have done unto) me, so may Anu 
and Adad, the great gods, graciously bring him 
to joy of heart and the attainment of victory"(29).

From three stelai set up by Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.) to commemorate 
the restoration of temples comes a curious form of intercession ad­
dressed to the foundation-stele and probably to be associated with the 
ritual anointing mentioned above. In each case the wording is much the 
same:

"Thou, foundation (-deposit), for Sennacherib, 
king of Assyria, lover of justice, maker of the 
image of Assur, builder of the house of his grace, 
to Assur speak: 'With Assyria and Esharra may his 
offspring prosper; may his sons and his grandsons 
abide among the black-headed race (of men) forever 
and ever"(30).

In the intercessions noted above, the intercessors have been mor­
tals, whether living or dead and, in this last strange instance, written 
words on a stele. In another type of intercession lesser gods, or gods, 
more approachable, are used to reach the higher gods on man's behalf (31). 
A fine example of this, in Assyrian religion, appears on a cylinder com­
memorating Esarhaddon's (680-669) restoration of the temple of Nanâ at 
Banna. He prays to the goddess:

"Mayest thou, O Nanâ, noble lady, as thou makest 
that shrine thy joyful abode, for me, Esarhaddon, the 
prince who fears thee, intercede before Nabû, thy 
spouse; life everlasting, abundant prosperity, health 
of body and joy of heart, decree as my destiny. Establish 
the foundation of my throne firm as toed rock. Make my 
reign (line) endure as long as heaven and earth"(32).

In Babylonian-Assyrian religion the one usually petitioned to make 
this sort of intercession was Nusku, the fire god. Jastrow says of him, 
"To whatever deity the offering was made, Gibil-Nusku could not in any 
 ease be overlooked. The fire constituted the medium, as it were, between 
the worshipper and the deity."(33). On an altar dedicated to this inter­
mediary God by Tukulti-urta I (c. 1250 B. C.) are the words:
"Altar of Musku, exalted messenger of Ekur, bearer of the scepter of the temples, who stands before Assur and Enlil, who daily speaks the prayer of Tukulti-urta, his beloved king, before Assur and Enlil...." (34).

An interesting parallel is found in Hindu religion. There Agni, the fire god (the Sanskrit word for fire is agnis), one of the gods most often mentioned in the Rig-Veda, is the intermediary. G. F. Moore says of Him, "Offerings of butter are made to him, and sacrifices to the other gods are committed to him which he conveys in his mounting flames and smoke to their seats on high, with the praises and prayers of the worshippers. As sacrifice propitiates the gods and removes guilt, and as fire purifies and expels evil influences, Agni is a god who takes away sin and restores the sinner to favour." (History of religions (1916), I, p. 254. As messenger between earth and heaven, he is associated with the Angiras (cf. Greek, Ἀγίρας), a race of mythical semi-divine priests, who are also mediators between gods and men and of whom he was the first.

Lastly, from the archives of Ishtarwashur, King of Taanach in the fifteenth century B.C., have come two letters which begin with prayer to the gods for the king to whom they were addressed. The letter from Ahijawi begins, "May the lord of gods protect thy life (for) thou art a brother...." (35), and the one from Guli-Addi, "Good fortune attend thy life! May the gods be concerned for thy welfare, the welfare of thy house and of thy children!...." (36). Attention is called to these cases, not for their worth as examples of intercession, for they may be only a conventional form of salutation, but because they show a certain familiarity with this form of religious expression in Canaan before the coming of the Hebrews.

These cases show that intercession, both social and religious, and of a number of different types, is found to-day in primitive religions and was
current in ancient times among the peoples which constituted the setting for Old Testament history and religion. This currency in neighbouring religions should by no means be taken as an indication that the Hebrews received their ideas of intercession from the Egyptians or the Babylonians or the Canaanites; but should be taken as an indication only that intercession is something natural to man. As prayer itself or sacrifice may appear in any religion, irrespective of its stage of advancement or the century, so intercession may have a place in any religion. Therefore, in studying the place which intercession has in Old Testament, and particularly in prophetic religion, we are not dealing with a thing peculiarly Hebrew or unique in the Old Testament. We are dealing, rather, with one of the common elements of man's religion as it came into transmuting contact with what was vitally unique in the religion of Israel.

2. The Background of Prophetic Intercession

Social Intercession in the Old Testament

Approaching Old Testament intercession more directly, we shall consider briefly some matters preliminary to study of the intercession of the prophets. In the first place we note that there are a few instances of social intercession in Old Testament books. Hamor, prince of Shechem, interceded with Jacob and his sons for his own son Shechem, asking that Dinah be given to him in marriage (37). By the intercession of Reuben, Joseph's life was spared (38). Jacob is represented by his sons as praying Joseph to forgive them (39). There are the intercessions of Jonathan for David (40), of the woman of Tekoa and of Joab for the banished Absalom (41), the intercession of Nehemiah for the poor Jews who were in debt (42), and that of Esther to Ahasuerus for the Jews in his empire (43). After the Temple Sermon, Jeremiah perhaps owed his life to the intervention on
his behalf of the people and princes (44), who later, during the siege, asked Zedekiah to put him to death (45); and when he was in the miry dungeon it was the intercession of Ebed-Melech, the Ethiopian, which saved his life (46). These cases will suffice to suggest how familiar the Hebrews must have been, both in their life and in the life of neighbouring peoples, with what we have termed social intercession.

Nature of God in the Old Testament.

Far more important is the answer to this question: What is the nature of the God whom the Hebrews worshipped? — for the way in which its god is conceived is the key to any religion. Yahweh, God of the Hebrews, was a Person; man was endowed with the qualities which made him a person when he was made in His image. Yahweh was the creator of heaven and earth (47), and its master (48). The Thunder was his voice, in poetic expression (49), in more sober prose it was His instrument, together with hail and lightning (50). He was never confused by those who knew Him with some natural force, as the Babylonians confused the god Shamash with the sun, and the goddess Sin with the moon. Yahweh stood above all nature, which was merely His creation and the medium through which His ruach acted. God of action He was, and all the activity in man's world, and even the more mysterious phenomena in man's own life, such as the beginning and end of life and a prophet's inspiration, were His doing.

On two outstanding points Yahweh was different from other deities whom the Hebrews saw worshipped among their neighbours. One was His ethical nature. His actions were governed, not by whim nor by a series of unreasonable taboos (51), but by moral principles to which the highest nature of worshipping man responded. The other had to do with His choice of the Hebrew people, as a result of which He revealed Himself to the patriarchs and leaders, aided them through the crisis of emancipation,
and sealed their relationship with a covenant of leadership and protection on His part and loyalty and obedience on theirs. Budde has remarked upon a connection between these two distinctive features of Israelite religion, and has said that this religion was ethical because it was a religion of choice and not of nature, the voluntary decision establishing an ethical relation between people and God for all time (52).

These are basic principles of Old Testament religion - Yahweh, as personal, creator and governor of the world, ethical in His character, bound by a covenant to Israel, the terms of the covenant being in harmony with His own nature. They are basic in the religion represented by the oldest as well as by the more complex religion of the later Old Testament writings (53).

Communication between the people and Yahweh

There are certain accepted beliefs current throughout the Old Testament regarding communication between the God of Israel and men. In keeping with His being, as a Person, He hears and speaks. When Hagar and the young Ishmael had been sent away from the encampment by Abraham and were in straits in the Wilderness of Beer-sheba, Yahweh heard the voice of Ishmael and sent His angel to help them (54). When the Israelites complained of their lack of food in the Wilderness of Sin, Yahweh heard their "murmurings" (55). Though it is foreign to the spirit of the Old Testament to state a theory of Yahweh's omniscience and omnipresence, the material is there from which these attributes might have been drawn. He is aware of the words which people speak, and He is attentive to cries of anguish and appeals for help (56).

For God to hear was one thing, but for Him to enter into conversation with men was another. Yahweh could do this; He could talk with men as
easily and intimately as friend talks with friend. Yet He did not talk with all men; only with those with whom he had some bond. He talked with Cain (57), with Abraham repeatedly (58), with Abimelech on Abraham's account (59), with Jacob (60), with Moses many times (61), with Joshua (62), Samuel (63), Solomon (64), Elijah (65), and Jonah (66), and also with Amos (67), Jeremiah (68), and Ezekiel (69). With these men Yahweh conversed with a remarkable naturalness and equality, and they on their part seem not to have been troubled by any great awe or fear of Him. The reader is impressed both by this and by the ease, the directness and the economy of words with which they approached their God.

Alongside this representation is another which does not invalidate the conclusion to which we have necessarily been led, that Yahweh was an approachable God: it is of Yahweh carrying on a conversation with men through the medium of His angel. Hagar (70), and Lot (71), are talked with through this intermediary. This is the manner in which even Abraham (72), and Joshua (73), conversed with God (74). In the books of Daniel (75), and Zechariah (76), Yahweh customarily conversed with men through His angels. Study of these cases will show that these intermediary beings did not, at least in pre-exilic religion, form an obstacle to the worshipper's direct approach to Yahweh, but were, rather, Yahweh's companions and co-workers, at times even difficult to distinguish from Yahweh Himself (77).

It is, also, the teaching of the Old Testament that Yahweh responds readily to the petitions of men and gives them that for which they ask (78). There may be reasons why He does not choose to answer prayers (79), but as the controlling power in every realm He is able, if He will, to comply with any request (80).
As angels are superhuman intermediaries in Old Testament religion, so also certain men stand between Yahweh and His people, in the offices of priest and prophet. Both offices were representative; the priest represented the people before its God (81), the prophet God before His people (82). For a long period in Old Testament religion the "word" of Yahweh (נָשִׁירָה) was delivered to Israel by men who in most cases had no connection with the priesthood and to whom this one function was an absorbing mission. The prophets were those through whom Yahweh spoke His "word" at His pleasure; but they had other lesser offices which originated on the level of their human relationships and moved upward to Him. One of these was the subject of this thesis, intercession; another was "inquiring of Yahweh" (נַעַמְּלַק וְזַבִּית). The latter had its rise in the natural desire of man to know the future and other hidden matters, which also led in other ancient religions to necromancy, divination, augury, astrology and kindred endeavours to fathom the counsels of the gods (83). In its very different expression in Old Testament religion the prophets, since they were close to Yahweh, and were therefore endowed with superior knowledge (84), were sought out to discover His purposes (85). This inquiring of Yahweh may have been of prime importance in the obscure beginnings of prophecy, but it seems to have become more and more rare, and among the canonical prophets was altogether secondary to delivering messages of Yahweh.

This is not the place to discuss prophetism as a profession (for such it became), or the part which the host of professional prophets had in Israel's religious life. Our concern is with biblical prophecy, which is quite a different thing from the prophecy of everyday religion in Old Testament times (86); for the process of selection exercised by the religious
teachers and literati of later generations has given us a residue from this great prophetic movement limited to references in a few historical books and writings of but a handful of the prophets themselves, all of whom were at odds with professional prophetism. We should find it difficult, therefore, to deal with this professional or common prophecy even if we would, but fortunately the criterion upon which the selection of what was worthy of survival was made is precisely in agreement with the highest exercise of the function which was prophecy's raison d'être, so that we possess of prophecy what has been judged its true "word" or revelation from God.

The biblical prophet might be a person of any class or occupation. What made him a prophet was his "call" to prophet's service. Yahweh took Amos, (who was neither a professional prophet nor the son of such a one) (87), from following the flock and said to him, "Go, prophecy unto my people Israel(88)". When Isaiah was called, he was commanded, "Go, and tell this people...."(89). To the reluctant Jeremiah Yahweh said, "To whomsoever I shall send thee thou shalt go, and whatsoever I shall command thee thou shalt speak."(90). In the life of every prophet there was some crucial experience or series of experiences which gave him the absolute conviction that he had been divinely called to undertake a mission and deliver the message of God (91). The experiences out of which this conviction rose were experiences of God, always of the same God, Yahweh, whose control of the present and of the future, whose ethical integrity and faithfulness to His covenant with Israel were the very essence of His nature.

The prophets taught nothing new about God (92). They were reformers rather than innovators, seeking to bring their national generation into a true relationship with the God of their call and prophet's experience,
the same God who had made Himself known to their forefathers and to Moses. All the ethics which the prophets taught were the qualities of Yahweh's character, and to each prophet a particular quality was the means of showing both Yahweh and Israel's relation to Him in a clearer light. With Amos, for example, this quality was justice (יהוה התומך). It was divine justice which drove him to Bethel, and by its plummet Israel was tested and judged. Therefore, when we speak of the prophets as reformers we must be mindful that it was Yahweh Himself who was the real reformer, who was in Himself both standard and power. They were reformers in a secondary sense, as those who revealed His will to the people.

Less than half the teaching of the prophets is in the form of idea; the greater part is in their account of their religious experience and personal relation to God (93). They were clearly conscious that they were not God in any sense, or the originators of the messages which they spoke, wrote and acted. God was an Other; yet He was a moral person, as they were, and with that Person they had spiritual intercourse. Thus far in speaking of the prophet nothing has been said which would be ground for supposing intercession to have been a part of his religious life. Had the record of prophecies been confined to messages from Yahweh we should, indeed, have received no intimation that the prophets were intercessors, but along with the discourses themselves much that deals with their devotional life and intercourse with Yahweh has been preserved, and from this source comes the material for the study of their intercessions.

We have said that in the religious relationship, as the priest was the representative of the people, so the prophet was the representative of God. In an official sense this was true; but the prophet was by no means a de-personalized, mechanical instrument in the hand of God, bear-
ing an attitude of detachment toward the people whom he addressed. On the contrary, he was uniquely a man of the people. Passages such as Hos. vi 1 ff., Jer xiv 2 ff. viii. 18 ff., ix 1 ff., raise doubt whether even the priests understood the people and felt with them as the biblical prophets did. They shared the life of the nation as its citizens, but as citizens who were unfalteringly loyal to Yahweh, the nation's true ruler. Their point of vantage by Yahweh's side made them feel their people's disloyalties to Him as doubly heinous and their calamities as doubly terrible. Association with Yahweh did not, therefore, withdraw the prophets from the life and fortunes of the nation, as seems to have been the case with the Rechabites; for though the nature of their office set them apart from men, the matters with which they dealt in the exercise of that office made them also the truest Israelites of all. As Davidson has said, "The life of the people flowing through the general mass only reached its flood-tide in them" (94).

However the prophet may have appeared to his contemporaries (who certainly did not understand him), he was in feeling and sympathy, entirely one with them, as they made up the nation Israel of which both they and he were a part. It should be borne in mind in this connection that the sense of group unity which we call social or corporate solidarity, which gave the nation a far larger importance than the individual, aided the prophet in his consciousness of oneness with the nation. Israel was more to him than an aggregate of individuals; it was a corporate reality which gave meaning to the life of those who had a place within it. His place was within Israel, even though he was a prophet; he could not have been a prophet had he not been first an Israelite. It was this thorough oneness with the people of Yahweh which made certain of the prophets intercessors.
Recalling what was said earlier about the availability and approachability of Yahweh as characteristic of Old Testament religion, it will appear how, because of his place in the confidence of God, this was true in a special sense for the prophet. No group or class in Hebrew religion were so near to God or so deep in His counsels as the prophets. The psalmist may have felt at times that Yahweh had forsaken him or that he was estranged from Him (95), but the prophet was never conscious of this separation. Elijah at Horeb, though he despaired for his life and the success of his life mission, was in close relation to Yahweh (96). One of the most frequently recurring thoughts in the book of any prophet is that expressed in phrases like: "The Lord said unto me...(97), or, "The word of the Lord came unto me...."(98), and though it is a hazardous thing to say precisely what these statements meant in his experience, they may certainly be taken as evidence that the relation with Yahweh which was basic to his prophetic office was one of close intimacy. This normal state might be clouded for a time, as when it was necessary for Yahweh to tell the rebellious Jeremiah, "If thou wilt return, then will I bring thee again, that thou mayest stand before me; and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth"(99); but even then it was temporary estrangement rather than separation. And though the prophet was always the servant of Yahweh, never commanding His word, but waiting for it, and sometimes for considerable periods (100), yet he was a servant who enjoyed the confidence of his Master, serving in an office important and even essential to Yahweh's relation to His people Israel.

The prophet's primary concern, then, was speaking Yahweh's word to the people. But the requirements and advantages of this function - his intimate relation to Yahweh, his sympathy for his own people Israel, and his clearer consciousness of their shortcomings and needs - put him in the position to become, as well, an intercessor for the people before Yahweh.
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CHAPTER II

TRADITIONAL TEACHING ON PROPHETIC INTERCESSION

The object of this chapter is to present the important material bearing upon prophetic intercession from sources antedating the period of the canonical prophets. Naturally, the principal emphasis of this thesis will be upon the intercessions of prophets from this latter period, which is the greatest age of Old Testament prophecy. But, as in a general study of prophecy it would not be possible to evaluate or understand the literary prophets apart from their predecessors, so in the special field of their intercessions, it is essential to have a background from traditional prophecy before proceeding to Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the three literary prophets in whose writings important cases of intercession occur. This chapter will not serve, however, simply as an introduction to the main discussion; for its material may be found to lead to very different conclusions from those which come out of the writings of the three prophets who have just been named. The purpose of this chapter is, rather, two-fold: First, to serve as an entrance into the subject, and, second, to present from the oldest historical sources what must have been the accepted or conventional teaching on prophets' intercessions by the eighth century B.C. Here we are dealing with secondary sources, as in the three succeeding chapters we shall be dealing with the prophets' own accounts of their message, religious life and intercessions.

1. The Intercessions of Samuel

Samuel is the first prophet to be considered in this study (1). He
was the second great leader who had appeared in Israel; he dominated a period which was highly important both in the nation's political and religious development. Before his time, since Joshua, leadership had been furnished by an occasional "man of the hour" or "judge"; but he, as the last of these (2), founded the kingdom and in a certain sense created the nation(3). His early training under Eli at Shiloh had been in the priesthood (4), and he offered sacrifices throughout his life(5); but he was also the "man of God"(6), the "seer"(7) and prophet(8), and through him the "word of Yahweh" came to Israel(9). That he furnished leadership in every sphere at a time of great national weakness and effected lasting benefits through this leadership, is an indication of his greatness. From the accounts of his activity it is clear that he did this, not as a political leader (else he would have made himself king), nor as a priest(10), but as a prophet. His call as a lad(11), and his later experiences of the word of Yahweh show clearly what the source of his policies was, and demonstrate that Samuel was great because he was the representative of Yahweh. This was the case with every other true prophet.

We begin this study with Samuel; but he was not the first prophet, even excluding Abraham and Moses. In his day there were other prophets, like those whom Saul encountered in a band(12). These may have corresponded to the 'sons' and 'schools' of the prophets of later times(13), who formed religious communities of their own(14). It has been frequently asserted that Samuel was the founder of these bands or schools, but Cornill holds this to be legendary(15). Whatever the connection between the two may have been, they differed in at least two ways: the utterances of the prophet bands effected no great change in the nation, as did the messages of Samuel, and their utterances seem to have been attended with ecstatic phenomena which are not found in connection with Samuel.
As far as prophecy itself is concerned, it appears, as we saw was the case with intercession, outside Israel and among a number of peoples. One recalls the often-cited prophet in Wen Amon’s story, about 1117 B.C. (16). Prophets are mentioned often in Egyptian inscriptions (17). Rudolf Kittel believes that a powerful prophetic movement, based upon a mystical absorption in the Godhead, was widespread in the region around the eastern end of the Mediterranean in ancient times and that this was felt in the Israelite 'nabiism' of Samuel’s time (19). David Livingstone observed the same phenomena among central African tribes - the "senoga" who was supposed to hold intercourse with the gods, worked himself into a state of ecstasy and then broke out into prophecy. Livingstone called them "pretended prophets" (20), which is much the attitude that many true prophets of Israel had toward the common type in their day (21). This common form of prophecy, with its crudely mystical and ecstatic bent, is likely to appear among any people when it has reached a certain stage in its religious development (22). But the distinctive Old Testament prophecy, though it may be touched by this generic sort (23), is concerned primarily with the messages of Yahweh to Israel - messages which can be, and are expected to be, subjected to the test of their own worth as words of the God whose nature was already known.

One of Samuel’s intercessions is related in the passage, I Sam. vii. 5-9. He made this prayer in connection with an incident in one of the wars between Israel and the Philistines. The former had up to that point met only with humiliating failure and defeat, and in their distress lamented after Yahweh, from whom their disloyalty had estranged them. No sooner was this change of heart evidenced than Samuel, the representative of Yahweh, came before the people with his Master’s terms. All strange gods, Baalim and Ashtaroth, must be put away; when this had been done Yahweh would deliver His people out the hand of the Philistine.
The account goes on to tell how the people put away their "strange gods", and met together in national convocation at Mizpah. Mizpah was not a random choice, nor was it made the assembling point primarily for purposes of military strategy (24). It was a place which had already been used for tribal - and national-religious convocations (25). It was one of the holy places of the land. In I Macc. iii. 46, it is called an ancient τόνυος προσευχῆς. In a place already consecrated to the worship of its God, the nation was to seek renewal of the old covenant relationship.

The means by which reconciliation was to be achieved were suggested by Samuel. "I will pray for you unto the Lord." The word here used, סְעָלָה, is in the Hithpael (26), is the most common Hebrew word for "pray", "pray for", "intercede". Standing alone it means simply, "pray". The intercession connotation is given, in this case, by the addition of דָּרֵךְ (27). The prophet said, "I will pray for you." He himself was conscious of no personal estrangement from Yahweh, but, on the contrary, of an unclouded intimacy which assured success for his intercession in behalf of the estranged nation. This perfect confidence in God and in his relation to Him was characteristic of the Old Testament prophet. No matter how far away from its God the nation as a whole might be, the prophet still retained his place in His confidence. This is the more remarkable in view of the general Old Testament teaching on the corporate solidarity of the nation.

When the people had gathered at the place of worship at Mizpah, they performed as a group certain rites. They drew water and poured it out before the Lord, symbolizing their sorrow and contrition, by these acts which accompanied the confession of their lips, "We have sinned against the Lord." It would appear that not even in their confession did the people address their God directly; this seems to have been considered Samuel's
privilege alone. Next, the people observed a day of fasting, to demonstrate still further their contrition. And when through these means the people had progressed as far as they could toward reconciliation unaided, Samuel judged Israel there. In other words, he aided them to put their house in order, in as far as they themselves were able. Israel, having done all that it could to win back the divine favour, then entrusted itself to Samuel's powers of intercession. "Cease not", they said, to cry unto the Lord our God for us."(28)

Samuel began his intercession, as the people had begun their approach to God, with an act of ritual. He made a whole burnt offering, symbolic of the entire self-dedication of the group on whose behalf he was making it. In this he was playing the part of a priest. Such being the case, the question is raised whether the intercession itself is not also priestly. The answer is, as we have already remarked above, that Samuel combined the functions of both priest and prophet, as Ezekiel did at a later time, and possibly Jeremiah, and though it is not always easy to draw the line of demarcation between the functions which belonged to each office, it would appear that in this instance he was acting the part of the priest in offering the sacrifice and the part of the prophet in making intercession.

The intercession itself is recorded in these words: "And Samuel cried unto the Lord for Israel; and the Lord heard him." "Cried unto the Lord" is a translation of לֹֽעַ֣נְתֵּךְ. The addition of נ is required to complete the meaning of intercession.

The narrative pictures for us a scene which is highly dramatic; the terrified throng of people assembled for a religious purpose but scarcely certain as yet of the good will of their God, the hated Philistines drawing near with weapons sharpened for the slaughter, and one man who alone had entrance into the presence of almighty Yahweh standing between
the people and disaster. This one "cried unto the Lord" - importunately, as the peril of the situation required. On Israel's behalf he besought Yahweh for deliverance from the enemy, already so near. The thunder of Yahweh, His voice, answered, Immediately the Philistines were discomfited and turned to flee before the Israelites had lifted a hand against them. All that remained for the people of Yahweh was the pursuit and the plunder. This outcome ought not to be regarded as an unexpected vindication of Samuel's faith. Samuel's faith did not need vindication. It was not a question of faith, but of meeting the conditions upon which the covenant between Yahweh and His people was based. These had been met; repentant Israel had been reconciled to Him with the aid of Samuel; the prophet had reached Him with the urgent need of His people; He had acted in the part of their God to save them.

Another reference to intercession, a statement of Samuel, occurs in I Sam. xii. 23. Saul had been anointed king, and Samuel was withdrawing from his place of leadership in Israel. But the people, their self-confidence shaken by a sign from Yahweh (29), and fearing to lose Samuel's support said, "Pray for thy servants unto the Lord thy God, that we die not; for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king" (30). Samuel assured them that they would retain Yahweh's favour as long as they served Him wholeheartedly, because He had made them His people, and added, "Moreover as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you: but I will instruct you in the good and the right way.... But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king" (31). For Samuel intercession for Israel was, along with instruction in "the good and the right way", the obligation of his office. Intercession and instruction were his part in keeping Israel in right relation with its God, neglect of which was his sin. But the people had their part to play in fearing and serving Yahweh, which completed the con-
ditions of the right relationship. Should they neglect these duties, es-
trangement and punishment must result, in spite of all that Samuel might
do as instructor and intercessor.

Again we are made to realize that Samuel was a man of more than one
office, for instruction was later considered a function of the priest.(32).
But in him the acts of judge, priest and prophet were fused in one man's
service of Yahweh, so that to say that as instructor he was a priest and
as intercessor a prophet would be to forget that in all that he did he was
one servant of Yahweh, Samuel. And though it seems clear from the reasons
already given that he was primarily a prophet, nevertheless it would be
imprudent to draw rigid teachings on the subject of prophetic intercession
from what we have observed in his life.

Bearing this in mind, the two conclusions of the above study are con-
cerned more with Samuel than with all prophecy, but they form a valuable
part of the body of teaching on our subject. The first conclusion is that
Yahweh answers intercession for the nation, under certain conditions. The
conditions are national repentance clearly expressed, willingness to live
in loyalty to Yahweh also clearly expressed, and the presence of a man like
Samuel, able to reach Yahweh with the petition. The other conclusion is
that such an intercessor believed that his God had laid upon him, along
with other duties, the obligation to intercede continually before Him for
the people of Israel. Neglect of this obligation Yahweh would consider
sin against Himself.

2. The Intercessions of Elijah

In the interval between Samuel and Elijah, Israel had ascended to a
brief prominence under David and Solomon; but civil war and the return to
power of nations with greater natural strength had reduced it to a less
conspicuous place among the smaller peoples. Now, in Elijah's time, un-
equally divided into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, the people of Yahweh rubbed shoulders with the Phoenician and Philistine principalities, Moab, Syria and other petty powers in the narrow confines of the western end of the Fertile Crescent. The king of Israel, Ahab, son of Omri, builder of Samaria, was a ruler of ability and courage. Among his neighbours he was a man to be reckoned with. To a coalition which fought Shalmaneser III at Karkar in 854 B.C. he brought more chariots than any of his allies (33). The coalition was defeated, though its efforts seem to have hindered the Assyrian advance to the Mediterranean for a time. To such a king alliance with other nations was an essential policy.

Between Samuel and Elijah there had been prophets - Nathan (34), Ahijah the Shilonite (35), the man of God out of Judah, prototype of Amos, who had an encounter with Jeroboam I at Bethel (36), and Jehu the son of Hanani (37). These men were all representatives of the righteousness of Yahweh and His sovereignty in Israel, but from what we read they were correctors and critics more than builders of a new order. They make their occasional appearances in the narrative as fearless bearers of Yahweh's judgments to kings. Of their other activities we have scarcely any knowledge. They drew their standards of the right life for an Israelite from the well of Mosaic teaching. Elijah was another such man, in massive proportion; but he defined the political, moral and religious issues more clearly than these others had done, and his mission embraced the whole nation.

Beside the politically-minded king and the great prophet stands a third figure, the Phoenician princess Jezebel, wife of Ahab and the personification of one of his alliances. She was a person of great force of character and a religious zealot, and through her the worship of Melkart, the Tyrian Baal, was introduced into Israel and rapidly advanced. To Ahab and the majority of his people west of Jordan this was not a matter
for concern, since it meant merely following an accepted usage in international relations. But the people in more remote places, particularly beyond Jordan, had a conservative loyalty to the religion of Moses, and it was from one of these "backward" places, from Tishbe in Gilead, that Elijah came to lead a revival of pure Yahweh religion (38). To him the issues were perfectly clear; but he seems to have found a few Israelites in the populous parts who shared his convictions. At Carmel he fought most of all against Israelite apathy. "How long go ye limping between the two sides? If Yahweh be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word." (39). He made little progress in convincing them of the evil of placing a foreign Baal on a level with Yahweh in Yahweh's land, until the true issues were clarified by the capricious destruction of Naboth, a man of the people. This demonstrated the type of life for which Baal stood, as witnessed in Jezebel, and the uncompromising righteousness and justice of Yahweh, as He was represented by Elijah.

In the ministry of Elijah there occur two cases of intercession, the former and more important being in connection with the son of the widow of Zarephath (40). It comes just after the prophet has been first introduced in the narrative: "And Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the sojourners of Gilead, said unto Ahab, As the Lord, the God of Israel, liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." (41). Warned by the word of Yahweh, he fled to what may have been an old haunt of his by the Jordan, where he remained until the drought dried up the brook from which he drank. Then he was directed to a new refuge in the house of a Phoenician widow in Zarephath. This town lay between Tyre and Sidon, six or seven miles south of the latter, in the heart of the country where Melkart was worshipped. There he and the widow, with
her son, were being miraculously sustained by Yahweh through the famine period, when the son "fell sick; and his sickness was so sore, that there was no breath left in him." (42).

The Hebrew reads, נַפְּנִיתוֹ נָפָלָה לְפָנָיוֹ בָּאָרָה. Commentators are in general agreement that, as against Josephus' interpretation, יְהוָה יִזְעָל וָנָהוֹ נָהוֹ (43), this means that the boy was dead (44). They base their interpretation principally upon v.20, in which the prophet speaks of the child as being dead; and upon the double meaning of נָפָל both for 'breath' and for 'life'. But the other view has its adherents as well (45).

Perhaps the difficulty lies in the difference between the Old Testament and the modern psychology. The Hebrew word for 'breath' (in this case נַפְּנִיתוֹ), but somewhat similarly for נָפָל (46), meant also 'life', 'spirit', 'soul'. The נָפָל, the 'breath', was the manifestation of the 'life', the 'soul'. This soul "is not an esoteric and mystical abstraction; it is the breath, and the breath which is the principle of life naturally comes to be regarded as the center of the consciousness of life, and of all its physical or psychical phenomena." (47). A man was a body, inhabited by a breath-soul, both of which were created and brought together by Yahweh (48). Man was like the whirlwind in the desert, dust vitalized by wind, flesh-dust animated by "Yahweh's loan of breath." (49). Death was Yahweh's withdrawal of the life-breath. The Hebrew had no conception of "the supernatural", as we use the term; since every event in nature had God for its author. If we say that each human birth was to the devout Hebrew a miracle (50), we can also say that to him the restoring of breath to a breathless body was scarcely more of a miracle. God was the unaided author of both.

Returning to the incident under consideration, it is clear that the account is not speaking in terms used by modern medical science. Dead or
not from the latter point of view, the boy's breath had left him, which both to the mother and the prophet meant his life.

Immediately the grieving mother connected this act of a Divine Being with the 'man of God' who lived under her roof. She knew that he stood in the counsels of the God of Israel, beyond doubt a very powerful God (51). Thus the shortcomings of her life, moral or ceremonial, had been brought to light and found worthy of punishment. Her son would still be alive had not the prophet come into such close proximity with her and brought with him the presence of God.

Elijah accepted her interpretation of the event, insofar as it made Yahweh the author of the lad's death. He took the body to his own chamber, which we may suppose was his place of prayer, and laid it upon his bed.

"And he cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, hast thou also brought evil upon the widow with whom I sojourn, by slaying her son? (52). Now to the just devastation of the land Yahweh had added the devastation of this home which He had caused to be a refuge for His prophet. Was this just? Here is a querulous, reproachful tone in Elijah's question. In reality it is the widow's own question, originally thrown at him, but now addressed by him to Yahweh. The prophet accepted the woman's blame without expostulation, because he was the 'man of God'. At the same time he sympathized with the woman, feeling that she had been ungraciously and unjustly treated; and when he stood alone before Yahweh he became the woman's advocate, presenting her case, a thing which she could not have done for herself.

Then, having appealed to Yahweh's sense of justice, Elijah proceeded to petition Him directly for the life of the child. Before considering the words of this petition, however, we ought to take note of the acts which accompanied them. Three times Elijah stretched himself upon the body. This recalls the part that accompanying rites played in the intercession of Samuel. In the present instance the actions might be interpreted in a number of ways:
as an attempt to revive the child by physical means, as an identification of himself as completely as possible with the child before Yahweh, or as a symbolic rite. These are interesting speculations; but not even the placing of the prophet's staff upon the child's face in the similar incident from the life of Elisha (53), helps us a great deal. Dr. Welch has suggested that both acts have significance principally as evidences of the early date of the stories in which they occur. My own feeling is that Elijah's prostrations upon the body were a part of the appeal to Yahweh rather than an independent attempt to resuscitate the child.

"O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again." (54). In v. 17 we were told that the נפש, the manifestation of life, had gone out of the body, leaving it without a נשא. Yahweh had done it; and the נשא had not simply gone out like a candle flame. It was still Yahweh's (55). So Yahweh's prophet prayed that He would return this vital spirit, still in His possession, to the body of the child (לְבֶנֶיהוֹלַי, into his interior, as it were) from which it had been taken.

There is evidence that Hebrews of the time of Elijah thought of their God, Yahweh, as having power only in the land of Israel and in certain other localities, such as Mt. Horeb (56). In the incident before us this belief does not appear. On the contrary, the power to take away and to restore the spirit of man was to Elijah the work of Yahweh, as much in Zarephath, the territory of Melkart, as in the land of Israel. His faith in Yahweh transcended territorial boundaries and took no notice of other gods. This intercession by Elijah reveals, therefore, a religious attitude which was in reality practical monotheism (67).

"And the Lord hearkened unto the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and revived." (58).
The prophet's intercession was answered without delay, precisely according to his request. And when he had given the child back to his mother, she said, "Now I know that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth." (59). By this divine act she was convinced, not that the God of Israel was a very powerful God, for that seems to have been already accepted by her, but that this Israelite was a true man of God and Yahweh's authentic spokesman. She reasoned logically, that the one who could approach his God and intercede successfully in so difficult matter as the life of her son had influence with Him which could belong only to His true representative.

The restoring of the widow's son to life by intercession is an important instance of this form of prayer; but for our study it has the limitation of being on the periphery of Elijah's prophetic activity. The other case comes out of his official dealings with Israel as Yahweh's prophet.

In the third year of the drought Elijah contested successfully with the Baal prophets at Carmel. Immediately after this encounter, we read, "Elijah went up to the top of Carmel; and he bowed himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees. And he said to his servant, Go up now, look toward the sea. And he went up, and looked, and said, There is nothing. And he said, Go again seven times." (60). The seventh time the servant brought news of a sign of rain over the Mediterranean. The narrative does not say that Elijah prayed for rain; what he prayed was known to himself alone. But it is perfectly clear that he was interceding for the nation that the sufferings of Israel through the drought might be ended. Yahweh's victory over the prophets of Baal would seem to him in his sympathy for Israel to warrant an end of the "evil" (61). So he drew apart from the commotion and slaughter, and on the summit of the mountain above the nation, he took his place between it and its God, and continued to intercede until his request was granted. This he did as boldly and
naturally as he had announced the coming of the drought to Ahab three years before, as though he considered pleading the nation's cause before Yahweh one of his duties as prophet just as Samuel before him had done. But it was, in a sense, not a strictly prophetic duty; for Yahweh had not commanded it. It was, rather, his duty as a member of the Israelite nation, but a duty which he could act upon in intercession only because he was the prophet, and therefore the intimate, of God. (68)

From the intercessions of Elijah's ministry certain conclusions may tentatively be drawn. One is that Yahweh answers the intercessions of His prophet for individuals, even individuals who are not Israelites. Another is that Yahweh will give very wonderful things - like life, and rain - to people for whom a prophet intercedes to Him. A third is that a prophet's intercession can bring an immediate answer; or if the answer seems not to be immediate, persistence in intercession can make it so.

3. The Intercessions of Elisha.

Elisha, whom Elijah anointed to be his successor (63), was in many ways different from his great predecessor. Perhaps a part of this difference is due to the way in which each man is portrayed in the Books of the Kings. In the portrayal of Elijah much that is inward and personal appears, as though he himself or some constant companion with deep understanding of his spiritual life had given its material. His times of exaltation of spirit and of despair are laid before the reader; his prayers are given as conversations with God. With Elisha it is different; he is pictured objectively, as though by someone who saw all that he did but lacked sympathetic insight into his inner life. His wonders are recorded, but little is said about his prayers. Perhaps this difference is in the narrative because it was first in the men. At any rate, it has bearing upon the study of their intercessions, because, though in the story of Elisha's life a number of divine in-
interventions appear, such as the delivery of the armies in the land of Moab (64), the multiplication of food for the sons of the prophets (65), and the healing of Naaman (66), which might have been occasions for intercessions; yet in connection with only two incidents does it say that Elisha prayed and these are but brief mentions. Elisha is pictured as the man who acts (67) rather than the man who prays. He seems to do his wonders by himself, until it is seen that his extraordinary power is due solely to his prophetic re-

the series of events connected with the great woman of Shunem, related in iv. 8-37, contains an incident similar to the raising of the widow of Zarephath's son by Elijah. Elisha, wishing to reward this Shunamite for the kindnesses which she had shown him, promised the childless woman a son. This child was born, and when he was old enough to find his way about, went to be with his father in the harvest field and was overcome by the sun's heat. A servant brought him home and laid him on his mother's knees, and there in a short time he died (69). The Shunamite laid the body on the prophet's bed in the room which she had had made for him and went in haste the twenty miles or so to Carmel to find Elisha. When he learned the reason for her visit, Elisha despatched Gehazi his servant quickly to bear his prophet's staff and lay it upon the face of the child. The narrative continues: "And Gehazi passed on before them, and laid the staff upon the face of the child; but there was neither voice, nor hearing. Wherefore he returned to meet him, and told him, saying, The child is not awakened. And when Elisha was come into the house, behold, the child was dead, and laid upon his bed. He went in therefore, and shut the door upon them twain, and prayed unto the Lord. And he went up, and lay upon the child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands: and he stretched himself (_param)- to bend, crouch, or bow. As in I. K. xviii.42
above p/) upon him; and the flesh of the child waxed warm. Then he went and walked in the house once to and fro; and went up, and stretched himself upon him: and the child sneezed seven times, and the child opened his eyes. And he called Gehazi, and said, Call this Shunammite. So he called her, and when she was come in unto him, he said, Take up thy son." (70).

As has already been said, this incident corresponds in many respects with that from Elijah's life. In a number of respects also it is different. We shall not discuss these, nor enter into the question of how much the one may be dependent upon the other, since our concern is for their intercessory significance. In its objective spirit, the narrative reports simply that Elisha "prayed unto the Lord." Lacking the words of this prayer we can yet say that obviously it must have been an intercession, but it does not have for this study the value of the precise words of Elijah. In the same objective spirit, it goes beyond the other story in saying twice that the child was dead and in describing minutely the acts which accompanied the intercessions. The latter are interesting and point to an early date for the account (71), but neither they nor other details of the story add appreciably to the knowledge of intercession which was gained from the life of Elijah; except that even though the portrayal of Elisha lacks inwardness, it is stated that when he faced a situation similar to that which had called forth his master's intercession, he too prayed.

The other reference to Elisha's prayers comes in connection with a Syrian raid upon Dothan to secure the troublesome man of God who was informing his king of the enemy's secret military plans. By night they surrounded the city, and in the morning Elisha's servant informed him of their peril. "And he answered, Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of
fire wound about Elisha. And when they came down to him, Elisha prayed unto the Lord, and said, Smite this people, I pray thee, with blindness. And he smote them with blindness according to the word of Elisha. And Elisha said unto them, This is not the way, neither is this the city; follow me and I will bring you to the man whom ye seek. And he led them to Samaria. And it came to pass, when they were come into Samaria, that Elisha said, Lord, open the eyes of these men, that they may see. And the Lord opened their eyes, and they saw; and, behold, they were in the midst of Samaria."

Of this group of three prayers the first and the last may be construed as intercessions. In the first he prays to Yahweh for his servant, He asked for him insight, true perception of the forces of the spiritual world which attended his master and gave them both protection.

Then when Elisha and the emboldened servant had gone out to the Syrians, the prophet prayed Yahweh to smite them with blindness (73). This He did immediately, and the 'blindness' enabled Elisha to conduct them into the capital city where they were rendered harmless. Again he prayed, that Yahweh would open their eyes, i.e. that their normal understanding might be given them again, and they were suddenly restored to a true perception of their surroundings.

The two intercessory prayers are, in a sense, very much alike. Both ask for something immaterial - insight, clearness of perception. For the servant the request was for a hitherto unexperienced spiritual insight; for the Syrians it was for a return to normal understanding. These benefits differ from those of any other intercession thus far examined in being, not material, but mental and spiritual.

In conclusion we note, first, that even though the writer or writers of the story of Elisha's life regarded him from an objective point of view...
and saw him primarily as a wonder worker, yet they did not fail to remark and to record certain of his intercessions. He did make use of intercession, then, and perhaps more than the narrative indicates. We note also that first in Elisha's experience there appeared intercessions which required for answer a spiritual and mental, rather than a physical, change in men: not a profound change, nor one that involved the altering of personality or character, but one that was inward. And when the change had been asked, the power of Yahweh, at His prophet's request did effect it.

4. The Intercessions of Abraham and Moses.

In developing the conventional teaching on prophetic intercession it is advisable to include the intercessions of Abraham and Moses. Though they were not prophets in the sense in which men like Amos and Jeremiah were prophets, yet the term had always in Old Testament literature a meaning which included others than the canonical prophets (74), and Abraham and Moses were among those to whom it was applied (75). Indeed, Moses is called the greatest of all prophets (76). In these men there is a close relation between the prophetic side of their life and their intercessions.

In the story of Abraham's life three cases of intercession are found. One, in Gen. xvii. 18 (77), is the prayer which the patriarch made for Ishmael when God told him that he should have a son by Sarah in their old age. Incredulous, he asked that the son whom he already had by Hagar might be accepted as his heir, "Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!" The petition could not be answered, because it conflicted with the divine plan which the writer of the incident was recording. Nevertheless, it was answered in a sense, since every blessing was promised Ishmael but the blessing of the covenant, (78).

In another case, xx. 7, 17, (79), Abraham prayed for Abimelech at the
time of his discreditable encounter with him over Sarah. When Abimelech took Sarah, the God of Abraham intervened on his behalf and spoke to Abimelech of the danger of sin and punishment. He advised him to "restore the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live: and if thou restore her not, know that thou shalt surely die, thou, and all that are thine." (80). And when he had restored Sarah, with suitable gifts, "Abraham prayed unto God: and God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maidservants; and they bare children. For the Lord had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah Abraham's wife." (81). This is the only time that Abraham is called a prophet (82). It is significant that associated with the prophetic name and intimate relation with God, was the power to make successful intercession for Abimelech and his people. He, though not intentionally at fault, had but one means of escaping the penalty of his error, which was to have Abraham the prophet intercede with God for him. Later, when he had made restitution, Abraham did intercede, and God thereupon removed the barrenness which He had already sent as punishment. (83).

The third case is Abraham's intercession for Sodom. As the story is told in Genesis xviii. 16-35 (84), the "Judge of all the earth" had come down to investigate the report that had reached Him of wickedness in the cities of the plain (85). But in the hill country above dwelt the man, Abraham His friend and prophet (86), to whom He was bound by a covenant which required "justice and judgment", and embraced "all the nations of the earth" in its blessing (87). Should this one see the smoke of Sodom and hear later of Lot's destruction and be ignorant why Yahweh had done it? So He confided to Abraham His reason for going to Sodom, before its wickedness was definitely known and its fate, therefore, was undecided. But Abraham did not receive this confidence in silence.
Once before he, the tent dweller, had championed these city dwellers among whom Lot lived (88). Now he was concerned about the justice of what he conceived to be in Yahweh’s mind. That He should punish the wicked was just, but to involve righteous men in their destruction was unjust. To destroy a few righteous people was worse in Abraham’s eyes than to spare a whole city of the wicked.

So, with familiar yet courteous boldness, Abraham interceded for Sodom. “Wilt thou consume (89), the righteous with the wicked? Peradventure there be fifty righteous within the city: wilt thou consume and not spare the place for the fifty righteous that are therein? That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked, that so the righteous should be as the wicked; that be far from thee: shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” (90). We must bear in mind here the Old Testament stress upon the value of present life and its colourless picture of life after death. It is surprising to find the father of the Hebrew people praying for a heathen city; but we must not allow the fact that he was praying for the Deity to make us forget that he was in reality concerned only for the righteous people in the city. First in his thought was the righteous Lot, and he evidently believed that there were other righteous among the heathen (91). But Abraham interceded for the whole city, because in his mind Yahweh’s judgment was directed against the whole city, which would either be spared entire for the sake of the righteous or destroyed entire for the wickedness of the many. This thought is in keeping with the current belief in corporate guilt and the corresponding incomplete conception of individual responsibility (93). Though the righteous were individually righteous and though Yahweh was in some sense responsible for them as individuals, yet they were to share the fate of the entire city.
Upon the basis of this principle the question arose, how many righteous made up the number needed to avert judgment? Abraham began with fifty, and found that Yahweh accepted these as enough. But his sense of justice was not satisfied with fifty, for it was unthinkable still that the righteousness of forty-five should weigh with Yahweh less than the wickedness of the rest. So, emboldened by success, he continued to ask for mercy, until the petition on behalf of ten was given a favourable answer. There, after six intercessions, he made an end, as though his own sense of justice was satisfied. Yahweh, the Judge of all the earth, would avert His judgment from Sodam for the sake of ten righteous people dwelling there.

As has already been suggested, Abraham was not simply interceding for the city, nor was he asking that its wickedness be forgiven. His care was for the righteous, his thought was upon them, and he was asking that for their sake the city be spared. It was believed that the righteous were in a distinct class, and that the righteous Yahweh, who punished iniquity and rewarded rectitude, knew who they were. Moreover, their righteousness bound them to Him and gave them a special claim upon Him, no matter who they were. Abraham himself was one of the righteous and he was concerned for those with whom he had this way of life in common. He was their champion, their advocate; but, in the final analysis, their virtue and not his prayer was the basis of appeal. He stated their case, as one who was both among the righteous and in close relation to Yahweh.

The incident reveals the grace of Yahweh. Though He was Judge of mankind and though the guilt of Sodom was very great, He was willing to listen to the intercessions of the prophet and to make the price of forgiveness as small as possible. But in the end both Abraham's solicitude and Yahweh's grace had a limit. If we interpret the narrative literally, nine righteous would have been too few to avert doom.
The sequel, however, was governed by principles different from those of which Abraham had taken account in his intercessions. Sodom was destroyed; but Lot, with two of his daughters, was saved (93), as well as the little city, Zoar, in which they took refuge (94). This leads us to infer that Lot was, after all, the only righteous man in the city (95), and that Sodom suffered a deserved punishment. But the righteousness of Yahweh not only met, but exceeded, all that Abraham asked of it, for the righteous individuals, even fewer than ten, were carefully preserved by the angels of Yahweh (96).

This intercession of Abraham is a stage above any we have yet seen. In the first place, it definitely makes the moral character of Yahweh the norm of all morality and justice. He is the judge of all the earth, the one who alone determines whether a man is righteous or unrighteous. In the case of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath's son, the appeal for the child's life was made to Yahweh's sense of what was fair and just. But here Yahweh appears as absolutely and grandly just. In the second place, it shows the moral character of Yahweh as the reason why Abraham could intercede. Before this incident Yahweh had revealed Himself to Abraham as the ethical God; and when now He revealed His intention to test Sodom, this ethical nature was both Abraham's standard for his own opinion and his reason for making an appeal for the city on account of its righteous dwellers. His intercessions were, therefore, in accordance with, and not against, Yahweh's own revealed character—His righteousness and justice.

Of the many intercessions of Moses, the most instructive are two which appear together in Ex. xxxii. 11-13, 31,32 (97), in connection with Israel's apostasy to the calf worship at Sinai. While Moses was still receiving the Law in the mount, Yahweh, already knowing of the apostasy, told him of it
and said, "I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people: Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them: and I will make of thee a great nation." (98). It is plainly represented to be Yahweh's intention to destroy Israel. His request that Moses let Him alone implies that the intervention of Moses would change this intention. But if he were not to intervene, what was taken away from the nation would be given to him.

In a sense, therefore, the destiny of Israel was in Moses' hands. He could either accept the covenant blessing and let the nation be destroyed, or he could save the nation by his intercessions and lose himself within it. He chose the latter course; he stepped between the 'stiff-necked people' and the wrath of their God. The consideration of himself becoming a great nation was not as great as Moses' identification with the already existing Israelite people. "And Moses besought the Lord his God, and said, Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand?" (99).

Besides the two reasons given here, that these were His own people, and that He had already exerted great power on their behalf, Moses went on to add two others: that the Egyptians would mock Him if He failed to preserve them, and that He had sworn to the patriarchs to multiply and provide for their descendants (100). "Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people."

"And the Lord repented of the evil which he said he would do unto his people." (101). By taking up the people's cause, Moses influenced Yahweh to reconsider the decision which He had made in anger. The language used, the reasons offered were precisely those which a man might find most effective in interceding with another man. Moses appealed to Yahweh's mercy, His generosity, His reputation and His honour. This is the end of the first
of the first of the two intercessions.

The account goes on to say that as he approached the camp after leaving Yahweh, Moses saw the idolatry with his own eyes and was so irritated that he threw down and destroyed the stone tablets, which were the only existing record of the covenant into which Yahweh had entered with Israel (102). This covenant the people had already broken and made void.

But when Moses had entered into the camp he set about its re-establishment. First, he inflicted the necessary punishment by the swords of the sons of Levi (103). Then he ordered a consecration of the people (104).

"And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin." (105). The covenant was broken, all visible evidence of it destroyed, the people separated and estranged from their God; it was a terrifying situation in that day when a nation’s god was its welfare and destiny. Prof. Welch has suggested that an analogous situation would exist in the Roman Church if its established system of salvation, pope and all, should suddenly collapse, leaving each person bare-souled before God, with nothing to rely on but His mercy. In Israel’s crisis, Moses was the only one able to approach God. He had found grace in Yahweh’s sight, he was known to Yahweh by name (106), he was in His confidence, and he had had no part in the people’s sin. So alone Moses undertook to atone for Israel’s sin and to win forgiveness.

"And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold." (107). No confession of sin gives God information; Moses was making this confession as the bearer of the repentance of the whole people and as its intercessor. He did not include himself with the sinners, but took up his position between them and God. Then, having named the sin specifically, he went on to make intercessions: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin - ; and if not,
blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which thou hast written." (103). The aposiopesis emphasizes the critical uncertainty of the situation. The appeal was to Yahweh's mercy, unsupported by any reason or argument (Israel could supply him with none) - except the one possible hold which Moses had upon Him, by reason of Yahweh's regard for him and his personal righteousness.

The meaning of the second part of Verse 32 is difficult. Moses' aim was, if possible to atone for, הַמַּעַן, "cover", the sin. Did this mean that he was to cover it himself, or that his intercession was to prevail upon Yahweh to cover it? Davidson considered the latter to be the probable meaning (109). Certainly there is no suggestion that Moses was offering himself as a vicarious sacrifice for the people. Nor is this just a despairing request that he may die if his petition be refused (110). Rather, he was praying that he, the favoured and righteous man (111), the prophet, might be so identified with the guilty people as to share their worst punishment. (112). His sense of solidarity with them was so strong that he refused to live apart from their corporate life (113). In the situation, this might have power, added to his intercession, to move Yahweh to leniency and forgiveness.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." (114). The punishment of sin is inevitable, and the man who has not shared in the sin cannot share in its punishment. As for this sin, its punishment will be reserved for a later time, (115), though it is passed over for the present.

This intercession, again, goes a step beyond any we have yet seen. It seems to teach that Yahweh recognized His prophet Moses' power to change His purposes by intercession. This amazing power of his intercession is the ground upon which was based the great alternative offered to Moses: either to stand aside as intercessor and accept a great personal benefit,
or to identify himself with the people and plead their cause. For Moses there was only one choice - to stand with the people, interceding on their behalf; to offer himself with his intercession, suffering their punishment with them, though he had not shared their sin. This case is a beautiful illustration of the way in which the interceding prophet stands both in the presence and confidence of God as one different from the people and at the same time among the people as one identified with them. This prayer of Moses may well stand as the model of all Old Testament intercession: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin - ; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written."

Undoubtedly Moses was the greatest of Old Testament intercessors. In addition to these instances, a number of others occur in the story of his life; these we shall go over summarily to get the full sweep of his activity as an intercessor. In Ex. viii. 12, 30, ix. 33 and x. 18 (116), it was by the intercessions of Moses that Yahweh removed the plagues of frogs, flies, hail and locusts when Pharaoh seemed ready to liberate Israel. After the Golden Calf defection, when Moses returned to the mount to renew the covenant and Yahweh spoke of Himself as a God who visited the iniquity of fathers upon their children unto the fourth generation, Moses prayed for Israel, "If now I have found grace in thy sight, 0 Lord, let the Lord, I pray thee, go in the midst of us; for it is a stiffnecked people; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance." (117). Here again he identifies himself with the people by speaking of "our iniquity and our sin." In Num. xi. 2 (118), when Yahweh punished the "murrurings" of Israel with a fire in the camp at Taberah, the cries of the people were only heard and answered through the medium of Moses' prayers.

Again in Num. xii. 13, the intercession of Moses moved Yahweh to heal the leprosy with which He had punished Miriam for thinking herself the equal of Moses in His confidence (119). It is in this connection, in
vv. 6-8, that Yahweh draws the distinction between ordinary prophets, to whom He speaks in dreams and visions, and Moses, to whom He speaks "mouth to mouth," an intimacy which has direct hearing upon his power of intercession. In Num. xiv. 13-19 (120), the intervention of Moses won pardon for Israel at Kadesh-barnea. At another time it saved them from the fiery serpents, Num. xxi. 7, (121). in Num. xvi. 22, (122), it was the intercession of both Moses and Aaron which changed the intention of Yahweh to destroy the whole people at the time of Korah's rebellion. Finally, in Deut. ix. 13-26 it is repeated that on two occasions the intercession of Moses shielded Israel from Yahweh's anger, namely, at Moreb (123), and at Kadesh-barnea (124).

5. Conclusions.

It is evident that two principles, general in Old Testament religion, were basic to prophetic intercession. These were, first, the sovereign power and ethical quality of Yahweh's nature, and, second, the prophet's intimate and privileged relation to Yahweh as one who possessed His Spirit. Therefore, when a prophet interceded he was using his privileged relationship with his God to influence His use of the mighty powers which He controlled. Was there a limit to the power of Yahweh? No, for He was Master of nature and of every sphere of life. Was there no limit, then to what the prophet's intercessions could influence Yahweh to do? The answer is that the cases covered in this chapter, i.e. all the more important cases from historical sources as old as the eighth century, set no such limit. In these cases we have seen Yahweh answering intercessions of prophets by giving His people victory over the enemy, by restoring the dead to life, by causing natural forces to operate as desired, by increasing a person's spiritual discernment, and by withdrawing His own judgments from individuals and from the nation. (125) These cases cover a great range of demonstration of power. Avoiding too broad generalizations, we can say that in the litera-
ture from which comes our knowledge of the history of prophecy prior to the age of the literary prophets, there is a general, consistent teaching that the prophets had a legitimate function of intercession, by which they exerted immense influence with Yahweh. Upon the extent of this influence the intercessions of this period seem to set no limits.
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CHAPTER III

AMOS AND INTERCESSION

1. The Prophet, his Times and Message.

In the century between Elisha and Amos history had moved swiftly both for Israel and for its world. Elisha had been the instigator of a revolution in the Northern Kingdom which wiped out the dynasty of Omri and put on the throne the orthodox fanatic Jehu (c. 842-814 B. C.). Thereafter the religion of Israel was in no danger from foreign Baals, but the nation itself was in the gravest peril from the Syrians of Damascus. These Arameans were natural enemies of the Israelites. Between the reigns of Jehu and his grandson Joash (c. 797-781 B. C.) the two nations were engaged in almost constant hostilities, which nearly exhausted Israel; for this was the time when Syria, intrinsically more powerful than Israel, was relieved of pressure from the Assyrians. (1). In consequence, Israel's stalwart peasantry, the sinew of the nation, were taken from their farms and wasted in campaigns, and the land itself was overrun more than once by Syrian armies. But when Assyria once more renewed her conquests at the accession of Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 B. C.) and obliged the Arameans to struggle for life against her, Israel was relieved from Syrian aggression. Not only so, but she was able to regain all that had been lost. However, this new prosperity and subsequent peace found the nation different from that older "kingdom of fight-husbandmen". The phenomenal, prosperity of the reign of Jeroboam II (c. 781-740 B. C.) was not used to restore to the common people what they
had lost in the wars, but was employed by those in power to gain wealth and unheard-of luxury for themselves. So, in traditionally democratic Israel, two classes appeared; a wealthy and irresponsible ruling class, and a serf-like class exploited by their unscrupulous fellow countrymen. Quite naturally those in power were interested only in maintaining the status quo, and in view of the present "good times" refused to believe that their nation was resting upon the most unstable of foundations. "Such a condition is perilous in the extreme, for if the lower classes have not manliness enough to rise against their oppressors they will no longer have the strength to resist the encroachments of foreign enemies. In either case the country is doomed. If we would understand the prophets of the eighth century, we must see them against this double background of rotting social order, and of advancing Assyrian power." (2).

The period just before Amos was also an elaboration of the externals of Hebrew religion at the expense of its moral soundness. "We have an established priesthood, an elaborate ritual meticulously observed, a wealth of sacrifice, and an eschatology which taught that in His own time Yahweh would appear to take vengeance on the enemies of Israel and to set her up as supreme. At the same time religion had little or no moral content." (3). Worship of Yahweh, with these refinements, was carried on enthusiastically at the sanctuaries, of which the more important were Dan and Bethel. In accordance with the belief, which Israelites as a whole accepted, that prosperity was an indication of Yahweh's satisfaction with His people, the worship in these northern shrines was conducted in the spirit of gaiety and self-satisfaction, to the pleasant accompaniment of songs and the music of viols (4). Material success had engendered in the worshippers a hearty sort of devotion to Yahweh, on the basis of so much for so much. There was, besides, an ex-
aggerated optimism regarding the future. It is true that there had been
drought, locust plague, famine, pestilence and earthquake (5), but these
"acts of Yahweh" were evidently interpreted by prophets and priests in
ways which did not decrease the prevalent feeling that all was well.

Then with the dramatic suddenness which has been so often remarked,
a Judean herdsman appeared in Bethel, like a second Elijah, to speak a
message not of Yahweh's pleasure in Israel, but of His judgment. We ac-
cept Amos as a genuine prophet without question, though he was not one
of the professional, or as we would say "ordained", prophets of his day.
Even from other important Old Testament prophets he differed in deliver-
ing but one series of messages and returning to his former way of life
and occupation. Yet though his time as prophet was brief, he is for our
purpose the most important prophet up to this point; for not only did
Amos commit to writing discourses which he delivered at Bethel, but in
those writings there occurs a most interesting group of intercessions. As
we take up the Book of Amos we are aware that here is something more
satisfactory for our study than the somewhat bald narrative of Samuel and
Kings. Here we are dealing with the prophet's own words and thoughts.

Amos appeared in Bethel suddenly, unexpectedly; yet prior to his
mission there must have lain a period of preparation of some length. We
may dare even to suggest what some of the factors in this preparation
were. In all likelihood there were visits to markets in the Northern
Kingdom, enabling him to observe at first-hand the formalism of worship,
the immorality and injustice which Yahweh condemned; there may even have
been journeys into some of the nations which he introduces into his open-
ing discourse; there were certainly meditations in the solitude of his
occupation upon these evils and upon the God of Moses and Elijah and up-
on the significance of unusual events in the world; and there were visions
from Yahweh revealing His purposes. He knew the God of Israel as the God
of all nations, the God of universal morality, the Judge of all the earth (6), and so laid the basis for universal religion (7). He disregarded sacrifices, offerings and all the trappings of worship, as being of no importance. His belief was, as A. B. Davidson has phrased it, that "moral evil alone is sin" (8). He pointed to the Israelites' specific sins which Yahweh's nature condemned, and showed that their peculiar relation to Him, instead of giving them license to do evil, only increased their responsibility to do good (9). And when this extraordinary man did appear in Bethel it was with an absolute message of Yahweh's just character and of His certain judgment upon Israel.

2. The Three Visions

As a part of Amos' message of judgment there appear, oddly enough, two intercessions for Israel. These occur in a passage which records several prophetic visions, of which the first follows: "Thus the Lord God showed me: and, behold, he formed locusts in the beginning of the shooting up of the latter growth: and, lo, it was the latter growth after the king's mowings. And it came to pass, when they made an end of eating the grass of the land, then I said, O Lord God, forgive, I beseech thee: how shall Jacob stand? for he is small. The Lord repented concerning this: It shall not be, saith the Lord." (10).

The prophet experienced a vision given him by Yahweh. It was as though He had lifted this man Amos, the mere herdsman, out of his common life and his dull generation and brought him into the chamber of His counsels, where His purposes were formed. Amos saw Him creating locusts in the land of Israel at the time of year when the king's tribute of early grass for his cavalry's fodder had only recently been cut (11), and the farmers, who until this was done were forbidden to touch the grass, were just beginning to derive benefit from the crop. For locusts to ap-
pear at that time was, indeed, a serious matter. It meant the destruction of the crops of private Israelites for the year, since the cessation of rains and the coming of summer would make a new planting fruitless (12). Yahweh showed him the locusts in their voracious progress, "and when they had made an end of eating the grass of the land (יִשְׁכַּב יַעֲשֵׂה), then I said...." The prophet could restrain himself no longer. To witness this catastrophe overtaking his own people, even though it was a just act of God, was too much to receive with resignation.

"O Lord God, forgive, I beseech thee." In experiencing this vision the prophet was not a mere spectator; he was able to respond. And his response was a petition for Israel's forgiveness. In the Amos of the visions we are observing one who is spiritually wide awake. He saw that these locusts (13) of the vision were not just one of periodic visitations which caused more or less hardship to the land every ten years or so (14). They were far more to him than what we might term a "natural" event. Behind them he saw Yahweh, God of Israel and of the world; and in them he saw the descent of that judgment which filled him with dread. It was a judgment too terrible to contemplate. His patriotism and his deep love for his brother Israelites moved him to speak. His response to the divine unveiling was to thrust himself precipitously between Yahweh intent on judgment and the guilty people. His prayer was, Forgive! forgive! Amos could conceive of mercy and forgiveness; Yahweh could, also.

"How shall Jacob stand? for he is small." (15). Citizens of the Northern Kingdom had the opposite thought. In their prosperity they not only considered themselves to be an imposing nation, but believed also that Yahweh's purpose was to lead them on to still greater power. But the clear-spirited prophet knew how distressingly puny the nation was in reality; so puny, indeed, that he could base his appeal for
indulgence upon this very impotence. With anything else than the support of almighty Yahweh how could little Jacob exist?

"The Lord repented concerning this: It shall not be, saith the Lord." The incident is anthropomorphically conceived; it has the flavour of the Old Testament. The prophet's appeal was heeded, and judgment was stayed because his pity reached over into the heart of God. The intercession of Amos sufficed to alter Yahweh's course of action in regard to Israel.

But Yahweh's controversy with Israel was not so easily settled, for the nation persisted in its evil course. Again the prophet was given a vision of judgment. "Thus the Lord God showed me: and, behold, the Lord God called to contend by fire; and it devoured the great deep, and would have eaten up the land. Then said I, O Lord God, cease, I beseech thee: how shall Jacob stand? for he is small. The Lord repented concerning this: This also shall not be, saith the Lord God." (16)

This second punishment was much more severe, for "Yahweh is now in open controversy with his people." (17). He commanded fire to be His agent against them. How this 'fire' is to be interpreted is a question of considerable difficulty (18). Fortunately, our study does not require a choice of any one of the interpretations which have been offered. Rather, we recall that we are dealing with a prophet's vision, in which forces appeared of an altogether superior order to the natural event, whatever it may have been, which was its original point of departure.

The important matter is that Yahweh had again taken up His old controversy with Israel. Evidently the actions of the nation were such that He was forced to reconsider His 'repentance', to which His prophet had persuaded Him. This time He was even more definitely set upon punishing them, and the instrument of judgment which Amos saw was fire which
devoured the portion and would also have quickly devoured (the portion). Here again has been variously interpreted. The important thing for the purpose of our study is the severity and imminence of the judgment which was in the act of sending. It seemed as if the whole nation was to be blotted out in another instant. Amos rose up a second time to try to turn aside the unthinkable evil from his people. His plea to was in the same words as before, except that instead of forgiveness for the offence he asked that He would cease the punishment. Perhaps this reflects the urgency that was in the prophet's mind; perhaps it suggests that he felt he dared not go so far as to ask for forgiveness a second time. Again his intercession was heeded, and the judgment of stayed.

The record of a third vision follows. "Thus he showed me: and, behold, the Lord stood beside a wall made by a plumbline, with a plumbline in his hand. And the Lord said unto me, Amos, what seest thou? And I said, A plumbline. Then said the Lord, Behold, I will set a plumbline in the midst of my people Israel; I will not again pass by them any more; and the high places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste; and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." In many respects this vision is different from the other two. For one thing, it is accompanied by no intercession, which might suggest that it is not significant for our study. It will appear, however, that it is of equal importance with the others. Again, it is not some act of judgment in world which sees, but Himself stationed with a mason's plumbet beside a wall. After the other two this vision seems calm and detached in its symbolism, from the distressing human elements in national crisis. is not actually performing a judgment upon Israel; rather, He is doing what
ought, and must, precede any actual punishment, and what must logically have preceded the beginning of His judgments portrayed in the first vision. He is examining the character of the nation. Yet even this His prophet does not actually see, but only Yahweh, the wall and the plummet in Yahweh's hand. It is the words of Yahweh (in the other visions He is not represented as speaking) which give point to the symbolism. They tell of the use of the plummet against His people, of an end of forgiveness, of His unalterable purpose to lay waste high place and sanctuary and royal house.

The plummet is an absolute standard for building and for testing, and, therefore, for tearing down. Here it symbolizes both the character of Yahweh and, in view of the condition of the wall, His judgment (21). The wall is, of course, Israel His people. Clothed in this symbolism judgment becomes a necessity, and when to this is added the express statement, "I will not again pass by them any more", further intercession was made impossible. No matter how great his affection for Israel might be he could not from this time on give evidence of it either by interceding before Yahweh or by preaching to Israel any other message than judgment. To do either was to be disloyal in the performance of his prophet's duties.

The effectiveness of the description of these visions as a part of Amos' message at Bethel is obvious. They bring out with unmistakable clearness the purpose of Yahweh to destroy the nation Israel, and they emphasize the certainty of this destruction by putting it even beyond the power of a prophet's intercession to alter. (And, of course, this was no ordinary prophet, but the one by whom the message of judgment was sent.) The effect of this part of Amos' message was so great, we may believe, that immediately Amaziah the priest was moved to put
an end to such prophesying. But we misinterpret Amos if we suppose that he introduced, or shall we say invented, these visions and intercessions merely to give his discourse effectiveness. They are true visions, (22) and they give us the only clear glimpse which we get from the Book of Amos of his personal religious experience. For this reason it will be necessary to continue our study of them further, to investigate any relation which may exist between the intercessions of Amos and the rest of his message.

These three visions are followed in the prophet's book by two others, in one of which (23), Yahweh showed Amos a basket of summer fruit (יִּֽפַּר), and said to him, "The end (יִֽפַּר) is come upon my people Israel; I will not again pass by them any more." In the other (24), he was shown Yahweh Himself standing beside the altar of some sanctuary, commanding the destruction of the building and the slaughter of every one of the worshippers. Like the third vision, these are visions of destruction, and though it will not be necessary to examine them as we have done the others, yet we shall bear in mind this accumulation of messages of judgment in connection with the vision of Yahweh with the plummet. In connection with none of these three last visions was any intercession made. They speak only of inescapable punishment.

3. Inquiry into the Significance of the Intercessions

Amos not Always the Prophet of Judgment

Students of Old Testament prophecy are agreed that Amos was the prophet of Yahweh's judgment. Many of them find him severe and unfeeling in his attitude toward the people of the Northern Kingdom among whom he preached, and they see these qualities reflected also in the character of his God. They compare him with that other prophet who stands so close
to him in time, whose life and whose God express forgiveness and love so adequately; and Amos, they feel, suffers by comparison (25).

This conclusion is reached by overlooking altogether the two intercessions. Unless they were merely a rhetorical device, which we cannot believe, they must have been the expression of a great and genuine sympathy for the Israelites upon whom he was required to pronounce judgment (26). To be unfeeling and severe, and to be pitiful to the point of intercession are expressions of opposite natures. Could the same Amos shake with righteous indignation and melt into tender pleadings? It is entirely possible; for Jeremiah was just such a prophet. But the inconsistency which we accept in Jeremiah (by which, indeed, we recognize him), seems incongruous in the paragon of single-mindedness whom we have come to believe Amos to have been. This is a real difficulty.

Evidently this unlooked-for, seemingly contradictory, sympathy in the prophet of severity has been overlooked or has not received proper emphasis. It may be that we shall be aided to a truer picture of Amos by these intercessions which themselves present the difficulty, and at the same time aided to a better understanding of the nature of his call to prophecy.

Relation of the Intercessions to Amos' Call and Message

In iv. 6-13 Yahweh taxes the people through His prophet with insensibility to the partial judgments by which He has already tried to awaken in them a sense of their transgression and of the estrangement between Him and themselves. There mention is made of a succession of misfortunes, which includes both a plague of locusts and a drought. Do the judgments by locusts and fire in the visions reflect or refer to these same events? This is evidently the conclusion to which G. A. Smith has come, for he says that the visions are not to be interpreted
"as the imagination or prospect of possible disasters (so von Orelli), but as insight into the meaning of actual plagues," and he refers to the occurrence of these same plagues among the series by which, as we were told, God had already sought to move the people to repentance. (27). And another commentator remarks, "It (the plague of locusts) is the same plague (as iv. 9) viewed from two slightly different standpoints, from the first of which appears the active, from the second the passive side of the divine mercy." (28). The way in which this passage is quoted by Harper (29), indicates that he also accepted this conclusion. Obviously such a point cannot be established beyond question, but the probability that the visions refer to the evils already commented on is great enough to be accepted without hesitation (30).

Almost certainly the visitations of Yahweh referred to in ch. iv. antedated the prophet’s visit to Bethel, by months or by years, and may have covered a considerable period of time. Again to say that the visions came to Amos contemporaneously with the plague is also probably correct. This view, of course, involves the interpretation of prophetic vision and of the visions of Amos in particular. It has been suggested that the prophet passed immediately from observing a brood of locusts into the state in which he experienced the first vision, and similarly with the others natural event and vision were almost simultaneous (31). Though this may not necessarily have been the case, it is a reasonable opinion. Certainly the visions, like the natural events to which they correspond, were a part of the experience of Amos before his appearance in Bethel and the delivery of his message. They were, in other words, in the period of his preparation, when God’s message was taking form in his spirit. That was the period of his call to prophecy.
The call of the Old Testament prophet had a subjective and an objective side, both of which must be appreciated. It is fairly easy to suggest, as has already been done for Amos in this chapter, what external forces may have played a part in bringing the prophet to this experience (32), but it is exceedingly difficult to understand what transpired in the prophet's own spirit. Because of this difficulty, one is tempted to resort to his own or other observable experience for his explanations. (33). This may be a legitimate method, up to a point; but it runs the danger of being too sure that Amos, for example, was not a prophet of Yahweh in the 8th century B.C. It runs the danger of making him identical with the mass of his contemporaries, except for a deeper understanding of current events and moral insight. It is possible, on the other hand, to appreciate that the prophets had experiences without close parallel in our own religious life. (34). The Hebrew prophet of the type of Amos was primarily, and always, a "man of God", who had been directly called to his office and who received clear messages from Yahweh. (35). The visions of Amos were to him precisely what he called them: the things which Yahweh had showed him. (36). But, as has been said, there were the external elements in the prophet's experience. He was awake to political, social and religious conditions; he was a keen observer. But whereas he had informed, observant contemporaries, not many of them interpreted events and conditions in the light of Yahweh's character, and of those who did, not all were called to be prophets. Amos was one who, though not a prophet by caste or profession, had been called to prophecy.

With these considerations in mind, we turn to an analysis of the first two visions. Amos, the Judean herdsman, had grown up in the re-
lative solitariness of his occupation, apart, unless for short periods, from the more progressive life and thought of the Northern Kingdom, or even of Judean cities. Over a period of years he learned, by report and personal observation, of what was to him the shockingly irreligious life of his fellow countrymen, especially those in Israel. In spite of their diligence in His worship, they were in reality forsaking Yahweh. The attitude of Amos was that of Nathan toward the licentiousness of King David, and that of Elijah toward the greedy villainy of Jezebel and Ahab, with this difference that it was no longer an individual but a nation which had sinned. The nation had sinned against the character of its God by the evils which we have already noted, and though all the individuals were, conceivably, not at fault, yet the prophet's sense of the nation's social solidarity made him include all in the national guilt. Added to this awareness of the significance of conditions he must have had, before his call, a profound sense of the reality of God and devotional experience. Yahweh was to him in truth what He was to other Israelites in theory, the governor of all events in nature and in human affairs.

As he tended his flocks, gathered his sycamore fruits, made his journeys and had communion with his God, the land was visited by the plagues and misfortunes which we have indicated. G. A. Smith has said that Amos felt them with a conscience. (37). Yahweh had sent them; they were His reply to the unfaithfulness of the people, His own people. But the people did not realize that they were being punished; Yahweh needed a 'mouth', a prophet. Amos knew by some intimate and forcible experience of God that he had been appointed to this office. "Shall the trumpet be blown in a city, and the people not be afraid? Shall evil befall a city, and the Lord hath not done it? Surely the Lord will do nothing, except he reveal his secret unto his servants the prophets. The lion hath roared;
who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken; who can but prophecy?" (36). This call may have come to him in connection with the visions; if not in this way it is not possible to say how it did come. (39). It was in visions that Isaiah (40), Jeremiah (41), and Ezekiel (42), were called to prophecy. Or the visions may possibly have come to him after he had become convinced of his call. In either case, when Amos saw the visions of locust, plague and fire, he was already conscious of being in the unique prophetic relationship with Yahweh. Yet he was a voiceless prophet, who had delivered no message, and in whose mind the message which he was to deliver had not come to its final form. In my opinion it was through these visions that Amos was given the message of judgment which we associate with his name.

In the two visions Yahweh's judgments were terrible, threatening the nation's overthrow. Amos was agreed in a general way with the justice of such a judgment, yet the sight of the actual progress of punishment caused him to appeal to Yahweh's mercy. In both instances he was not the prophet of judgment at all, but the prophet of mercy. His affection for Israel was great and sincere. It refused to accept the nation's doom as God's answer to its sin. He could conceive of mercy; why could not Yahweh Himself be merciful? "Forgive, I beseech thee: how shall Jacob stand? for he is small." And in each vision his petition, so compassionately made, was heard favourably. Surely at this stage he was the prophet of the mercy of God:

But in these first visions there was a conflict which their outcome had not resolved. The conflict was between the prophet's sympathy and his duty, which paralleled a conflict between Yahweh's favourable answer to his petitions and the impossibility of not judging Israel. We shall
learn more of this conflict and the misery which could attend it when we study Jeremiah's intercessions. In the case of Amos the period of struggle must have been brief; the third vision brought a solution.

The third vision was primarily for the benefit of Amos. We might call it a lesson vision. It embodied the sort of lesson which would appeal to a man of logical mind. The symbolism demonstrated to him clearly that, on the one hand, the character of Yahweh, upon which the choice and development of the nation had rested, and, on the other, the heartlessness and apostasy of Israel, were in mortal conflict. He might have interceded again; had he been Hosea or Jeremiah one feels that he would have interceded again. But being the man of logic rather than of emotion, he saw means of the vision that mercy was not the solution, since it betrayed the character of God. Therefore he turned away altogether from mercy, so far at least as his message to the Israel of his day was concerned, and gave himself to the preaching of judgment with the single-minded zeal of one who was convinced that he had been given this message by Yahweh Himself.

My interpretation is, then, that Amos received his commission to prophecy judgment only after he had twice advocated the way of mercy in his intercessions before Yahweh. Thus he dared to suggest another method of dealing with the nation than that which he was being taught. But the third vision was sufficient to turn him from mercy and to convince him that punishment was the only treatment of Israel consonant with the nature of his God for it was the only way His righteousness could be vindicated. I realize that this statement simplifies the change from mercy to judgment which Amos experienced. The two visions which followed, of the summer fruit and the temple, were of a character to convince him of Yahweh's purpose to punish; but whatever their effect, it is the third
vision which uncovers to us the way in which Amos weas brought to the change in attitude.

The struggle within him, which must necessarily have accompanied this transition, was ended before he went to Bethel. This explains why, except for the first two visions themselves, his prophecies have a uniform emphasis upon condemnation, which is responsible for his being called the cold and unfeeling prophet.

The Intercessions and the Closing Section of the Book

The Book of Amos closes with a picture of future restoration and plenty, in a passage which is the only part of the book the authenticity of which has been seriously questioned. This is ix. 8c-15, especially 11-15 (43). An examination of all the grounds upon which these conflicting opinions are based has no place in this thesis; there is one argument of those who question the genuineness of these verses upon which the intercession of Amos have definite bearing. This argument is phrased by R. A Cripps as follows, "A promise of restoration such as is outlined in vv. 11-15 is quite incongruous after the threat of absolute destruction which is characteristic of the main body of the prophecy of Amos." (44). And he adds that though other prophets of woe who made promises of restoration for the future escape the charge of inconsistency, "Amos' special message" keeps us from crediting him with this picture of future happiness.

From the conclusions of our own study the force of this argument can be appreciated. We have remarked what is believed to be a certain logical consistency in the thought of Amos, a mental honesty, which forces us to the conclusion that any passage which represents God as regarding the unrepentant nation with benevolence did not originate with him. He seemed to regard the judgment as inevitable (45), as though he saw no indication that the nation was ready to change; and the vision of the plumbline we
take to embody the axiom that there could be no change in Yahweh's attitude without change in the life of the nation. But what was impossible for the nation of his day might have been conceived by him to be Yahweh's will for some future time. "In that day" has the vagueness of a far future. If the verses which speak of the sifting of Israel among the nations and the preservation of the good grain (46) be accepted as from Amos, they form a suitable introduction to a picture of the new age. Or if, without these verses, we can allow that Amos did not expect that the inevitable judgment would annihilate the nation, we have some basis for such a view. When we ask the question whether Amos, as we know him, could have conceived of the state of things portrayed in the last verses of his book, we can, recalling his intercessions, answer that he had a spiritual flexibility which does not elsewhere appear in the messages which he delivered at Bethel. His mind, which was not closed to the acceptance of a message of certain judgment, was open to a message of future happiness. Like Jeremiah, another intercessor, Amos could have been the prophet of a day of restoration beyond the day of judgment.

There are other objections to the Amos authorship of the passage which this argument does not touch, such as its lack of moral emphasis and its reflection of a period different from the time of Amos. Our interest is simply in the bearing of his intercessions upon this one point.


The Intercessions of Amos are obviously of a different type from any discussed in chapter two. They are the prophet's own account of his experience of intercession, rather than the account of a chronicler. In one we have the report of the prophet's words and postures; in the
other the prophet brings us himself within the veil of his visions and reveals his secret conversations with God. Yet in Amos' intercessions the basic principles are the same as in these others; he stands, as Moses, Samuel and Elijah had stood, before Yahweh in his position of privilege as prophet, to plead the cause of the nation. He had the viewpoint of both parties; he felt for both; he sought to resolve the conflict between the two. But whereas the intercessions of the older prophets won the forgiveness of Yahweh and the withdrawal of judgment, the intercessions of Amos effected, in the end, absolutely nothing.

The reason for Amos' failure may have been in his faulty relation to Israel; for though he stood in the same relation to Yahweh as the former prophets, he stood in an entirely different relation to the people. They are represented as the outstanding figures of their day in the nation; Amos was a nobody in Israel. Before Yahweh he was as truly a prophet as they, before Yahweh his intercessions were as authentic and significant as theirs, and twice they stayed the judgment in its descent; but so unimportant was he in the eyes of the people that, even had they been aware of his intercessions on their behalf, they would still have regarded him as a person of no consequence, a nobody prophet. Of this we may be certain from their treatment of him at Bethel.

When Samuel interceded for Israel he brought to Yahweh its confession of sin and repentance (47). Likewise, Moses at Sinai interceded for a people from whom he had exacted a sort of expiation at the hands of the sons of Levi and who had consecrated themselves (48); at Kibberah the people first "cried unto Moses" before he prayed for them (49), when they were afflicted by serpents at Yahweh's will "the people came to Moses, and said, We have sinned." (50). When Elijah prayed successfully for rain he did so after the people had confessed, "Yahweh, he is God" and
had killed the prophets of Baal (51). All these intercessors brought with them Israel's repentance or some expression of cooperation; but Amos brought only his personal sympathy and patriotism which could not regard the judgment unmoved. Israel did not recognize its sin, let alone repent of it, and the gulf between God and people remained as wide as ever; and the prophet who loved Israel failed finally in intercession because he tried to stretch himself across this chasm of estrangement. He found himself unable to do it; he found himself in a conflict between his heart's sympathy for North Israel and his prophet's loyalty to righteous Yahweh. It was an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. The vision of the plumbline seemingly compelled him to choose between his unrighteous people, whom he yet loved, and his God. Perhaps there was in him a stern, puritanic strain which helped him make the latter choice more readily. From his messages we may judge that he never looked back to his personal wishes for Israel's greatness; when he went to Bethel, to his public ministry, he was the prophet of a single harmonious message of judgment. It does not matter whether we pity him for his lack of sympathy and patriotism, or value him for his loyalty to the word of Yahweh; he understood, as we scarcely can, why he was the prophet of doom.

The intercessions of Amos suggest, also, a change which was taking place in prophecy itself. The prophets of the traditional type were great figures in the nation, who took a leading part in its affairs and rebuked its kings to their face. Amos had at no time this confidence of the nation; but he did have the confidence of Yahweh, a clear knowledge of His nature, a corresponding insight into social and moral issues, all of which find expression in the quality of his written message. That he resorted to writing is probably accounted for by his
failure to convince the people through his spoken words. From Amos on until the end of the exile, prophecy dwelt, as its positive message, upon its amazing revelation of the true nature of God and the life which such a God required in man.

These intercessions reveal Amos in a role strikingly different from his usual one as prophet of judgment. They reveal a side of his nature which is commonly, and unfairly, overlooked.

They show us, finally, a prophet for whom intercession was definitely limited. For the first time in the Old Testament we see, what against the background of the last chapter appears extraordinary, a prophet whom Yahweh Himself prevented from interceding. Amos ceased interceding, not because he was ignorant of Yahweh, but because he had been given a new and more perfect insight into His nature.
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CHAPTER IV

JEREMIAH AND INTERCESSION

Hosea, the next canonical prophet, a younger contemporary of Amos, was the prophet of Yahweh's love for Israel. Contrary to what we might have expected, he made no mention of intercession in his book. A single reference by him might, because his personal life is understood so well, have illuminated our problem; but we may not even draw a conclusion from his silence.

The year 723 B.C. witnessed the fall of Samaria and conquest of the Northern Kingdom by Sargon (724-705 B.C.). He says, in what is called the Display Inscription, "I besieged and captured Samaria, carrying off 27,290 of the people who dwelt therein. 50 chariots I gathered from among them, I caused others to take their (the deported inhabitants') portion, I set my officers over them and imposed upon them the tribute of the former king." (1). This blow crushed the Kingdom of Israel, and though many of the old inhabitants must have remained in the land (2), Ephraim was thought of from this time on as a people scattered among the nations (3). It was left to Judah, hitherto less prominent, to carry the religious inheritance of all the children of Jacob. Consequently, Jerusalem became the focus point of all important Israelite affairs both political and religious. Towards Jerusalem Micah prophesied and in it Isaiah spent his long life as prophet; but these men, like Hosea, wrote nothing about their intercessions.

Notwithstanding Isaiah's silence regarding intercession, a brief summary of his message will serve as a link between Amos and Jeremiah, and
will preserve in our study the thread of prophetic development. Isaiah is epitomized as the prophet of God's transcendence and holiness. Unlike the canonical prophets who preceded him, he entered as Yahweh's prophet into the court life and politics of the time, exercising in this sphere an increasingly greater influence. "Even to the political historian Isaiah is the most notable figure after David in the whole history of Israel"(4). Yet Isaiah was never a politician or statesman in the accepted sense; his part in Judah's national life was a strictly religious part, and he was a leader not by virtue of his own political insight but by virtue of the word of Yahweh. (5). Conceivably it was this combination of practical statesmanship and profound spirituality which moved him to gather a group of convinced disciples for study and testimony in the testimony and the law (6). This was a step in the direction of individual, as contrasted with national, religion. Another precedent of far-reaching effect was Isaiah's declaration of the inviolability of Jerusalem on the occasion of Sennacherib's attack. A century later this prophecy had gathered about it such a halo of fulfillment and popular wish that it very nearly brought about the downfall of Jeremiah (?)

In world affairs the age of Jeremiah was a period of conflict and uncertainty. The Scythian peril was like a drawn sword over the nations, Assyria fell while the little peoples applauded, Egypt and Babylon struggled briefly over the spoils in Syria and Palestine. Yet so slight a power was Judah that even in this disorder she achieved independence only for one brief period under Josiah. She passed from hand to hand, from Assyria to Egypt to Babylon, ever restless under the yoke, revolting as often as intrigues with Egypt and the neighboring nations permitted. Two of these revolts resulted in Babylonian conquests, in 597 and 586 B. C. and sufficed to do to Judah what had been done to the Northern Kingdom in
722. The second of these conquests marks, very nearly, the close of Jeremiah's ministry.

1. **Background of Jeremiah's Intercessions.**

The explanatory note which introduces the prophecies of Jeremiah contains the phrase, "Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiah, of the priests that were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin." (8). This is usually interpreted to mean that Jeremiah came from the exalted priestly family of Eli and Abiathar, which had suffered eclipse since the exile of Abiathar to Anathoth by Solomon. (9). "If this be correct there was no family in Israel whose fortunes had been so closely bound up with the national religion as that into which Jeremiah was born." (19). This conjecture is, at any rate, more acceptable than the view that he came from a Levite family who eked out a living by priestly service at the local high place. (11). In so sensitive and serious a person as Jeremiah the frequent rehearsal of family and national achievements would stimulate to an uncommon love for the nation and concern for its welfare. The low state of religion in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon, in which his boyhood was spent, must also have had a profound effect upon his thinking and mission. It is evident from his early prophecies that even before he was called to be a prophet he had pored over the earlier prophetic writings, especially those of Hosea, and had become familiar with their message. But more than this, he was so wholly in agreement with their conception of God and attitude toward national sin that he could preach them as his own. (12). At the age, then, when other young men were interested in professional, business, or social matters, Jeremiah was already too deeply concerned with the moral condition of the nation and its consequences to share their life.
The account of Jeremiah's call to prophesy (13), is an excellent introduction to his intercessions, indicating as it does the same qualities of spiritual character which appear in these supplications. Where-as Amos, who seems to have been a reserved, unemotional man, gives us through his intercessions just one flash of insight into the core of his own being, Jeremiah lays bare more of his innermost experiences than any other prophet. With Amos the reserve was laid aside just for an instant, with Jeremiah the processes by which convictions were formed, conflicts solved and decisions reached are clearly revealed. This is true even of the circumstances of his call. His account of this experience enables us to become acquainted with the real Jeremiah, and thus renders us less likely to misinterpret his intercessions.

Jeremiah's call is presented in the form of a dialogue. Yahweh speaks, the man answers, and is answered in turn. First, Yahweh informs Jeremiah that he is a prophet, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations" (14). The office which Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and others, his spiritual fathers, had filled so heroically, was the office to which he now was commissioned. Before he himself was aware of it, even before he began to have any form as a man, God had set him apart (לטפ) to this office. He was never intended to be anything else than a prophet. This may be taken both to express his conviction and to explain to him the reason that he had not shared normal life with Israelites of his own age. Further, it was to the office of prophet to the nations that he had been sanctified. No other prophet had been given so vast, so inclusive a commission. Jeremiah is given the world to labour in. (15)

"Then said I, Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak: for I am a child."
God has spoken; now man answers Him. And if what Jeremiah says of himself be correct, his abilities did not match the task to which God has predesti-
nated him. But we suspect Jeremiah of exaggerating both his lack of ability and his youth, in an attempt to escape the responsibility of this mission.

Where is here that 'foreordination' which separated Jeremiah from other men? All that the prophet's answer shows is a man who hesitates to accept responsi-
bility, who is fearful, and who lacks faith in God.

"But the Lord said unto me, Say not, I am a child: for to whomsoever I shall send thee thou shalt go, and whatsoever I shall command thee thou shalt speak." (16). The answer is, in substance, that which was given to St. Paul centuries later, "My power is made perfect in weakness." (17).

Jeremiah's ability to perform the mission was to be Yahweh's divine co-
operation. Because He had chosen him to be His prophet, he became the in-
strument of divine communication and divine action. "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth: See I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down, and to destroy and to overthrow; to build, and to plant." (18).

When we tell over the prophets of Israel and single out the most distinctive teaching or characteristic of each, Jeremiah stands forth as the prophet of individual religion. Among the prophets, though this is not true of other parts of Old Testament literature, such disclosure as he gives of his personal religious life is especially noteworthy. (19).

He revealed, then, far more of the purely personal side of his religious life than did any other prophet, and he chose to incorporate in his writ-
ten prophecies not only the results of his spiritual struggles, but the struggles themselves. The first of these is revealed in the experience of his call which we have just rehearsed. It is a struggle, within the prophet, of two contrary forces. The first is the divine force, Jere-
miah's God. How Yahweh entered the man's experience is not disclosed, but we realize that Jeremiah knew Him as a real Person. He had already a grip upon him, which commanded his personal loyalty, and gave him insight into the nature and consequences of his nation's sin. This Force became one of the elements in an inner struggle when He said, "I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations." From an objective viewpoint, this element was Jeremiah's God; subjectively it may be thought of as the young man's sense of mission and conviction of a divinely appointed task.

The other opposite force was the natural weakness and timidity of his character. Davidson suggests that Jeremiah's fundamental characteristic was weakness. The inner conviction that Yahweh had chosen him to be the Hosea of his generation found the man Jeremiah, the Jeremiah who was not yet a prophet, hesitant and fearful. He had all the knowledge and the conscience necessary for the task (indeed, if he had not had these he could not have been shown the mission), but he drew back from the painful conviction that he was the chosen instrument.

Such an inner conflict as we witness in the account of Jeremiah's call is a most unpleasant and distressing spiritual state. For this reason a person in conflict will seek a speedy end of his spiritual discomfort. In what appears to have been a similar conflict in Amos the solution was reached quickly, so it would seem, by his complete acceptance of Yahweh's verdict upon Israel. In the instance before us Jeremiah also came to a solution: he allowed himself to be convinced. He accepted Yahweh's mission because his objections were answered by divine promises: Yahweh is Himself his strength, He puts His words in his mouth, He sets him over nations and kingdoms. We are amazed by this clear, unobstructed relationship between the man and God. It rouses us to admir-
ation that the man would, without popular demand or acclaim, accept the prophetic mission, especially so weak a man. But by very reason of the nature of the forces in conflict within him Yahweh's victory in this first struggle was not final victory. In other bitterer conflicts of the future he would regret his acceptance of the prophetic call. (22).

"In these," says John Skinner, "we shall find the key to the significance of his personality as the first great exponent of individual and universal religion." (23).

2. A Group of Jeremiah's intercessions and the Problem which they Create

Places in the Book of Jeremiah where the prophet's intercessions are referred to either directly or indirectly are vii. 16, xi. 14, xiv. 1-7, xv. 9, xviii. 20 and xlii. 2. A reference by Jeremiah to the intercessions of other prophets occurs in xxvii. 18. Of these the passage xiv. 1-9 is much the most informing, and to this we now turn.

xiv. 1-xv. 9.

This passage may be regarded, for our purpose of the interpretation of its thought at least, as an entity. (24) It is a dialogue between the God of Israel and his prophet (who at times speaks in the first person and at times as the spokesman for the nation), on the occasion of a distressing drought in Judah. As in the visions of Amos ch. vii, to which the passage bears striking resemblances, the prophet interprets the event in nature as Yahweh's punishment for Judah's sin, and endeavors to turn away the judgment and to heal the difference which made it necessary.

A preliminary problem demanding some consideration is the manner in which the two prayers imbedded in the dialogue, xiv. 7-9 and 19-22, ought to be interpreted. Jeremiah represents the nation as praying; that is
clear. (25) But is this the nation praying through the lips and heart of its prophet, or is this the prophet's caricature of the nation's false piety? Is Jeremiah interceding for Judah out of the intensity of his longing that she should be spared the hardship attendant upon this drought, or is he ridiculing before the people the prayers which he has heard them make? (26). But though it is possible that Jeremiah should have made use of ridicule to emphasize his message, there are reasons for believing the first interpretation to be correct, apart from the important subjective one of feeling that the second interpretation does violence to Jeremiah's character.

The view that these are intercessory prayers is supported by Yahweh's repeated command to Jeremiah to cease praying for Judah. "Pray not for this people for their good" (27), and "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people." (28). These commands are intelligible only if the prayer which precedes each is an intercession of Jeremiah. And even if xiv. 11 be regarded as a later insertion (29), xv. 1 requires that what goes before should explain it. (30). And if xiv. 19-22 be the prophet's own prayer of intercession, no reason remains for interpreting vv. 7-9 according to the contrary view. (31). We shall venture to interpret them both as Jeremiah's intercessions.

Verses 2-6 describes the drought. Normal commerce and intercourse have ceased; the land mourns. Suffering touches all men: their great ones (ךָּרָאִים) and their lowly ones (ךָּרָאִים). The farmers, their stock, even the wild creatures on the hills, share the agonies of thirst and hunger. Jeremiah tells what he saw with his own eyes. He has suffered with the rest, but to his body's torment was added the torment of the knowledge that this was the judgment of God. His natural sympathy for Judah was augmented by this knowledge, and from this
sympathy he proceeded to the desperate hope that the suffering in judgment might end by the reconciliation of Israel and Yahweh.

But even as he agonized in sympathy he knew that the fault was Judah's and that Judah must repent. So in verse 7 he stood up in his place in the nation which had sinned, and in behalf of all the people confessed that sin. In verses 8 and 9 he added a passionate appeal for help. "Why shouldest thou be as a man astonied, as a mighty man that cannot save? yet thou, O Lord, art in the midst of us, and we are called by thy name; leave us not."

Yahweh's reply was two-fold. First, in verse 10, he spoke to the people through His prophet, answering the petition with His reason for not accepting it. "Even so have they loved to wander; they have not refrained their feet: therefore the Lord doth not accept them; now will he remember their iniquity, and visit their sins." Though Jeremiah, if he had allowed himself to consider, would have realized that his expression of Judah's repentance was not in accord with Judah's true feeling and was indeed only the creation of his ardent sympathies, yet in that prayer he was speaking honestly for Jeremiah, the Israelite, whose heart was sore for his people. His simple humanity clutched at some way to turn aside the evil judgment, though reflection might have called it illogical and ineffectual. But immediately he was wrenched out of his fellow-Israelite attitude into his prophet attitude, and as prophet re-iterated Yahweh's judgment which his human sympathy had tried to have withdrawn.

The second part of Yahweh's reply was a message to Jeremiah, forbidding him to intercede for the people and explaining why he should not intercede. "Pray not for this people for their good. When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they offer burnt offering and oblation, I will not accept them: but I consume them by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence." Yahweh had a fixed purpose to punish Judah which
their fastings, prayers and offerings had no power to alter, because they
did not touch the issues upon which they and He were at odds. The people
believed that the correct observance of these things which the popular
cultus required would gain the favour of Yahweh and safeguard them against
misfortune. But Yahweh brushed this counterfeit devotion aside, and not
finding beneath it the conformity to His essential requirements which He
sought, reiterated His judgment. His prophet He commanded to cease from
intercessions which misrepresented the nation's worthiness to be forgiven.
The command suggests that Jeremiah's intercessions were a disloyalty to
Yahweh. It might also be interpreted as a reproof for having turned aside
from his prophet's duty of proclaiming Yahweh's judgment.

The dialogue might have ended there. That it did not is a gauge of
the strength of the tie which bound Jeremiah to his nation. Yahweh's word
was true, but an excuse might be found for Judah. "Then said I, Ah, Lord
God! behold, the prophets say unto them, Ye shall not see the sword, neither
shall ye have famine; but I will give you assured peace in this place."(39).
Surely God would not punish a people whose religious leaders, speaking in
His name, assured them that they were on good terms with Him, and that He
intended to give them only that which was good. Jeremiah was a ready ad­
vocate; a persistent intercessor.

But Yahweh's reply swept this excuse aside. "The prophets prophesy
lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither
spake I unto them." (33). Their words were human, born of their own
wishes. Jeremiah, too, would have found it easy to follow his human sym­
pathy and to have preached peace and a happy future, had not his call to
prophecy and his subsequent relation with Yahweh brought to light a wholly
other set of divine principles which made judgment inevitable. These un­
inspired prophets with their human messages will be punished by the very
disasters which they had assured the people could not come; and the people who were so undiscerning as to heed them will be overwhelmed by the same death. Jeremiah, the inspired prophet, was bidden to take up again his burden of woe, to speak to the people through his own tears of the weight of the affliction coming upon them. For the condition of Judah was hopeless, "for both the prophet and the priest go about in the land and have no knowledge." (34)

But even this decisive answer did not silence Jeremiah. Again, speaking with the voice of the nation, he made piteous intercession for Yahweh's mercy. The prayer is a succession of short questions, petitions and ejaculations, which suggest a state of great agitation in the prophet's spirit. He followed his appeal for mercy with confession of sin, and to these he added an appeal to Yahweh's honour and covenant, acknowledging that He alone had power to send the long-desired rain. "Are there any among the vanities of the heathen that can cause rain? or can the heaven give showers? art thou not he, O Lord our God? therefore we will wait upon thee; for thou hast made all these things." (35). In Jeremiah the balance between human sympathy and sense of mission was a delicately adjusted one. Here again the weight is thrown toward his human tenderness; for which perhaps the very finality of Yahweh's answer to his last intercession was responsible. At any rate, we witness him again completely absorbed in yet more ardent intercession, as though he were oblivious to his own office and message as prophet and Yahweh's repeated commands.

But the dialogue had an end, and the final word was Yahweh's. "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: (36), cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth." (37) Not only was Jeremiah powerless to intercede, but even Moses (38), and Samuel (39) together, powerful as their influence in intercession had been in their own
day, could not have turned Yahweh's favour toward this nation with its present guilt. This was more than a repetition of the command not to intercede; it eliminated all intercession as an expedient for aiding Judah. It was parallel in force to the vision of the builder with his plumbline which put a stop to the intercessions of Amos.

Joined to this refusal to heed Jeremiah's petition was Yahweh's repetition of His judgment upon this people in terms more terrible than any hitherto used in the passage. "And I will appoint over them four kinds, saith the Lord: the sword to slay, and the dogs to tear, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the earth, to devour and to destroy. And I will cause them to be tossed to and fro among all the kingdoms of the earth. Thou hast rejected me, saith the Lord, thou art gone backward; therefore have I stretched out my hand against thee; I am weary with repenting." (40). Punishment was certain, but Judah was the cause of her own punishment.

This is the conclusion of the passage. Again, as in the experience of Amos, intercession is shown to be something decidedly different from what it was traditionally and conventionally represented in Hebrew religion. To Amos Yahweh revealed Himself as One who could not, in the circumstances of national sin, answer intercession for the nation. The logic of His justice closed His prophet's mouth. In this case, Jeremiah is actually commanded to cease interceding. Yahweh tells him that no group of intercessors, not even Moses and Samuel could alter His intention to judge Judah. Had Jeremiah been another Amos, that would probably have been an end of the matter, but with him we are dealing with the very opposite type of man. He is not the self-possessed man of single purpose; he is at first, the man of two natures, who wages a conflict within himself. The one ceases to intercede for Israel when the divine verdict is
known; the other continues to intercede in disregard of Yahweh's repeated commands to stop.

The passage just studied reveals a phase of this conflict in Jeremiah; between his God and religious conviction, on the one hand, and his sympathy for Judah, expressed in his intercessions, on the other. As at the beginning of his prophetic experience, so now again the conflict had resulted in a victory for the prophet over the man; Yahweh and His demands had again conquered him. Logically, this should have been a final conquest; from this time on Jeremiah should have been a man of single-minded loyalty to Yahweh? Was this the case? Have we in this group of intercessions the experience which brought Jeremiah to inner unity? Or was there never an end within him of this spiritual warfare, of which his intercessions were a part?

An answer must be found to these questions if we are to discover the full part which intercession played in Jeremiah's life. But the answer will not come simply through the study of other references to his intercessions. These, indeed, are few, and merely repeat the command of xiv. 11. One says, "Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee." (41), and the other, "Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them." (42). Beyond the proof which they offer that Jeremiah made frequent use of intercession for the nation, they add nothing to the knowledge already gained from xiv. 1-xv. 9. To answer the question whether Jeremiah continued to intercede in spite of Yahweh's commands or whether he attained obedience and inner unity, requires a study of the whole great conflict in this prophet, of which the intercessions were but one phase. We shall attempt to do this very briefly, and though this may seem a de-
vious way of solving our problem, I believe that it will not only give
the needed information on Jeremiah's intercessions but also show that
the intercessions themselves serve as a key to the whole conflict experience which was so significant for his life and teaching.

3. Other forms of the Conflict.

These struggles within and around Jeremiah were all the by-products of his prophetic mission. As a man, that is, as a layman, he was so sensitive and gentle that it is difficult to imagine him in private life enduring open disagreement with anyone. Consequently, when through the preaching of Yahweh's message he found himself regarded with hostility by almost all his people, he felt the full cruelty of every expression of their opposition. This opposition so disturbed the delicate balance of his emotions that at times the compassionate intercessor entertained the most savage feelings toward the people of Judah. We realize how thoroughly his spirit was disturbed when we see him at one time or another contending against God (43), and in behalf of God, in behalf of Israel and against Israel.

Loneliness, also, was a factor in Jeremiah's inner discord. The sensitive, introspective person feels loneliness, especially the loneliness occasioned by hostility, as though it were intense physical pain. By his vocation Jeremiah was committed to separation from the normal life of his contemporaries. "I sat not in the assembly of them that make merry, nor rejoiced: I sat alone because of thy hand." (44) "The word of the Lord came also unto me, saying, Thou shalt not take thee a wife, neither shalt thou have sons or daughters in this place." (45).

Throughout much of his life he was followed by the studied persecution of those whom his messages antagonized, until at times he felt himself to be man at enmity with the whole earth. (46). The men of his
native town schemed to do away with him (47), after the Temple Sermon early in Jehoiakim's reign the Jerusalem priests and prophets tried to have him condemned to death (48), prophets contradicted his messages (49), the roll of his prophecies was burned (50), and even his "familiar friends" turned against him. (51). In the reign of Zedekiah he was imprisoned (52), and thrown into an old cistern (53).

We do not, then, wonder that at times, feeling that the trials of his mission were more than any prophet ought to be asked to endure, he desired with all his heart to be free of the prophetic office (54), or rebelled against the intolerable life which resulted from obedience to Yahweh (55). But we consider it strange, are shocked even, that this gentle spirit should have been so shaken by opposition that he entreated God to revenge him upon his people. "O Lord, thou knowest; remember me, and visit me, and avenge me of my persecutors" (56). "Bring upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double destruction" (57). The most savage of these outbursts, in which he even cited his own intercessions as a reason why his prayer for retaliation should be answered, shows how near at times the conflict within brought him to defeat of his life's mission. "Then said they, Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for the law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet. Come, and let us smite him with the tongue, and let us not give heed to any of his words. Give heed to me, O Lord, and hearken to the voice of them that contend with me. Shall evil be recompensed for good? for they have digged a pit for my soul. Remember how I stood before thee to speak good for them, to turn away thy fury from them. (58). Therefore deliver up their children to the famine, and give them over to the power of the sword; and let their wives become childless, and widows; and let their
men be slain of death, and their young men be smitten of the sword in battle. Let a cry be heard from their houses, when thou shalt bring a troop suddenly upon them: for they have digged a pit to take me, and hid snares for my feet. Yet, Lord, thou knowest all their counsel against me to slay me; forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight: but let them be overthrown before thee; deal thou with them in the time of thine anger." (59)

To the casual reader of Jeremiah's book it would seem that now at last the prophet had come to regard the people as Yahweh had long regarded them, as worthy of the most terrible judgments. But this would be a superficial interpretation. The reasons behind Jeremiah's attitude were personal ones, rising out of the discord in his own life. He was exasperated, goaded to fury; and in this weakness of anger he asked for revenge. I am aware that such an attitude appears somewhat similar to Yahweh's own attitude toward Israel as it is disclosed in prophecy, and even in the prophecies of Jeremiah. (60). But the reasons behind Yahweh's judgment of Israel were of an entirely different quality from those which moved Jeremiah to want vengeance. It is not a matter that can be discussed thoroughly here. Suffice it to say that the judgments of God, and even the vengeance of God, are consistently represented as originating in an entirely different and higher order of being from the human order to which Jeremiah and all men belonged. He is God, Creator, upholder of Israel since Abraham. He is unmoved by the desire for retaliation or by sudden wrath which moved Jeremiah to oppose Judah. His opposition arose out of weightier issues linked to His character as Creator of the earth and God of Israel. That this is true, that Jeremiah against Judah was disloyal to rather than in accord with Yahweh against Judah, is evident from Yahweh's reply to His prophet's petitions
for the punishment of the nation on his account. "The Lord said, Verily I will strengthen thee for good." (61). Again, "if thou wilt return, then will I bring thee again, that thou mayest stand before me; and if thou wilt take forth the precious from the vile, then shalt thou be as my mouth.... And I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall... And I will deliver thee out of the hand of the wicked, and I will redeem thee out of the hand of the terrible." (62).

Jeremiah's fits of temper hindered him in the performance of his prophetic duty. So much so that he had to come to himself, return to Yahweh and subject himself to the discipline of cleansing before he could regain the confidence of Yahweh and exercise his prophet's office. These outbursts, which would seem to reveal the man of the opposite sort from the intercessor, have this much in common with his intercessions that they indicate imperfect loyalty to his God. In both, the Jeremiah of inner conflict is seen. In this case, as in the call experience and the intercessions, the solution was found in returning, or shall we say, resurrendering, to Yahweh and realizing Him as the all-sufficient master of his life. It was a new submission to the hard role of the prophet.

To repeat the question before us, was Jeremiah always a prophet of divided loyalty, preserving always a part of himself at cross-purposes with the will of God? Or can these struggles be located in a part of his experience? To answer, it is necessary to date the numerous passages in which the conflict is revealed.

4. Date of the Conflict Passages.

Jeremiah's life as prophet can be divided into clearly defined periods, as follows:

B. C.

626. His call, in the 13th year of Josiah.
626–621. His ministry until Josiah's reformation.

621–608. His ministry during the remainder of Josiah's reign.

608. Jehoahaz.

608–597. His ministry during Jehoiakim's reign.

597. Jehoiachin

597–586. His ministry during Zedekiah's reign.

586–? From the fall of Jerusalem until his death.

But the oracles and narratives of the Book of Jeremiah are not arranged chronologically; consequently in many cases it is difficult to determine their date, and in some impossible, because of lack of evidence. The passages dealing with Jeremiah's intercessions are: vii. 16, xi. 16, xiv. 1–xv. 9, xviii. 20. Others revealing his inner disorder are: iv. 10, 19, xi. 18–23, xii. 1–6, xv. 10–21, xvii. 14–18, xviii. 19–23, xix. 7–18. Because of the number of these passages, we shall build upon the conclusions of scholars, rather than attempt an original investigation.

S. R. Driver dates the entire first group of passages in the reign of Jehoiakim. The second group he assigns to the same period, with the exception of iv. 10, 19, which he puts in Josiah's reign. (63). Cornill's arrangement locates the passages of both groups before B. C. 597, except the following: iv. 10 (a gloss), xii. 4 (no satisfactory context can be found), xv. 11–14 (a gloss), xviii. 21–23 (foreign to the spirit of Jeremiah), xix. 7–12, 14–18 (reign of Zedekiah). (64).

A. S. Peake (65) dates all the first group in Jehoiakim's reign, except xiv. 1–xv. 9, which he considers to be of uncertain date. Of the second group, iv. 10 he dates early (as against Duhm's opinion of late date); also iv. 19 (as against Schmidt). The passage xii. 13–23 he dates in Jehoiakim's reign (as against Stade and Schmidt who reject it, except
that the latter retains vv. 21-23. The two passages, xviii. 19-23 and xx. 7-18, he holds to be probably from Jehoiakim's reign. He puts xii. 1-6 in Josiah's reign, shortly after 621 B.C. (as against Duhm and Schmidt, who reject it). xv. 10-21 is of uncertain date.

A. W. Streane (66) approves in general Cornill's classification. In particular he dates in the first group as follows: vii. 16, later than Josiah's reforms; xi. 14, Jehoiakim's reign, between the Temple Address and Carchemish (B.C. 605); xiv. 1-xv. 9 cannot be dated with any confidence; xviii. 20 perhaps from Josiah's reign. Of the second group, he dates iv. 10, 19 before the re-writing of the Roll (B.C. 604); xi. 18-23, and xii. 1-6 from Jehoiakim's reign, between the Temple Address and Carchemish; xv. 10-21, cannot be dated with confidence, but the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign suggested; xvii. 14-18, at any rate before 597; xviii. 19-23, perhaps from Josiah's reign; xx. 7-13, the early reign of Jehoiakim; xx. 14-18, late in Zedekiah's reign (because it reflects confinement).

John Skinner (67), assigns xi. 18-23 and xii. 1-6 to the time of Jeremiah's removal from Anathoth about the sixth year of his ministry; and xv. 10-21, xvii. 14-18, xviii. 18-23, xx. 7-12, 14-18 to "the middle period of his work, before he had become a prominent actor on the stage of politics."

Bruston, Edouard (68), assigns iv. 10, 19 to Jeremiah's first discourses v. 16 and xi. 18-23 to the period of Josiah's reformation xiv, xv to the third year of Jehoiakim xvii. 5-18 to Jehoiakim's reign; xviii-xx to the second year of Jehoiakim.

Albert Condamin (69), says that no date can be assigned to xiv. 1-xv. 9. But he regards the entire passage as Jeremiah's. xvii. 12-18 dates from the reign of Jehoiakim and xviii, xix from the first five
years of the same reign. So also Eichhorn, Keil and Steuergagel.

Paul Volz assigns iv. 10, 19 to the first period of Jeremiah's ministry, he hesitates to locate xii. 1-6 definitely; the rest he assigns to the reign of Jehoiakim vii. 16, xi, xiv, xv, xvii. 14-18, xviii, 19-23, xx. 7-18. (70)

From the above synopsis of scholarly opinions it seems legitimate to draw two conclusions. One is that the two groups of passages, those dealing with Jeremiah's intercessions and those comprising his 'Confessions', date from the same general period of the prophet's experience. The other is that this period can be located at some time before 597 B. C., the year which saw the end of Jehoiakim's reign and the first capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. There is a good deal of uncertainty regarding one important passage; some scholars hesitate to assign chs. xiv, xv to any period; but even for these chapters the weight of opinion favours a date in Jehoiakim's reign. In taking a consensus of opinion it is safest not to venture a more definite date for the passage as a whole than before the year 597 B. C., but it is possible to say with definiteness that the passages in the book which reveal Jeremiah's inner struggle and divided loyalty come out of the period of his ministry before the first conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

5. The End of Inner Conflict

It follows from the dating of the passages under discussion that inner struggle and uncertainty were, as indeed we would expect to find, characteristic of Jeremiah's earlier experience as a prophet. Though his life after 597 was fully as difficult in the service of Yahweh as his life before that time, yet in that period he neither interceded for the people nor gave vent to complaints and personal animosities such as characterize his earlier ministry. The clash of loyalties, the obtrusion of personal
likes and dislikes into his prophet's work, came to an end at last in singleness of purpose and inner peace. God became to him at last in reality, what He had always been in theory, the tenour of his life and creator of his attitudes.

Two students of Jeremiah have, among others, called attention to this development. John Skinner found the key to Jeremiah's maturity in his "Confessions", the central interest of which he saw to be, what we have already observed, "the struggle in Jeremiah's mind between fidelity to his prophetic commission and the natural feelings and impulses of his heart" (71). He regards it as "not at all improbable" that this group, reflects Jeremiah's experience during the last twelve years of Josiah's reign. This, as we have noticed, is a very early date. In justification he says, "It seems to me that we can understand Jeremiah better if we think of the spiritual agony of the 'Confessions' as the Gethsemane, rather than the Calvary, of his life. When we behold the calm courage and self-possession with which he faces death and outrage and imprisonment under Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, we get the impression of a man whose inward struggles are over, who has emerged with the victory over himself, and braced for his closing part. And the marvellous lucidity and composure of his outlook on the future destiny of God's kingdom seems based on the knowledge of his own indissoluble relation to God, and the clear insight into the essentially religious constitution of human nature, which he gained largely through the experience which is enshrined in his 'Confessions'. (73).

A. B. Davidson, on the other hand, seems to have found the key to Jeremiah's maturity in his intercessions. He says, "with the first captivity under Jehoiachin and the accession of Zedekiah the period of Jeremiah's conflicts was over. God had conquered him and he acquiesced in
His will. He no more intercedes for the people, but bends his whole energies to induce them to yield to the decree of God, and subject themselves to the king of Babylon. This was his attitude both before the siege (chs. 27-29) and during it (21:1-10; 37; 38)." (74)

Skinner and Davidson agree in substance with each other and with the conclusion to which we have come, that the prophet emerged from uncertainty and inward conflict into fixed faith in God and a clearer message. Davidson is, according to the results of our investigation, on surer ground in dating the change later. His conclusion also commends itself in being based on more objective reasoning and in reading the crisis in Jeremiah's life in terms of his intercessions, which are the honest attempt of a deeply religious man to heal the differences between his nation and his God, rather than in terms of the "Confessions", which are the expression of personal maladjustment.


It has been shown that the intercessions, and also the other evidences of a weaker, human side of Jeremiah, disappear from his writings by 597 B.C. He had come, in other words, to the place in his experience which he have reason to believe Amos reached, following his vision of the plumbline. Jeremiah took a far longer time to attain his willingness to accept Yahweh's will for Judah and himself as right, no matter what it might involve. In the case of Amos we observed that his ending of intercession came in connection with the revelation of Yahweh's essential justice which required the judgment of an evil people, and that this became the heart of his message to Israel. Was there in Jeremiah, then, any corresponding revelation or deepening of message accompanying the final
adjustment to Yahweh's will which ended his intercessions? Yes, there was. The unifying of his life in unquestioning loyalty to Yahweh led to some very vital development in his message.

The Doom of the Nation.

For one thing, the end of intercession at Yahweh's command meant his own conviction that the judgment of the nation was inevitable. A. F. Kirkpatrick has suggested that while Josiah reigned, Jeremiah was hopeful of a successful reformation in Judah (75), that in Jehoiakim's reign he passed gradually from this hope to the conviction that Yahweh's terms of pardon would never be accepted; and finally from the fifth year of Jehoiakim he prophesied only sentences of judgment. "They are a people past praying for, and Jeremiah is forbidden to intercede for them any more.... The seventy years' duration of the Babylonian supremacy are now plainly proclaimed" (76). Certainly in the earlier years of his ministry Jeremiah preached both forgiveness, upon condition of repentance and amendment of life (77), and threats of judgment (78), while during the entire reign of Zedekiah his messages, so far as Jerusalem was concerned, were of judgment only (79). For Judah, as it was constituted after 597 B.C., its rulers, priests, prophets and people, there was no escape. The nation's doom was certain, at the hands of Yahweh's instrument, the Babylonian power. xxi. 9.

So evident is this change in Jeremiah's message that the increased stress upon judgment has been used to confirm the popular belief that he was above everything the prophet of "woe and gloom". But it would be cause for wonder if his conquest of fear and bitterness of feeling, and his unquestioning choice of Yahweh's will for himself and for his nation should have had no other reflection in his message than the negative one of severer judgment upon Israel.
The Personal Religion of an Individual Relation to God.

One positive result of Jeremiah’s conflict was the achieving of a harmonious personal relation with Yahweh. When he allowed himself to be persuaded at the first to take up the work of a prophet, a personal relationship with Yahweh was established into which the responsibility of loyalty entered. But Jeremiah cherished other loyalties besides this one - loyalties to his people and to himself. He must have had personal ambitions, even though they may have been only to live quietly on the family acres at Anathoth. As he spoke the messages of Yahweh, obedient to this new loyalty, he found himself becoming estranged from his people and losing the pleasures of life to which he had looked forward. He fought to retain them; he even quarrelled with Yahweh, as we saw. But each time he was forced back upon his God, apart from whose service he found no true satisfaction, and gradually as he consented more and more to Yahweh’s will for him, his life became transformed and took on a new loyalty and certainty and power. His religion was this personal, converting, strengthening fellowship with God.

This is not to say that prophets before him, men like Amos and Hosea, had failed to achieve a personal relationship with God. The prophetic office must always have required such a relationship. But Jeremiah, through the unique circumstances of his life, came to know God personally not only in the official capacity of prophet, but as an individual Israelite. In this particular sense he may well have been the first religious individual. And considering his own relation to God to be the normal right one for all men, he was led to see all religious life in the colours of his own amazing experience. The reality of that intimate relation with God was the one value in human experience which
transcended the hopeless condition of the Judah in which his days were spent.

A New Future for Israel.

Punishment of Judah was inevitable; when Jeremiah accepted this, God opened his eyes to a new future. When God had taught him how to walk in the difficult path of the present, he was able to direct his glance to the road far ahead. It will aid our understanding of Jeremiah's vision of the future to consider its religious and political aspects separately, though we recognize that to the prophet such a division was unnecessary. On the one hand the political aspect was a restoration of chastened Israelites to their own land; a restoration; that is, after a period of judgment in exile. For a time he conceived of this return in terms of the Northern Tribes, who had been broken by the Assyrians in B.C. 722 (80). For them Jeremiah, himself a native of Benjamin, had a sympathy which we can appreciate. This clemency of his message from Yahweh is in striking contrast with his contemporaneous attitude toward Judah. But after B.C. 597, it was the exiles in Babylonia, already feeling the whip of their God, who received messages of hope, though Jacob was not forgotten. To these exiles in Babylon he gave Yahweh's definite promise of glorious restoration to their own land (61). We see, then, that for the people among whom he lived, who had not felt the chastening sting of judgment, his messages were consistently of woe and destruction; but for those upon whom the blow had fallen, whether children of Jacob or Judah, he had explicit promises of forgiveness and return.

Though this political aspect of his vision of the future was of the greatest historic importance, the religious or spiritual aspect has an even higher value. Within the frame of a restored Israel was set a
religious community upon a new basis. In the new religious order the intimate, personal relation with God, which had been given him at the cost of so much inner conflict and agony, was to be the possession of every person. The marvelous passage which follows is the best depiction of this prophecy. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord, But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people: And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." (82). When to this we add from other passages which have the same prophetic theme, Jeremiah's doctrines of strictly personal moral responsibility in that future Israel (83), of the new nation's perpetual loyalty (84) and of their spontaneous confession of sin and sincere desire for the "everlasting covenant" (85), the prophecy is complete. Between the repentant, forgiven Israel of twelve tribes reunited and Yahweh, the only God, there is to be a perfect relationship, founded upon the new covenant of individual hearts. This bond is never to be broken; this relationship is never to be clouded by misunderstanding.

God, in the future, in His own future, was to create a nation of wholly opposite character from the nation which Jeremiah knew. That
obedient nation was to have permanent forgiveness and re-instatement in
the divine favour, though the present nation was doomed to the judgment
of defeat and exile. All the benefits for which he used to pray so con­
tantly and piteously, the intercessions which had been refused because
they were wrongly conceived, were to be granted in the future. What
was altogether impossible, even to God, in the circumstances of the pre­
sent was to become the very texture of all life in that new day.

Are we dealing here with an unsound dream? How could Jeremiah
legitimately preach this message which seemed a contradiction of his
own experience? The answer is that there was in his experience precise­
ly that knowledge upon which God could build this revelation of future
religion. He knew how God had remoulded his own character to the measure
of His will. He was conscious of agreement with God, corresponding some­
what with the new covenant of the future. He believed that true religion
was a personal transforming relation with God, and that the new religious
society should be made up of individuals having the same inner covenant
experience. It was a sound faith, founded upon the knowledge that what
God had done once in him He could do again in all men.

7. Summary

To sum up our conclusions concerning the part played by interces­sion in the religion of Jeremiah, we saw that it was an expression of
his sympathy for Judah entering the peculiarly intimate relation with
Yahweh which he had as a prophet. Because intercession conflicted with
moral fact working out in Yahweh's necessary judgment upon a corrupt
people, it could not be righteously granted. We saw that there were, be­sides this, other conflicts within Jeremiah, all of them involving in
some manner his prophet's loyalty to Yahweh. These were not a permann­
te feature of his religious experience, but represented, rather, a stage
which came to an end when he achieved inner harmony through full acquiescence in Yahweh's will. This change had taken place at a time—in all probability, previous to the first captivity in B.C. 597.

This experience was Jeremiah's adjustment to an intimate relation with God. It was the door by which he reached the capacity to see a new Israel of the future, composed of those in whose hearts a new covenant was written. With such a vision he prophesied confidently that God would give the very benefits which in the present time he had not been able to secure by his intercessions. But it was by his acceptance of God's denial of his intercessions and the deeper loyalty to God which this involved that Jeremiah became capable of faith in a holier future for Israel.
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CHAPTER V

EZEKIEL AND INTERCESSION

1. The Prophet, His Times, Message, and Mission.

By one of the paradoxes of faith, Ezekiel, who witnessed the break-up of his nation and was himself caught in its wreck, was yet the prophet of an absolutely sovereign God, who ordered human history to the end that Israel and all the nations should know that He was the Lord. In contrast with the prophet Jeremiah who ushered out the old order of Israelite national life, his young contemporary stood at the beginning of the exile period, "in which the Jewish nation seemed to stand between two worlds, 'one dead, one powerless to be born.' That what was best in the old revived, and that the new really did come to birth, was the result of Ezekiel's activity." (1).

When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem in 597 B.C. and deported into Babylonia the upper stratum of the population (2), Ezekiel was among those carried away. He was of the priestly aristocracy, "in all probability...of the family of Zadok." (3), and his perfect familiarity with the rites of temple ceremony suggests that he may have officiated as a priest in the temple worship. In any case, this priestly background, unlike that of Jeremiah, had a profound influence upon his conception of religion. Indeed, it is suggested that he was as much priest as prophet, and he has been called "the priest in prophet's clothing." (4). The opinion of Josephus that he was a youth when the captivity
took place (5), is generally doubted; instead, it is supposed that he
was in his early manhood. (6) He settled down among the captives by
the "river" Chebar, living with the rest of them a reasonably normal, un-
restricted life, in his own house (7), with his wife (8). It was in
these circumstances that he was called to be a prophet (9), and carried
on his prophetic ministry.

His call came when the exile had endured five years, in 595 B.C.
In a vision more rich in imagery and symbolism than the vision through
which Isaiah experienced his call, in which God was pictured more tran-
scendently, he was called to a task nearer to the hearts of men than
any other prophet's. Yahweh made him "a watchman unto the house of
Israel", to be responsible to Him for the souls of the people (10). He
was the pastor of the exiles, an office new to prophets. The growth
of personal religion, noted in connection with Isaiah and Jeremiah, was
brought to a new stage in the work and teaching of Ezekiel. The cir-
cumstances of the nation's downfall and the exile created the need and
the opportunity for faith which could endure because it was built into
the hearts of men. (11). But his commission to prophesy included not
only the Jewish exiles, and not even these and the remnant in Judah,
but the whole house of Israel. (12).

The Book of Ezekiel is made up of two equal divisions of twenty
four chapters each, corresponding to the two periods of his ministry:
597 B.C. to 586, and 586 to 572. The material in the book is arranged
chronologically. The first part is on the whole severe and threaten-
ing in character, dealing principally with the destruction of Jerusa-
lem and the nation, though it contains a number of references to a
remnant and the restitution (13). The second part has a kindlier tone
and prophesies of reconstruction and the new Israel. (14).
If the ignominy of Megiddo had been a test of faith, the conquest and captivity of 597 proved a far more crucial test. Many of those who went into exile must have felt disillusioned regarding the power of their God, who had not been able to protect His people. For them the temptation was great to worship the gods of the conquerors and, living as they did the normal life of inhabitants of Babylonia, to lose their Israelite identity, as the exiles of the Northern Kingdom had done. Those who remained faithful to Yahweh in exile, regarded themselves as superior to the part of the nation left in Judah; yet they believed that there could be no true worship of Yahweh apart from the temple and altar in Jerusalem, and looked for an early catastrophic political change to vindicate their faith in their God and restore them to their former position in the land. On the other hand, the remnant in Judah seem to have felt at times that they were the object of Yahweh's special favour, in contrast to the exiles who had incurred His wrath and punishment; but at other times, when they were following their inclination to idolatry and violence, they claimed that Yahweh had forsaken their land and no longer regarded them (15).

Ezekiel's interpretation of the course of his nation's history was wholly different, corresponding to his different conception of God. Yahweh is the only God, in an absolute sense, and all the nations are under His power (16). His holiness abhors every kind of filth and uncleanness, whether moral or physical (17), and those nations and people who sin against His holiness are inevitably punished. But He "has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth", and promises life to every one who keeps His judgments and statutes (18). Ezekiel taught that man's relation to God was an individual one (19), but he made more use of the
customary conception of the nation's unity speaking in most instances to the nation. Unlike earlier prophets, he taught that the chosen nation Israel had always rebelled against Yahweh's will (20), and now it was necessary for Him to destroy His temple which they had profaned by their idolatries, and cleanse the land which they had defiled (21). When He had done this by the agency of the Babylonian power (22). He would, when forty years of exile had elapsed (23), restore the obedient part of the people (24) to their old land and create of them a nation with a new spirit, bound to Him by an everlasting covenant (25), and ruled by a king called "my servant David." (26) "He looks," says Kautzsch, "to the establishment of a priestly state, whose chief aim shall be the conserving of the holiness of God." (27). All these events of the fall and rise of Israel are the acts of a sovereign and holy Lord, which He does, not for their sake, but for His own name's sake (28), that they and all the nations may know Him as He is, when he sanctifies Himself before them (29). For Yahweh is self-contained in His perfect righteousness and holiness, punishing sin against His laws and creating new hearts for reasons inherent in His divine nature. Here is the doctrine of Amos' carried to its ultimate conclusion.

In contrast to Jeremiah, Ezekiel gives little evidence in his writings of the inner struggle of human sympathy against the severity of divine decrees. From the beginning of his ministry until the end the principle of Yahweh's sovereignty was the tone of his prophecy. It may be, as Skinner has suggested, (30), that his thoroughgoing adherence to this principle was partly due to familiarity with the writings of Jeremiah whereby he benefited by the older prophet's conflicts. But a certain austerity and self-contained detachment from the crises
of national life were the natural reasons why he accepted the severity of Yahweh's will for His people so readily.

2. Ezekiel's Intercessions.

In this Book of Ezekiel the following passages are relevant to our subject: ix. 8, xi. 13, xiv. 12-23, xxii. 30. All of them occur in the first part of the book, the part containing prophecies which antedated the fall of Jerusalem. The temple was still standing and Judah was still a nation. The first two are intercessions by the prophet in one of his visions; the others are statements which have some bearing upon intercession.

The intercessions in ix. 8 and xi. 13.

In the sixth year, i.e. 591 B.C., as Ezekiel sat in his house with the elders of Judah before him, he had a vision (31). The spirit of God took him by a lock of his head and brought him to the temple in Jerusalem where he found "the glory of the God of Israel", and was shown the "abominations" which the house of Israel committed there (32). Then as he was observing these things, Yahweh confided to him His purpose to deal unsparingly with the degenerate inhabitants of Jerusalem. He said, "And though they cry in mine ears with a loud voice, yet will I not hear them." (33). He called aloud for the six men with destroying weapons who had charge of the city and the man with the writer's inkhorn. The latter He commanded to put a mark on the forehead of all who had protested against the "abominations", and the former He commanded to slay all who did not have the mark. "Slay utterly the old man, the young man and the maiden, and the little children and women; but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my sanctuary."
Then they began at the ancient men which were before the house. And he said unto them Defile the house, and fill the courts with the slain: go ye forth. And they went forth, and smote in the city. And it came to pass, while they were smiting, and I was left, that I fell upon my face, and cried, and said, Ah Lord God! wilt thou destroy all the residue of Israel in thy pouring out of thy fury upon Jerusalem?" (34).

In Ezekiel's cry are joined the horror of the evil itself and his pity for "the old man, the young man and the maiden, and the little children and women", his fellow-Israelites. His words, "Wilt thou destroy all the residue of Israel?" are not simply a question. They are an appeal to the mercy of God. (35). They seem to issue out of the prophet's fear that the doom which in the vision has overtaken every worshipper in the temple, will be as complete through the city and the whole land. It is an outcome which he seems not to have contemplated, as though he still associated the creation of a new people with the remnant of Judah, (36).

The answer of Yahweh to the intercession was a re-statement of His purpose to punish the people for their wickedness. "The iniquity of the house of Israel and Judah is exceeding great, and the land is full of blood, and the city full of the wrestling of judgment; for they say, The Lord hath forsaken the earth, and the Lord seeth not. And as for me also, mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have pity, but I will bring their way upon their head." (37). Judah has put Yahweh with His laws of conduct out of its mind, considering Him, perhaps, to have been overcome by foreign deities in the conquest of 597 B.C., or to have withdrawn Himself from their sphere of life. (38). This lack of faith and the evil life which resulted from it were Yahweh's reasons for destroying
them. They had judged themselves; they had put themselves in opposition
to Him; He only "brings their way upon their head." As Ezekiel listened
to this answer to his prayer, the man with the writer's inkhorn returned
to say that he had done as he had been commanded. The punishment was
completed; and the prophet's intercession had been without effect.

In the second part of the same vision the spirit brought Ezekiel
to the "east gate of the Lord's house", above which the "glory of the
God of Israel" hovered in the act of withdrawing from His place in the
Temple. (39). There the prophet saw twenty five rulers and leaders of
the people (40), of the anti-Babylonia party (41), among them Jaazaniah and
Pelatiah, princes of the people, whose counsel was, "The time is not
near to build houses: this city is the caldron, and we be the flesh."
(42). This seems to mean that they advocated devoting every resource
to military enterprise, trusting with a sort of desperate courage that
the caldron, their city, would protect them from the fire. (43). The
fire of war attendant upon the plotted revolt having been kindled, the
pot was the place of safety. As Ezekiel watched these intriguers who
had forgot Yahweh, he was commanded by the sovereign God to prophesy
a very different future. In the divine purpose the only flesh left in
the caldron, which was the city, would be the bodies of the victims of
their factional strife, while they, who feared the sword, would fall
by the sword far beyond the caldron's protection, "in the border of
Israel." "I will judge you in the border of Israel; and ye shall know
that I am the Lord: for ye have not walked in my statutes, neither have
ye executed my judgments, but have done after the ordinances of the
nations that are round about you." (44).
"And it came to pass, when I prophesied, that Palatiah the son of Beoalah died. Then fell I down upon my face, and cried with a loud voice, and said, Ah Lord God! wilt thou make a full end of the remnant of Israel?" The posture and words of the intercession are almost exactly like those of ix. 8. He felt the same concern for the "remnant, as though it still bulked large in his picture of the people's final redemption.

In Yahweh's former answer He only re-emphasized the judgment upon Judah. This time, turning His back upon Judah, He sent a special message to the Israelites in exile. "Son of man, thy brethren, even thy brethren, the men of thy kindred, and all the house of Israel, all of them are they unto whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said, Get you far from the Lord (45), unto us is the land given for a possession. Therefore say, Thus saith the Lord God: Whereas I have removed them far off among the nations, and whereas I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them a sanctuary for a little while in the countries where they are come." (46). Yahweh concludes His answer with a repetition of His principle of retribution based upon personal responsibility: "But as for those whose heart walketh after the heart of their detestable things and their abominations, I will bring their way upon their own heads." (47). Finally, the glory of the Lord rose up and departed from Jerusalem and rested upon the mountain east of the city, the Mount of Olives; and the Lord's prophet was restored to Chaldea.

Again, as with Amos and Jeremiah, we find Yahweh refusing His prophet's intercession for the nation. It was a denial after the manner of Amos' third vision, rather than the sharp commands which at last silenced Jeremiah; it was a refusal which instructed, and brought a new revelation to the prophet. It is significant that Ezekiel should intercede; he did
not have Jeremiah's degree of tender sympathy. His loathing of idolatry and violence would scarcely seem to warrant intercession for those who were suffering for these evils; yet he does intercede. It is also significant that his intercessions should be rejected. In the experience of these three canonical prophets intercession for the nation has ceased to be a means of influencing God and begins to look, rather, as a means by which God influenced His prophets. Thus, oddly enough, it is not the intercessions of these prophets themselves which are most significant for the study of prophetic intercession, but the replies of God.

The account of the vision in which the intercessions occur begins, "And it came to pass...as I sat in mine house, and the elders of Judah sat before me, that the hand of the Lord God fell there upon me." (48).

Ewald has reconstructed the scene by supposing that word had just reached the elders of the exiles that their fellows in Judah no longer considered that they had a place in the nation, and in their distress of mind had sought out the prophet of Yahweh to hear, if possible, some reassuring message. Whether this be true or not, it would seem that by the time of this vision the exiles knew that they were disowned by the Jews in the homeland and that the door was shut upon any restoration such as they had contemplated. (49).

It would seem, also, that at the time of the vision Ezekiel understood Yahweh's will for the nation's future, whatever that future might be, to involve the preservation of a remnant of Judah (50). Both they and the exiles were important, equally important, in the divine plan. This explains the prophet's concern for the remnant in Judah. The two intercessions ask the same question, "Wilt thou destroy all the residue of Israel?" and "Wilt thou make a full end of the remnant of Israel?"
"Residue" and "remnant" are the same word, יִשְׂרָאֵל (51). It refers to the part of the people of Israel still left in the land, still held to be essential in Ezekiel's schemes for the future.

But this was not in the purpose of Yahweh, and in replying to His prophet's intercessions He revealed what the future really held for Israel. His first answer simply tells of the iniquity of the people and states His purpose to "bring their way upon their head", but the second contains some very significant ideas. It makes, for the first time, a distinction between the remnant in Judah and the people in exile, rejecting the former and giving the latter the central place in Yahweh's plan for the future. They, the exiles, have felt His punishment and have been scattered among the nations, but He will be their sanctuary for a little while, until the time is ripe for their new life. Then, also, for the first time in the book, the exiles' restoration is affirmed. Yahweh will return them to the homeland and they will cleanse it of idolatries. He will put a new spirit within them and thereafter they will keep His statues. But as for the idolaters who now dwell in the land, they will be swept away.

Reference to the synopsis of Ezekiel's doctrine in the introduction that these are, to this chapter will show, in brief, this prophet's essential teachings. Without reading too much into this answer of Yahweh it would seem to be a legitimate interpretation that here we have the turning point in Ezekiel's prophetic ministry. When his sympathy and patriotism expressed themselves along the line of his own preconceived ideas, as he was faced with what appeared to be the annihilation of the "remnant", Yahweh denied his intercession, but filled the vacancy left by the denial with His own true purpose. Ezekiel now began to see the return of the
exiles, their personal re-creation and perfect obedience to divine statutes and ordinances. "They shall be my people," says Yahweh, "and I will be their God." From these seed ideas of revelation grew the rest of the constructive teaching of the book. The rest was but the elaboration of these.

The significance of xiv, 12-23 and xxii, 30

These two passages, forming a group by themselves, need to be examined because of their relation to intercession. The first of these is addressed to the exiles in Babylon for their instruction, and begins, "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, when a land sinneth against me by committing a trespass, and I stretch out my hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof, and send famine upon it, and cut off from it man and beast; though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God." There follow similar statements regarding these three men in the case of Yahweh's judgments by "noisome beasts, sword and pestilence." The four instances given would to be seen/hypothetical, and intended to clothe a principle. The three names carried their associations primarily of great personal righteousness (52) but also of power with God to deliver others (53), in the cases of Daniel and Job by their intercessions, though in this passage it is their righteousness which is stressed. In the present crisis the presence of these three righteous men would save "neither sons nor daughters", and would but deliver their own souls. The principle involved is that the time is past, when a nation can be delivered by the presence in it of righteous men; that now the fate of the individual must be determined by
the quality of his own life, and the fate of the nation by the quality of the lives of its citizens.

The prophet proceeds to apply this principle to Judah. "For thus saith the Lord God: How much more when I send my four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword, and the famine, and the noisome beasts, and the pestilence, to cut off from it man and beast?" (54). The accumulated force of the four instances smashes home the truth that Jerusalem, which possesses not even Moab, Daniel and Job, faces inevitable destruction. Jeremiah had shown that neither his own fervent intercessions, nor the intercessions of Moses and Samuel, had they been alive, could stay divine judgment. It was also Ezekiel's experience that intercession was unavailing. It is declared that the power of human righteousness would be equally unavailing, that even the most righteous men in Hebrew history, were they in Judah, could but save themselves. (55) Does this have any bearing upon intercession? At first glance it would appear to be concerned solely with the power of human righteousness. It was characteristic of Ezekiel to fix upon righteousness; his priestly leaning was to the tangible in religion. Whereas to Jeremiah the desperate condition of the nation was most vividly expressed by the ineffectuality of the mediations of the greatest intercessors, to Ezekiel the most vivid expression of this same condition was by the failure of the most righteous men to save any but their own lives by their mediation. Intercession, therefore, was not uppermost in this prophet's mind, but we may dare (since it had a place both in his own experience and in that of two of the three men whom he names, according to Old Testament accounts), to include intercession among the ineffectual means available to these righteous characters in seeking the salvation of others. I believe that the principle here stated by Ezekiel teaches indirectly the fruitlessness of inter-
session for the nation by anyone.

Yet no sooner is this principle stated than it is followed by another, that though man's intercessions and righteousness are of no avail, Yahweh's sovereign power can do what He pleases (56). By His power a remnant shall be preserved, both sons and daughters, and brought to Babylon to teach the exiles by their wickedness the necessity behind Judah's overthrow. "And they shall comfort you, when ye see their way and their doings: and ye shall know that I have not done without cause all that I have done in it, saith the Lord God." (57) God is sovereign, and His purposes, which are righteous, are above the influence of any man.

In the prophecies of the seventh year, 590 B.C., in a passage where Yahweh is summarizing His complaint against each class of people in Judah - against prophets, priests, princes and common people, appear these words, "And I sought for a man among them that should make up the fence, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none. Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath; their own way have I brought upon their heads, saith the Lord God." (58). The passage raises two questions: first, does this teaching contradict xiv. 14, where it is said that the three righteous men save only themselves, and, second, is the "man" referred to an intercessor? Davidson has remarked "A 'man' here is not a man to intercede, but a man to interpose, to stem the tide of ruin and turn the fortunes of the people. The moral energies of the nation were wholly exhausted; it could no more put forth out of itself a saviour to retrieve its fortunes."(59).

The words, "I sought for a man", suggest that Yahweh expected to
find such a man, that He had a right to find such a man in Judah. When
this is compared with Jer. v. 1, we find that Jeremiah was familiar with
the thought that a search through the city discovered no just man for
whose sake Jerusalem could be spared. Neither Ezekiel nor Jeremiah can
be speaking of an actual intercessor, or Jeremiah himself would have
saved the city. Some other meaning is intended. If it is a righteous
man, the passage contradicts xiv. 14. If it is a leader of the people,
another Josiah, to reform the character of the nation, there is thought
to be no contradiction (60). But in no case does it seem legitimate to
interpret the "man" as an intercessor (61).

3. Conclusion.

Again in Ezekiel intercession takes a form which would be unexpec­
ted had it not been encountered already in Amos, and Jeremiah. Con­
trary to tradition the intercessions themselves were refused, or rather
ignored. Not only so, but by inference intercession for Israel by any­
one was shown to be useless to stay or avert judgment from Judah. Never­
theless, when Ezekiel interceded, though Yahweh gave no regard to the
intercessions themselves, yet He used the occasion to open to His prophet
for the first time the marvellous future in store for Israel. He gave
him at that time the sketch from which the magnificent plans for the new
nation were later drawn, especially in the second half of the book. It
was as though the act of intercession found the prophet in the spirit
for this new vision.

In his writings Ezekiel reveals very little of his personal life, -
less than any of the greater prophets. With his cool reserve he is the
opposite type of man from Jeremiah, and even his intercessions reveal this
characteristic. One wonders that such a man should have been called to
be the pastor of the exiles; not one of his prayers for them is given. Perhaps these and other problems will be clearer when we have completed our study.
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CHAPTER VI

ADDITIONAL TEACHING

ON PROPHETIC INTERCESSION FROM THE PERIOD OF CANONICAL PROPHECY

Up to this point we have found prophetic intercession presented by the Old Testament in two different ways. On the one hand, the earlier historical sources represent their prophets as praying to Yahweh for individuals, both Israelite and alien, and for the nation Israel, with uniform success. This is what we should expect to find on the basis of the prophet’s intimate relation with Yahweh and the fundamental teachings of Old Testament theology which were reviewed in our opening chapter. The other representation is, in important respects, of a different character. In each case it is prayer for Israel which has brought itself under Yahweh’s judgment, and in each case, except in the first two visions of Amos, it is not successful. Yet though these intercessions, with the exceptions noted, fail in their attempt to win forgiveness for the sinning nation, they are closely connected in each prophet’s experience with the origin of certain of his most distinctive teachings.

How is this difference to be explained? Does it represent progress in prophetic intercession, whereby the second type superseded the first and caused a desistance from intercession among the canonical prophets? By an examination of the remaining cases of intercession from the period of canonical prophecy it will be possible to answer these questions.

1. Hezekiah’s Request for the Intercession of Isaiah,

In II K. xviii. 15 – xix. 37 and Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii is told the story of an invasion of Judah by Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.) during the reign
of Hezekiah and the prophetic ministry of Isaiah (1). The account begins: "Now it came to pass in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, that Sennacherib king of Assyria came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them." (2). The occasion for this punishment was Judah's part in the general revolt against Assyrian rule, arranged by Merodach-baladan at the death of Sargon. The prophet Isaiah had opposed this revolt from the first (3), for the nation whose God Yahweh was had need of no other defence (4). But when, in spite of the payment by Hezekiah of the heavy fine imposed by Sennacherib (5), the Assyrian added the demand that the city itself be surrendered, Isaiah turned to support Hezekiah against the insolent invader and to teach the inviolability of Yahweh's city (6).

In the account of this incident it is said that when Hezekiah heard of the Assyrian demand for surrender, "he sent Eliakim, who was over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and the elders of the priests, covered with sackcloth, unto Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz. And they said unto him, Thus saith Hezekiah, This day is a day of trouble, and of rebuke, and of contumely.... It may be the Lord thy God will hear the words of Babshakeh, whom the king of Assyria his master hath sent to reproach the living God, and will rebuke the words which the Lord thy God hath heard; therefore lift up thy prayer for the remnant that is left." (7).

Hezekiah was himself a righteous man; in the eyes of the Jewish historian he was a model of kingly virtue and piety (8), and when he had sent his imposing delegation to the prophet he also interceded for the city (9). But the prayers of Isaiah the prophet are represented as being of a far more efficacious sort; for not only does the king speak of Yahweh as peculiarly Isaiah's God, but the answer to Hezekiah's
intercession comes to him through the mouth of the prophet (10). The difference between them was simply the difference between a good man and a prophet; the latter had an access to God which was denied to other men. Isaiah was recognized as beyond question the greatest prophet of his day, and therefore the one who stood closest to Yahweh. Israel had received messages from its God through him for a generation. For the most part they had been unheeded, but in this grave crisis, when diplomacy and kindred human efforts had failed, the leader of the nation sent this influential group of men, including, let it be noted, the "elders of the priests", to ask Isaiah for his intercessions. This is not only a recognition of Isaiah's power as intercessor, but also an indication that intercession was associated with the prophet as one of the functions of his office.

The narrative does not say that Isaiah prayed for the nation; it says only that when the king's messengers made their request he had an answer from Yahweh ready for them: "Be not afraid of the words that thou hast heard, wherewith the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me. Behold, I will put a spirit in him, and he shall hear a rumour, and shall return unto (K. to) his own land; and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own land." (11). Whether the prophet had already interceded for Jerusalem or not, at this juncture he already had an answer from Yahweh that He would redeem the city. It should be noted, finally, that the king's deputation went to Isaiah "covered with sackcloth", confessing to the prophet, "This day is a day of trouble (12), and of re­buoke, and of contumely (13). These, in the chief men of the nation, may be taken as an admission of error, a change of heart on the part of the leaders (14), and an expression of their willingness to obey the word of Yahweh in the future. With these credentials they approached the
prophet to win his intercessions.

It is evident that in this case we are dealing with intercession like that in chapter two. We have again taken up the thread of the more conventional teaching on this subject.

2. Secondary References in Jeremiah

The first of these is found in Jer. xxvii. 18.

Early in the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah enunciated the principle that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was Yahweh's servant, into whose hands He had by His sovereign power given for a time the whole group of nations in the western Fertile Crescent (15). Let Judah, therefore, preserve its life and continue in possession of its lands by serving Nebuchadnezzar, and let it not listen to those false prophets who counselled it to revolt from Babylon (16). In view of the prediction of the other prophets that the vessels of Yahweh's house, taken to Babylon in 597 B.C., would very shortly be returned, he gave a special word of admonition to "the priests and all the people", saying, "Harken not unto them; serve the king of Babylon, and live: wherefore should this city become a desolation? But if they be prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of hosts, that the vessels which are left in the house of the Lord, and in the house of the king of Judah, and at Jerusalem, go not to Babylon." (17)

According to conclusions to which we formerly came, this was the period in Jeremiah's experience when he was becoming convinced (18), of the inevitability of judgment and, as a consequence, of the impropriety of his own intercessions. In the reference before us, we see that in spite of the commands to desist with which his own intercessions had been met, he still regarded intercession as a legitimate, even as an obligatory, function of the true prophet. Jeremiah seems to suggest,
first, that it is a prophet's duty to intercede (in this case for the safety of certain vessels in Jerusalem), if his convictions are consistent with intercession (19). But the more obvious inference is, second, that the truth of a prophet's favourable prediction can be tested by a favourable answer to his intercessions. These other prophets and their prophesying Jeremiah brands as false; yet if they be true prophets, in possession of the word of Yahweh, they will be vindicated by the result of their intercessions, because the predictions which they have made are of such a character that, if they be true, Yahweh will certainly regard their prayers for them. A note of sarcasm similar to Elijah's in I K. xviii. 27, can be detected in Jeremiah's proposal: let them not pray for the vessels already carried away, let them merely exert themselves to keep the vessels which remain; that will be enough of a test. His own prophecy is the contrary one that even these remaining vessels shall be carried away as spoil to Babylon. The event itself will prove which of them is right.

Nowhere else in the Old Testament, to my knowledge, is successful intercession made the test of a prophet's messages. It is, indeed, a rather strange test to use, and its use here would be hard to explain were we not already aware of the great part which intercession played in Jeremiah's deepest experience. This reference furnishes a very valuable addition to our study of that experience; for it shows that Yahweh's commands to cease intercession did not mean that henceforth all prayer for others was wrong and forbidden, but only intercession which conflicted with the "word" and revealed purposes and, therefore, with the character of Yahweh. In this instance the prophets who opposed Jeremiah were challenged to intercede, indeed were under obli-
gation to intercede, because what they claimed to be the revealed purpose of Yahweh invited intercession. In the light of Jeremiah's own experience it is perfectly clear why he proposed this test.

Other references to intercession are found in the Book of Jeremiah in xxxvii. 3 and xlii. They are requests made to the prophet for his intercessions.

The first reads, "And Zedekiah the king sent Jehucal the son of Shelamiah, and Zephaniah the son of Maaseiah the priest, to the prophet Jeremiah, saying, Pray now unto the Lord our God for us." This occurred during the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, when the approach of Pharaoh Hophra's army (c. 588–569 B.C.) and the temporary lifting of the siege seemed to justify the shallow optimism that Jerusalem was delivered from the Chaldeans. It was also before Jeremiah had been put in confinement. The two messengers were, like those sent to Isaiah on a similar mission, men of importance in Judah. (20) This was a mark of the respect in which the prophet was held, and the importance attached to the success of this mission -- i.e., the securing of his intercessions. It is difficult to understand, however, why Zedekiah should have sent this delegation to the pro-Babylonian prophet at a time when all his predictions seemed to have miscarried and the hopes of his opponents were high. Cornill (21), explains it as a taunt of Zedekiah; but this is neither in keeping with that king's timid character nor with his dependence upon Jeremiah at other times (22). Indeed, a little later in this same period of the raising of the siege, Zedekiah had him brought out of prison for a secret interview and asked him the characteristic question, "is there any word from the Lord?" (23). There need be no doubt that in xxxvii. 3 Zedekiah was really anxious to secure the intercessions of Jeremiah.

The reference in chapter 42 is another request for the prophet's
intercession. Jerusalem had been taken, Nebuchadnezzar had placed a Jewish governor named Gedaliah over the remnant left in Judah with his seat of government at Mizpah, where Jeremiah also chose to live (24). But an ambitious Jew, Ishmael the son of Nathaniah, murdered Gedaliah and other leaders, at the instigation of the king of Ammon (25); and the rest of the people, from fear of Babylonian reprisal, took up their residence close to friendly Egypt. There at Geruth Chimham they sought Jeremiah's aid to find what Yahweh wanted them to do. "Then all the captains of the forces, and Johanan the son of Kareah, and Jezaniah the son of Hoshaiah, and all the people from the least even unto the greatest, came near, and said unto Jeremiah the prophet, Let, we pray thee, our supplication be accepted before thee, and pray for us unto the Lord thy God, even for all this remnant; for we are left but a few of many, as thine eyes do behold us: that the Lord thy God may shew us the way in which we should walk, and the thing that we should do." That they turned to Jeremiah in this way is an evidence of the regard which the complete vindication of his message had won for him. As in Isa. xxxvii. 2-4, they refer to Yahweh as Isaiah's rather than their own God. The benefit which they desired from Him was right guidance in their exceedingly difficult position.

With the former of these requests for prayer Jeremiah was prevented from complying by the inner experiences which we have studied in our fourth chapter. In response to the second request he prayed for guidance and received it "after ten days" (26), only to find that the people had already made up their minds to follow a different course of action. As xxxvii. 18 showed, Jeremiah believed that Yahweh's commands forbade only certain intercessions; in this case it was right for him to pray for the people. These two references, like others already observed, reveal a be-
lief current among the people of Judah that the prophet was one with a special power of intercession. As he was the one by whom messages came from Yahweh, so also he was the one who had an approach to Him which was denied to others.

3. Intercession in Isaiah XL - LXVI

In the latter part of the Book of Isaiah five passages are found which bear upon our subject from various angles. These are liii. 12, lix. 16, lxii. 6, 7, lxiii. 5, lxiii. 7 - lxiv. 11. Some consideration will be given to each of these.

The Servant of Yahweh and Intercession. Isa. liii. 12.

At the end of the last and best-known of the four "Servant Songs" in Deutero-Isaiah (27), appears a phrase which in the RV is translated, "Yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." According to this translation, the prophet is summing up the redemptive work of Yahweh's despised and mistreated but finally vindicated Servant by saying that his life of obedience and suffering atoned for the sin of many transgressors, for whom he had also made intercession to Yahweh. If this translation be correct, it is indeed significant that the intercessory work of the Servant should be given this prominence; but since this is not the only possible translation, it will be necessary to answer two questions before incorporating the teaching of this passage into our study. The first of these is, What is the meaning of נָאָה? and the second is, Who is the servant of Yahweh?

In the first place, then, נָאָה has been interpreted by some to mean "to intercede" (28), and by others "to interpose." (29) The argument is not conclusive in favour of either meaning, and one feels after examining it that the traditional application of the phrase to Jesus
Christ has influenced both those who render it "intercede" (30) and, in reaction to this interpretation, those who render it "interpose" (31). The thought parallelism of the poetical construction asks nothing more than, "He bare the sin of many, and substituted for the transgressors."

It seems to me to be the strongest argument in favour of this reading that it reproduces the verse form most common in the section. But, on the other hand, the introduction of a new, but related, idea was used, as in v. 9, with greater effect, and there is ground for supposing this to be the case in v. 12. That הָעַבֶּד denotes some form of interposition or mediation, all seem to agree. The question is whether the Servant interposed himself, as the faithful and obedient Servant of Yahweh, or whether he interposed his prayers for the people. If the former meaning be taken, it is merely the final statement of a thought already stated several times in the chapter. If we take the other meaning, it adds a new element to the picture of the Servant; for the first time it says that he mediated, not only by his life and works, but by his intercessions. The choice which one makes of one of these meanings will be determined largely by whether he considers this new thought an intrusion or a valuable addition to the sense.

In view of this division of opinion, it is not possible to speak dogmatically for either meaning; but for the following reasons there is a certain degree of probability in favour of the translation "to intercede." In the first place הָעַבֶּד can certainly have this meaning (32). In the second place, there seems to be logical and almost necessary connection in Old Testament religion between mediation by act and mediation by prayer, as we remarked in connection with Ezek. xxii. 30. The way in which God was conceived, and the tradition of intercession in Israel and especially among the prophets seem to require intercession
in any mediator. It may not be too far-fetched to recall, in this con-
nection, the duality of act and prayer in the intercessions of Samuel,
Elijah and Eliahu, and the relation of intercession and power to inter-
pose in Abraham and Moses (33). If Jeremiah were in any sense a proto-
type of the Servant (34), his intercessions must have been as well known
to the author of this passage as his sufferings. It is also somewhat
significant that in the story of the seven martyr brothers in II Macc.
vii. 37, 38 (35), and again in the story of the martyrdom of Eleazar in IV
Macc. vi. 28, 29 (36), there occurs precisely this combination of media-
torial act and intercession. We see, then, that entirely apart from the
crucifixion of Christ, there is in Hebrew religious thought this associ-
ation of prayer with act which would have made it very natural for the
prophet to have written, as the completion of the thought of the chapter,
"and made intercession for the transgressors."

The second problem has to do with the identity of the Servant of
Yahweh (37). Very many suggestions have been offered. Those who have
identified the Servant with a group have applied it to the whole people
of Israel (38), to the pious and faithful element of Israel, to the pro-
phetic order and to the ideal Israel. Those who prefer to identify the
Servant with an individual have suggested a number of possibilities: on
the one hand, some contemporary of the prophetic writer — an otherwise
unknown teacher of the Law, Jehoiachin, Zerubbabel, or his son Meshullam
(39), or on the other hand, the ideal individual, the Messiah. The
problem is not one which can be discussed with profit here, since it does
not greatly affect our conclusions; but of all the interpretations which
have been offered it seems to me that George Adam Smith's is the most
sound. He believes that at times the Servant signifies the whole peo-
ple, as in xli. 8, at times the godly element of Israel, as in xlix. 3–6
and in liii. 13 - liii probably an individual (40).

Though our answers to the two problems are not above question, we can now proceed with the discussion more intelligently. As in Jeremiah and Ezekiel we observed that when Yahweh's judgment began to fall in 597 and 586 B.C., the prophets' message began to change from sin and chastisement to the creation by Yahweh's redemptive power of a new corporate and individual Israel, so also this part of the Book of Isaiah prophesies principally, not of judgment, but of its sequel—the day of Yahweh's redemption and restoration. To this prophet God is more completely sovereign than He was even to Ezekiel. He is the absolute ruler of the nations, the only and holy God, who brings to pass what He has promised, and whose purposes do not fail. He will redeem Israel, His elect and favoured people, yet not for their own sake (41), but in order that they may be His witnesses to all the earth (42). Thus the nation Israel is the Servant of Yahweh. But since the nation as a whole is still blind (43) and unforgiven (44), it devolves upon the Servant of Yahweh, who in this case appears to be the godly element in Israel, to convert it (45). Finally, in the passage at the end of which our phrase stands, the Servant is revealed as one who by the despite, suffering and death inflicted upon him at the hands of transgressors has borne their transgressions. "All we like sheep have gone astray;... and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Here the Servant appears to be an individual upon whom Yahweh has laid the burden of bearing" the iniquity of us all." It is said of this one, who so effectively, interposed, that he also "made intercession for the transgressors."

We recall that Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel had "made intercession for the transgressors", but had been met with refusal, because Yahweh could not forgive the nation which was still sinning against Him. We
recall, also, that Jeremiah and Ezekiel taught that in the new Israel of the future, Yahweh would forgive the people's iniquity and cleanse them and give them new and obedient hearts (46). Thus they taught that in the future He would do what He could not do in the present; He would cleanse and forgive by a power and method of His own. It would seem that the picture of the Servant before us represents another step in this revelation of Yahweh's redemption. He is the means by which a part of the prophecy of Jeremiah and Ezekiel is fulfilled; he is the means by which God cleanses the people from their sin. His intercessions, for the people, unlike those of the three prophets, are effective in winning forgiveness for sin. What none of "us" could do by his life (47), nor any prophet by his intercessions, the Servant of Yahweh was able to do by his life and intercession.

It is exceedingly difficult to interpret this picture in Old Testament terms. It is difficult not to associate it with Jesus of Nazareth, whom it seems to describe so aptly. As a further development of Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's splendid conception of the new Israel it is incomplete and disappointing; yet it is nearer to human life and truer to human history than these glowing prophecies. In our last chapter we shall have more to say on the subject. For the present our conclusion is that, if the last phrase of Isa. liii. 12 be best translated "and made intercession for the transgressors", intercession has been given a place of power in prophetic religion which it did not have in the experience of the three prophets whose intercessions were denied. (In Amos this denial is but emphasized by the answering of two intercessions). Intercession has become effective in the realm of the highest Old Testament religion, but it is the intercession of someone of an order superior to the prophets.
The Passages lix. 16 and lxiii. 5.

In the part of the book called Trito-Isaiah, LXI - LXXVI, are four other passages which bear examination. Two of these express the same general thought and may be considered together.

In ch. lix the prophet speaks, telling the people that it is not the indifference of Yahweh but their own gross sin which prevents Him from redeeming them. "Yea, truth is lacking; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey; and the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment. And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his own arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it upheld him." This is followed by a renewal of the promise of Yahweh's deliverance. The word here translated "intercessor" is יָשָׁר, the hiphil participle of the word which was used in the hiphil imperfect in liii. 12. There is the same difference of opinion in this case as to whether its correct translation is "no intercessor" or "none to interpose." (48) Here there seems to be greater reason than in liii. 12 for adopting the latter translation.

In lxiii. 1-6 the prophet describes, as though it were already past, Yahweh's return in triumph from Edom (which here represents all the enemies of Israel), having taken His vengeance upon them. In reply to questions, Yahweh explains what He has done, in part as follows, "For the day of vengeance was in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me." Here "none to uphold" might mean none to uphold by intercession, as Moses is perhaps represented as upholding Israelite armies against Amalek by his persistence in prayer (Ex. xvii. 11, 12).
In the former of these passages, Yahweh is saving Israel from itself, in the latter from its foes. In each case He is represented as being disappointed in a search for some human champion or intercessor who can aid Him, and in each case He is forced to save Israel by His own divine power alone. Ezek. xxii. 30 seems to me to furnish an apt parallel (49). Here as there, some sort of physical intervention appears to be the principal meaning, but along with this might very well have gone the thought that the champion was also an intercessor.

lix. 6, 7.

We read, "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, 0 Jerusalem; who shall never hold their peace day nor night." Here, again, the problems of interpretation are many. Is the speaker the Servant of Yahweh? (50), Yahweh Himself? (51). Are these the walls of the "actual city"? (52), or of the ideal Jerusalem of the future, (53). Most important of all, are the watchmen angelic beings "who form the invisible guard of the holy city"? (54), or are they the prophets? (55). This last question we shall endeavor to answer. In v. 6b these watchmen are called "the Lord's remembrancers", a figure which evidently originated from the office of remembrancer in both Persian and Hebrew courts (56). This is in accord with the conception of Yahweh's heavenly court and numerous following of supernatural beings, but not less so with the office which the prophets had customarily exercised (57). As for the office of watchman, it was to this that Ezekiel was specifically called after the fall of Jerusalem (58), and to me it seems unnecessary, in the absence of other evidence, to follow the Jewish interpretation which comes out of a law-centered rather than a prophetic theology, and to make the watchers, angelic beings. We are dealing with a period still largely under the influence of prophets like Ezekiel. Therefore, we shall interpret the
watchers as prophets whom either Yahweh or His Servant has set to guard
the city constantly, so that God may never be permitted to relax in His
solicitude. To these the prophet calls, "Ye that are the Lord's remem-
brancers, take ye no rest, and give him no rest, till he establish, and
till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth." As Belitzsch has re-
marked, Zechariah, Haggai and Malachi were prophets who performed this
function, which is a form of intercession (59).

The Prayer in lxiii. 7 - lxiv.

There is general agreement among commentators that this is the pro-
phet's prayer in behalf of his people (60). The office of putting Yahweh
in remembrance of His promises, to which he has just pointed his brother
prophets, he himself now assumes. Like Jeremiah, in his intercessions
in xiv. 7-9, 19-22, he identifies himself with his people in their suf-
fering and transgression; he makes himself one with what Orelli calls
the "oppressed exilian Church." Like the prayers of Jeremiah, also,
this prayer acknowledges past mercies from Yahweh, confesses the people's
sin, and prays for a new forgiveness and mercies. Like them, again, it
has a liturgy-like phrasing which is in keeping with the prophet's aim
to represent the "Church." He is one of the remembrancers; he is also,
like the Servant of Yahweh, an intercessor for the transgressors.

Chapter v is generally regarded as the reply of Yahweh to His pro-
phet's prayer, and it is difficult to imagine how else it could be taken.
(61). It draws a sharp distinction between the idolaters, who are pro-
mised a punishment as severe as any pre-exilic prophet's (62), and the
servants of Yahweh, the true Israel, who are to be restored to their
land (63). The treatment which the two will receive is contrasted, "Be-
hold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants
shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: Behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed;... and ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen, and the Lord God shall slay thee; and he shall call his servants by another name." Then there follows one of the finest pictures in the Book of Isaiah of the marvellous age of the restoration. "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be glad and rejoice forever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy."

Conclusions

In section XL -LXVI of Isaiah, teaching bearing upon prophetic intercession appears in two forms. One, in the part called Deutero-Isaiah, is the prophetic conception of the Servant of Yahweh, who is not a prophet, who bears the sin of many and makes intercession for the transgressors. The other, in what is called Trito-Isaiah, is the assignment of the office of "remembrancer" to prophets in the future Jerusalem, an office which the writer immediately assumes in Lxiii. 7 - Lxiv. This intercession is answered by a renewal of the promise of national redemption which had long been a prominent element in prophecy. It also reveals that Yahweh has made a distinction between His "servants", who would benefit by the promise, and the transgressors, who would not. In reality, prophetic intercession is in Isa. XL -LXVI where it was with Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as far as winning forgiveness for transgressors is concerned, (in contrast to the effectiveness of the Servant's intercessions); but instead of being met with commands to cease, it now has an official recognition in the office of keeping Yahweh in mind of His promises for Israel's future welfare.
4. The Intercession in Daniel ix. 16-19.

"In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus... I Daniel understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes." (ix. 1-3). There follows the prayer of Daniel, wherein, identifying himself with the people of the exile, he made confession of their sin, acknowledged the righteousness of the judgments which had come from Yahweh, and supplicated Him for His city and sanctuary and people. It is this closing intercession which comes within our field of study. The Book of Daniel is variedly dated and interpreted (64). According to the commoner critical interpretation neither was there a prophet Daniel nor is the book itself a prophetic writing (65).

With the exception of the one verse, ii. 23, this is the only prayer in the book. Its language is reminiscent of other Old Testament prayers, as for example the prayers in Neh. 1. 5-11 (66), and Neh. ix. 5-38 (67), and Solomon's prayer in I K. viii. 23-53 (68). But this prayer has even closer parallels in language with the Book of Jeremiah (69) and the part of Jeremiah which seems most akin to it in language, thought and feeling is the passage containing the intercessions of Jeremiah in xiv. 7-9, 19-22 (70). There are parallels of phrase and idea with other Old Testament writings as well, especially with Deuteronomy (71). The reason for much of this similarity may be a common Hebrew prayer phraseology, changing little through the centuries, as in Christianity; though if this were true one would expect reminiscences of the Psalms, more than those which have been noted. But making allowances for this, the passage owes so much to the Book of Jeremiah, and especially to the prayers in xiv, that
to me it seems justifiable to claim for the writer a thorough familiarity with and a certain degree of dependence on the writings of this prophet (72). Let it be noted, as well, that it was a study in the "books", of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years of exile, which served as the point of departure for what is contained in this chapter of Daniel (73). We may be reasonably certain that, whatever the age of this chapter, it represents the experience of one before whom the roll of Jeremiah was open. This one is not a prophet of Jeremiah's type, but he represents what was befalling prophecy at the end of the Old Testament era. If this be not a prophetic writing, it is in affinity with prophecy. Consequently, for our study this intercession has value; for as a period ends a sentence, so this prayer ends prophetic intercession.

The intercession itself is as follows: "O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, let thine anger and thy fury, I pray thee, be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain; because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are round about us. Now therefore, O our God, hearken unto the prayer of thy servant, and to his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not; for thine own sake, O my God, because thy city and thy people are called by thy name." Though it is somewhat repetitious and wordy, the prayer compares favourably in genuineness of feeling with the prayers of the prophets. It is marked by an unstudied, heart-felt
emotion reminiscent of Jeremiah (74); it is the urgent petition of a man who is deeply concerned for his people's good. In these things intercession has lost nothing.

What was the outcome of the intercession? Not a command to cease, nor any sort of direct answer from Yahweh. The answer came to the intercessor in the form of a visitation from "the man Gabriel." "Yea whiles I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he instructed me.... Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression." (75). But in the end there shall be pouring out of wrath upon the desolator. Here there are similarities with prophetic intercession as we have observed it, and also important differences. This answer compares with answers given to the intercessions of Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in that it is not a compliance with the request but the introduction of a new element - a revelation. This revelation connected with intercession is not of Yahweh's character, as in Amos, nor of the nature of the religious relationship, as in Jeremiah, but, as in Ezekiel, of Yahweh's purposes for Israel's future. Daniel's intercession is not answered as it stands, any more than was Ezekiel's, but it draws forth a divine reply which is comforting because it reassures His people of His vigilant solicitude on their behalf and of His definite purpose to benefit them. Here also Daniel's intercession does not suffer in comparison with these of the greatest prophets.

But when we consider the mode of revelation to Daniel a very great difference is apparent. Even Ezekiel, who conceived of God so transcendently, received his messages, as did his predecessors, by "the word of the Lord." For him Yahweh may have been surrounded by a dazzling and
fearful majesty, but this did not prevent Him from speaking intimately with His prophet. (76). In Daniel, however, "the man Gabriel" appears flying swiftly, to instruct Daniel in the purposes of God. No longer may a man, even a Daniel, hear the word of Yahweh directly from Him; He speaks first to His Gabriel who bears the message into the lower human sphere. No man may any longer be mediator between men and God Himself, and he who takes upon himself the mediatorial office of intercession, though he can pray to God, must receive his answer through another mediator standing close to the throne of God. Obviously there could be no true prophecy where this theological concept held sway. Direct access to Yahweh was the life-breath of Old Testament prophecy; when Gabriel and Michael rose to stand guard at the door to God's audience chamber true prophecy died, and with it prophetic intercession.

As has been said, this instance puts a period to our study of prophetic intercession. The age of true Old Testament prophecy was ended; that of New Testament prophecy was not begun. In the interregnum legalism was master, and God's law became hedged about with ordinances and His Person with angels. The Book of Daniel stands within the interregnum, with its emphasis upon the externals of religion and the transcendence of God, but set in it is this prayer of confession and intercession which carries us back in spirit to the former period. This might easily be the prayer of a prophet - even a prayer of Jeremiah. So intercessory prayer appears as the most conservative element in the Book of Daniel. Of all the functions associated with genuine prophets, it would appear to have survived the longest. And if we seek a reason, it is probably that intercession was never the possession solely of the prophets, nor even a function which was necessitated by their office as spokesmen of the word of Yahweh, but one which they used more than other
men because it belonged to those who stood closest to God. This intercession does not make the Book of Daniel a prophetic book, nor does it make Daniel a prophet; but it remains that it is the most prophetic, and therefore from the Christian point of view the most religious, element in the book.

Summary

We began this chapter by saying that there were two distinctly different presentations of prophetic intercession in the Old Testament. The traditional teaching, found in sources other than the writings of literary prophets and based upon the prophet's unique relation to Yahweh, attributed to him seemingly unlimited power to win benefits from Yahweh for others, both individuals and the nation. The other type emerged in the experience of the literary prophets, the prophets of national judgment, when their intercessions for the nation came into direct conflict with Yahweh's revelations and their own message. The questions which we then asked were, What is the significance of this change, and did it cause a permanent cessation of intercession among the prophets? In this chapter we have seen that during the period of the ministry of these literary prophets the traditional teaching on the peculiar efficacy of prophetic intercession continued, seemingly unaffected by their own experience, which they shared in their prophecies. Even Jeremiah was appealed to by the national leaders for his intercession. Not only so, but even he continued to regard intercession as a legitimate and necessary function of the true prophet, so long as it did not conflict with the revealed purposes and His nature. Accordingly, both Jeremiah and Ezekiel could have prayed, after 597 B.C., for that part of the nation which had gone into exile and, after 536, for the whole people in exile, since this would have been consonant with their teachings on the restoration. This they
may have done, though no such intercessions appear in their writings. But in the latter part of the Book of Isaiah, which points with assurance to Yahweh's glorious redemption of His people, the prophet does take up again this ministry of intercession, and this time, far from being commanded to cease, he is told to call his brother prophets of the future to be Yahweh's remembrancers, to guard the new Jerusalem with their prayers. To be remembrancers, i.e., to remind Yahweh of His promises, might seem to be a limited form of intercession; but, as a matter of fact, it was all the prayer that was needed, since Yahweh had thoroughly committed Himself to Israel's redemption and glory. But this prophet's own intercession for his people was treated with a reserve similar to, but not as great as, that with which the prayers of Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel for the people were received. It still found, even at the dawn of the restoration, the moral nature of Yahweh the test of what He would allow. Those who were worthy of redemption would be redeemed; but those who were worthy of death would be given death.

In contrast to this stands the prophetic concept of the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah LXIX. He has power to interpose on behalf of transgressors and win their forgiveness by his redeeming act and prayer.

Finally, in the Book of Daniel appears an intercession which shows strong prophetic influence. It is the most vital and most conservative element in the book, yet it lacks the directness of approach and intimacy of intercourse with God which were the basis of true prophecy. This intercession, as we have said, puts the period after prophetic intercession.
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62 Isa. lxv. 1-7, 11, 12
63 Isa lxv. 8-10
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69 E.g. cf. v. 6 "thy servants the prophets" with Jer. vii. 25, xxv 4, xxxvi. 5, etc.; cf. v. 6 "our kings, etc with Jer. xliv. 17, 21; cf. v. 7 "men of Judah," etc with Jer. iv. 3, 4, xi. 2, 9, xvii. 25, xxxii. 32, xxxv. 13, xxxvi. 31; cf. v. 7 "all the countries," etc. with Jer. xvi. 15, xxxii. 3, 8, xxxii. 37; cf. v. 10 "to walk in his laws" with Jer. xxxvi. 4, xxxii. 23, xliv. 10, 23, cf. v. 10 "his laws, which he set" with Jer. ix. 13, xxxvi. 4, xliv. 10; etc.

70 Both are in the first plural, yet are prayers of one man in behalf of the many. In both are found confession of the nation's sins, present and past, and appeal for help in present need. For particular parallels, cf. v. 5 "we have sinned" with Jer xiv. 7; cf. v. 4 "keeping the covenant" with Jer. xiv. 21 "break not thy covenant"; cf. the idea of confusion of face" in vv. 7, 8 with Jer. xiv. 19b; cf. v. 13 "our iniquities" with Jer. xiv. 7; cf. the appeal for Yahweh's present help on the score of his past redemptions in v. 15 and Jer. xiv. 8; cf. v. 16 "thine anger and thy fury" with the thought of Jer. xiv. 12; cf. v. 17 "for the Lord's sake", and v. 19 "for thine own sake" with Jer. xiv. 7, 21 "for thy name's sake"; Cf. vv. 18, 19 "called by thy name" with Jer. xiv. 9; cf. the idea of the sins of the fathers in vv.8, 10, 11 and especially v. 16 with Jer. xiv. 20.

71 Cf. e.g. iv. 1 ff., vi. 1 ff., xi. 1ff.
72 In our study of the prayers in Jer. xiv. the view that these were in reality prayers of the people, such as they were accustomed to offer in their worship, held up here to some by Jeremiah, was discussed and rejected.

73 Dan. ix. 2

74 Cf. again Jer. xiv.

75 Dan. ix. 21, 2, 4.

76 In Ezek XL and after, "a man" accompanies the prophet to explain his visions.
CHAPTER VII

OTHER FORMS OF OLD TESTAMENT INTERCESSION

A study of the place of prophetic intercession in Old Testament religion would be incomplete if it neglected to mention other forms of intercession in the Old Testament and their relation to the intercessions of the prophets. The present chapter will treat briefly four other such types of intercession: that of the priests, of the Psalter, of holy men, and of angels.

1. Priestly Intercession

Heiler, in his book on prayer, remarks that in the religions of mankind as a whole the priest has been the one best qualified to pray and the one believed to possess the greatest powers of intercession (1). This is what we might expect to find in Old Testament religion as well, since the priest was the people's official representative before Yahweh; but it is already evident from our study that the priest in Israel was less concerned with prayer for others (according to Old Testament literature, of course) than the prophet. This is a phenomenon which calls for an explanation.

It has been said in this thesis that the prophet was the representative of Yahweh and the spokesman of His mind to Israel, and that the priest represented the people before Yahweh (2). We saw, however, that this generalization could not be rigidly applied to the prophet, since some of his duties represented the people, as in interceding for them and inquiring of Yahweh. The priest, likewise, had functions not covered
by representing the people before Yahweh. From earliest times he was one who kept the oracles of God and obtained His guidance on right courses of action (3). He was also a judge of right conduct, the keeper of the Torah, and the one who gave the people instruction in the Torah (4). Evidently, then, our generalization can be applied no more rigidly to the priests than to the prophets. Nevertheless, there was a great difference between the prophets and the priests, at least from the eighth century on; they influenced each other and had much in common, but each order had its own characteristic functions - the prophet in delivering the direct word of Yahweh, and the priest in teaching the Torah and mediating between the people and God in the offering of sacrifice. The prophet was one taken in possession by the Spirit of Yahweh; the priest held office by virtue of caste and knowledge of Torah and ritual. He was an official, he was the people's representative before their God. Therefore, though from the nature of prophecy it is clear why the prophets were intercessors, it is to be expected that the priests also would be among the intercessors in Hebrew religion. We ask, then, in how far was intercession a function of the Old Testament priest?

References to Priestly Intercession: Neh. ix. 32, Mal. i. 9, Joel i. 14. 11. 17

In Neh. ix. is recounted how the Jews kept the Feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem in the seventh month, after they had rebuilt the city walls under Nehemiah's leadership. At the end of this feast a convocation of people was held at the Temple for instruction in the Law, for confession and worship (5). "Then stood up upon the stairs of the Levites, Jeshua, and Bani, Kadmiel, Shebaniah, Bunu, Sherebiah, Bani, and Chenani, and cried with a loud voice unto the Lord their God" (6). The prayer itself is a lengthy confession of Israel's sin and an acknowledgment of
Yahweh's mercy against a background of their national history. Embedded in it is an intercession, which reads, "Now therefore, our God, the great, the mighty and the terrible God, who keepest covenant and mercy, let not all the travail seem little before thee, that hath come upon us, on our kings, on our princes, and on our priests, and on our prophets, and on our fathers, and on all thy people, since the times of the king of Assyria unto this day." (7)

This is a clear instance of priestly intercession, in which the priests are the people's mediators in prayer and offer the petitions of the nation. They stand apart from the worshippers, "upon the stairs of the Levites", evidently above the people. Their prayer is part of a public service, which they lead in their capacity as appointed representatives of the nation.

From the same period is the reference to priestly intercession in Mal. 1. 9. In the two preceding verses this prophet speaks Yahweh's message of condemnation against the priests for their carelessness and dishonesty in officiating in His worship, particularly for sacrificing blemished animals. In v 8b he asks what effect the offering of such gifts to the governor (8), would have. "Will he be pleased with thee? or will he accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts." In the light of what he is about to say, the prophet is evidently asking if such gifts would win them a position of favour and influence (possibly having in mind influence in intercession) with the governor. He continues, "And now, I pray you, intreat the favour of God, that he may be gracious unto us: this hath been by your means: will he accept any of your persons? saith the Lord of hosts." He bids them intercede for Yahweh's favour upon the nation, which has been lost partly by their disloyalty. It is not a challenge to intercede (9), but a statement that their intercessions,
accompanied by such offerings, would not be received any more favourably by Yahweh than by the governor. The interrogatory form was calculated to add force to the final question, "Will he (i.e. Yahweh) accept any of your persons?" which is a rhetorical question and allows only a negative answer.

In this passage it is apparent that Malachi considered intercession for the nation an office of the priest, as in pre-exilic religion it had been considered an office of the prophet. His words suggest that the priest's sacrifices, when fittingly offered, made him an acceptable person before Yahweh, and that this position of privilege allowed him to make intercession successfully.

There are two references to priestly intercession in the Book of Joel. The occasion of the prophecy was a terrible locust plague and severe drought which were to the prophet indications of the near approach of the severe judgments of the Day of Yahweh. His reading of events in nature was precisely like that of Amos (10), but according to his prophecy, he chose a different way to avert or moderate the nation's punishment. Instead of interceding himself for the people, he directed his appeal to the priests, asking them to put on sackcloth and lament (11). He bade them, "Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the old men and all the inhabitants of the land unto the house of the Lord your God, and cry unto the Lord." In ii. 15-17 he repeats this appeal (12). "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the old men, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them
say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the nations should rule over them: wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?" Every person was to come to this solemn assembly, in order that the appeal to Yahweh might be as compelling as possible; and when all had assembled, the priests were to come forward as those who approached Yahweh for the throng and nation. They were mediators, the official intercessors. It should be noted, too, that the drought had stopped the regular temple offerings (13), so that the priests did not have these with which to enter the presence and favour of Yahweh (14). Yet in spite of this lack the prophet still recognizes them as the ones able to intercede for the nation - its official mediators.

Vv. 18 ff. tell how Yahweh answered the intercessions of His priests. "Then was the Lord jealous for his land, and had pity on his people." He promised them abundance of food and deliverance from their enemies. Priestly intercession according to the prophet Joel, had the same power to influence God as the intercessions of prophets like Samuel, Elijah and Moses.

The conception of priestly intercession presented in Nehemiah and Malachi is unquestionably post-exilic in date. In them it would seem to have taken the place of prophetic intercession; for the latter is nowhere mentioned. The Book of Joel, which has more to say about this type of intercession than any other Old Testament book, represents it in precisely the same manner as Nehemiah and Malachi. According to its picture, intercession was the function of the priest, even when circumstances were favourable to prophetic intercession and similar to those in which an eighth century prophet, Amos, did intercede. Its teaching on prophetic intercession would seem, therefore, to point to the late
rather than the early date for Joel, locating it in the same general period as the other two prophets.

There was a place in Old Testament religion for priestly intercession. Even if the picture in Joel be of conditions in the eighth century, this type of prayer appeared in the literature only after the intercession of prophets had long been a well-established teaching. But if, on the other hand, the more likely late date of Joel be taken, priestly intercession made its first appearance in this body of literature after the exile, i.e. after prophecy had lost its force and Judaism was under the influence of the priesthood. Even so, very little is said about priestly intercession, and two of our three sources of information are the writings of prophets. We are forced to conclude that either that the Old Testament is distinctively a prophets' book, or that intercession was not a very important factor in the ministry of the priests.

Priestly intercession naturally took on the characteristics of the priest. It differed from the prayers of prophets, except the Mizpah intercession of Samuel who was nearly half priest, by being the petition of an official spokesman and mediator. According to Nehemiah and Joel its place was in the public worship of large throngs of the people, where the peculiar power of the priests as a holy and representative order had its fullest scope. Whereas the petitions of the prophets for others were spontaneous expressions of their sympathy for men and intimate personal relation with God, those of the priests were more formal in character, taking on the qualities of mediatorial duty, supported by the congregation of the faithful and the paraphernalia of ritual worship (15).

2. Intercession in the Psalter

The Book of Psalms, as it now stands, has been described as "the
hymn book of the second temple", or "the Praise-book of post-exilic Judaism" (16), or "largely a collection of those cult hymns which were intended for the use of individuals or of the community, but which were originally associated with an act of the cult" (17). The Psalter is the part of the worship poetry of Israel which has won the right to survive, and stands today unmatched in its field of literature. No doubt its parts were greatly influenced by the teachings of the prophets, but it stands in closer relation to the priests, through whose hands it has come. It is appropriate, therefore, to consider at this point a few of the intercessions which it contains.

Intercession in the Psalter may be expected to differ both from the spontaneous prayers of the prophets and from the official prayers of the priests. It was the intercession of worshippers, cast in a form which could be used repeatedly in the service. Thus, in Ps. iv. 7 the worshipper prays, "Lord, lift up the light of thy countenance upon us." In this psalm, except in this one sentence, the first person is used throughout in such a way as to indicate that this is the personal rather than the collective "I" (18). It appears, therefore, to be a prayer in which the worshipper is interceding for the nation, in which he includes himself. In Ps. v. 11,12 occurs that contrast between the righteous and the wicked which the Psalmist delights to draw. In v. 11 he prays that the latter may receive a fitting punishment (19), and in v. 12 asks for the former, "But let all those that put their trust in thee rejoice, let them ever shout for joy, because thou defendest them: let them also that love thy name be joyful in thee." Other intercessions, which seem to be prayers of an assembled congregation, are: "Let all those that seek thee rejoice and be glad in thee" (20), "Arise, O Lord; 0 God, lift
up thine hand: forget not the poor" (21), "Save thy people, and bless thine inheritance: feed them also, and bear them up for ever" (22), and "Do good, O Lord, unto those that be good, and to them that are upright in heart" (23).

Intercessions are more numerous in the Psalter than in any other book of the Old Testament; this is what we should expect to find in a book of devotions. It is not always easy to say whether the intercessor is an individual worshipper or the congregation; nor does it greatly matter. The important thing is that intercession had a place in the public worship of Israel. In the temple worship there was room for the direct appeals of the people for others to Yahweh. To be sure, these had a set form and the things asked were very general in character. The psalmist's petitions do not ask forgiveness for the transgressors, but condemnation; for the righteous (among whom one is certain that the worshipper always includes himself) he asks blessing and vindication. Intercession in the Psalms is not on the high level of prophetic religion, but it does represent the highest level of popular religion in ancient times.

3. Intercession of Holy Men.

We have observed, besides prophetic intercession, the prayers which priests could make for others by virtue of their mediatorial office and the prayers which temple worshippers could make for others in its services. There is still a third class of Old Testament people who have the privilege of intercession, by virtue of their great personal righteousness and piety. This type of intercession was not limited to any one period of Old Testament religion, but appeared throughout its length, as the characters of men made it possible.
Abraham and Daniel might have been classed with this group, had their prayers not already been more fitfully discussed in connection with phases of prophetic intercession (24). David was an outstanding figure of this group. Four instances of his prayers for others appear in Second Samuel and First Chronicles. He prays for his royal house and dynasty (25), for Bathsheba's child which died (26), for the nation, when Yahweh sent a pestilence upon them at the time that they were numbered by David (27), and, in his dying, for his successor Solomon (28). The prayer for Bathsheba's child was not answered, but that for the people during the pestilence was regarded. In the latter incident he appealed to Yahweh also through sacrificial offerings at Araunah's threshing floor, and, in II Sam. xxiv. 25, it is suggested that these were the means by which God was persuaded to end the plague. David is represented as one who enjoyed a place of privilege before Yahweh: he was His anointed one, upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh rested all his life (29); he was a man of genuine piety, faithful to his God (30), whose right to officiate at the sacrifice was not questioned.

The lengthy prayer of Solomon in II Chr. vi, at the dedication of the Temple, is largely an intercession for the nation (31). It resembles the prayer of Samuel at Mizpah and the priestly prayers in Nehemiah and Joel, in being part of a great public service of worship. It seeks to secure Yahweh's favour upon Israel for all time to come.

We have already mentioned (32) the prayer of king Hezekiah for the nation's deliverance from Sennacherib (33). In Second Kings it is said of him that "he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done." (34). He also was a man who had access to Yahweh by reason of his piety.

Job, too, belongs to this group of holy men who were intercessors.
Toward the end of the Book of Job, after the problem of the poem had been solved and Job vindicated, Yahweh speaks to the friends of the patriarch, telling them that He is angry with them; "For ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath. Now therefore, take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept....So Eliphaz the temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite went, and did according as the Lord commanded them; and the Lord accepted Job" (35). It would appear, as McFadyen has said, that "the real vindication of Job is the efficacy of his prayer" (36). His intercession, which is associated with his friends' burnt offerings, obtained for them the favour of Yahweh which they had lost by misrepresenting Him to Job. The incident is strikingly similar to the intercession of Abraham which freed Abimelech from the consequences of his fault against the patriarch (37).

Nehemiah also belongs to this group, by reason of his intercession in i. 6-11. His prayer follows the general prayer form which we have observed in other intercessions of this later period of Old Testament religion, and is made up of confession of the people's sin, appeal to Yahweh's promises and past mercies and a closing petition covering the present need (38). Like the others, Nehemiah was a national leader of deep religious conviction and exemplary piety.

These cases present a homogeneous teaching on the intercession of saints or holy men. Outstanding figures in Israel who, though religious men, were neither prophets nor priests, were able to approach God in behalf of others and to win His favour for them. The Old Testament's
limited teaching on the future life limited this power of intercession
to the earth-stage of life, so that it had no doctrine of what we to­
day call the "intercession of saints." But later on, in the period of
apocryphal literature, such a doctrine does appear, in a form which in­
cludes prophets among the saints. Thus it is said of Jeremiah in Second
Maccabees, "This is a lover of the brethren, who prayeth much for the
people, and for the holy city, Jeremias the prophet of God." (39)

4. Intercession of Angels

Angels play a part in the religion of early Old Testament litera­
ture as Jehovah's messengers to men (40), and executors of His judgment
(41). This is how they are represented through most of the Old Testa­
ment; it is not until late that they appear as mediators for men before
Jehovah.

In Job v. 1, Eliphaz the Temanite says to Job, "Call now; is there
any that will answer thee? and to which of the holy ones wilt thou turn?"
(42) This seems to express a belief in the power of the "holy ones", or
angels, to intercede for men (43). In another place in the poem Job
answers Barachel the Buzite, "If there be with him (i. e. the afflicted
man) an angel, an interpreter (44), one among a thousand, to shew unto
man what is right for him; then he is gracious unto him, and saith, De­
deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom."(45) The
meaning of this difficult passage seems to be that the interpreting angel
explains God's judgment to the sick man, who repents. Thereupon this
angel intreats for him either to God or to the angel of death who is about
to carry him off to Sheol (46), and in consequence the man is healed.

In Zechariah i. 12 occurs a clearer instance of angelic intercession.
"Then the angel of the Lord (i. e. the interpreting angel, who customari­
ly delivered the messages of Jehovah to this prophet) (47), answered and
said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me with good words, even comfortable words." (48). Zechariah goes a stage beyond Ezekiel in the development of an angelology; he is the earliest prophet to introduce orders and ranks among the angels (49). In the passage quoted he pictures an angel as interceding for Israel. To us it is exceedingly significant that a prophet should consider God so unapproachable that he would represent an angel as the intercessor and would himself deliberately avoid the office which formerly belonged in a special sense to the members of his order. It is an evidence that prophecy was losing its distinctive form and force, both when the prophet must hear the messages of God through a mediator (even if that mediator be thought of as a personification of the prophetic spirit) (50), and when he must hear the intercessions which his own heart felt, offered by "the angel of the Lord."

These references to intercessions by angels, though few, are enough to show that they who had always had a place in Hebrew religion as Yahweh's messengers, had in later Old Testament literature become also mediators between men and God. In the post-exilic development of angelology they took over from the prophets and others their intercessor function. As we might expect, the fully elaborated angelology of apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature marks a corresponding development in this doctrine of the intercession of angels (51).

This brief discussion of intercession by those other than prophets has shown how right it is that the latter were the true intercessors of the Old Testament. Only in post-exilic times, when priest leadership was being substituted for prophet leadership, were priests and angels repre-
sented as mediators for men. "Intercession of saints" does not appear at all in the Old Testament. The only form of intercession which has a place beside the intercession of prophets throughout Old Testament religion is that by leaders who were also men of great piety. These "holy men" had an access to Yahweh similar to the prophets', and some of them, like David and Hezekiah, were closely related to the prophets in spirit and ideals. They were, in a sense, half-prophets. We may say, then, that prayer for others - for individuals and for Israel - was the natural function of prophets as long as they were the spiritual leaders of the nation. But when prophecy lost its power, this function passed to others - to priests and angels, whom the new developments in theology made heirs of the prophets as intercessors.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

It is now fitting to draw together into a strand the threads of our argument and discussion. Intercessory prayer, we saw, was neither a distinctively Hebrew practice, nor was it confined in Old Testament religion to the prophets, though they were the greatest of its intercessors. Prayer for others was a part of ancient religion in general, and he found exercising this function most frequently was simply the one believed to have the greatest mediatorial power with God or the gods. In non-Israelite religion this one was the priest; in Old Testament religion he was the prophet. The latter, as Yahweh's spokesman and the one indwelt by His Spirit, stood in a relation to Him which allowed the prophet to approach Him on behalf of the nation or individuals more effectively than any other. This was true from the rise of Israel's prophetic movement until the rise of post-exilic Judaism, when the priests took over the work of intercession from the prophets.

As we have already remarked more than once, the intercessions of prophets are represented in two different ways in the Old Testament, both of which are based upon typically Israelite conceptions of the nature of God. The one, called by us the conventional teaching on this subject, accepts no limit either to the power of Yahweh to act or of the prophet to influence His action by petition. Thus in the narratives which form what was by the eighth century the traditional teaching on
intercession of prophets these men have an amazing influence upon Yahweh in winning His help for others. The influence of these servants of Yahweh was in accord with the way in which He was conceived by the religiously most advanced element in the nation until the time of Amos. Like the theology of the time itself, this teaching on intercession was simple and rather elementary, in keeping with a simplified national life and experience, though this representation may be due partly to the fact that the cases are reported at second hand in the historical sources. At any rate, the conventional teaching made the prophets the great intercessors, who were great because they were successful.

When with Amos prophecy became self-recording, intercession began to be represented in a different light. In the writings of this prophet, as in those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it is shown to be unwelcome to Yahweh and ultimately unheeded by Him. At the same time prophecy itself was undergoing changes; it was becoming universal in scope, and in its wider world view Yahweh was the Judge of nations, the One to whom each was accountable. He might reject Israel, because He was God of the world, and God of Israel by His own choice. Prophetic religion became super-national and capable, in the end, of enduring the terrifying circumstances of national downfall. This downfall it predicted, as the judgment of Yahweh upon the wickedness of the Israelite kingdoms. The futile intercessions of these three prophets for the nation were a part of their message to their people; they are personal and unofficial, unattended by witnesses and reported only by the prophets themselves. In all these respects they differ from intercessions of the conventional sort. They were a part of the deep personal experience through which the prophet came to realize or to have revealed to him the truths of
his message to Israel. Therefore, beyond their value as prayers, they furnished valuable insights into the manner of the prophet's experience of the word of Yahweh and the content of that message.

Why did the three literary prophets intercede for their nation? Not because intercession was an office: nothing about prophecy was official. Prophecy was vital and spontaneous, as its prophets were possessed by Yahweh. They interceded because they had a great desire to avert the judgment which Yahweh was preparing for His unrighteous people and to reconcile them and their God. They had insight, beyond their contemporaries, into the character of Yahweh, and knew that a conflict existed between this character and the life which the nation was living. The idolatry, immorality, injustice of the latter necessitated divine action in punishment of these infractions of the covenant between them and in vindication of Himself before the world. This these prophets clearly understood and taught, but when it came to the point of seeing the hand of God in motion against their people they interposed petitions motivated by a sympathy more powerful than intellectual conviction. These petitions were necessarily refused, because they conflicted with the justice, righteousness and holiness of the character of God.

It is obvious that these intercessions were necessarily refused for in the light of the prophets' own mature teachings they were pointless. Their value lies, therefore, in allowing us a glimpse of the prophet's thought when his convictions were in process of being formed. Thus in the case of Amos the twice heeded interpositions were a sign to the prophet that Yahweh was willing to put His love for Israel before His just character. This seemed a solution, until the vision of the man with the
plumbline convinced the logical mind of Amos of the necessity behind divine judgment. So thoroughly was he convinced that his whole message to Israel was built around this doctrine of the inevitability of judgment because of the just nature of God. Thus when intercessions were denied, they were not met with blank refusal but were utilized as the occasion for opening the prophet's understanding of the necessity for a treatment of the nation different from that which he had contemplated or from that from which his human sympathy reacted. This was one value of prophetic intercession; another was the occasion which it offered for personal adjustment to the severity of the divine will. It was like a door which the prophet attempted to open outward to permit national escape from punishment but which Yahweh opened inward to give the prophet himself a new religious experience. Only in the case of Jeremiah can this be seen clearly. For Amos it seems to have been sufficient to teach the truth to have the prophet accept it, but with Jeremiah, man of emotion, petition followed fruitless petition in spite of repeated commands to desist. He was torn in a painful inner conflict between his loyalty to Judah, of which his intercessions were the expression, and his loyalty to Yahweh. Finally this conflict found a solution in the inner harmony and strength of acceptance of the mastery of Yahweh, which meant as well a more vital relationship with Him. It was the reality of this personal relation with God which constituted Jeremiah's unique contribution to Old Testament religion, together with his teaching of the spiritual covenant of the new Israel which was based upon it. The third value of prophetic intercession in these prophets was the stimulus which it gave to their conception of the new future. What the prophet could not by his intercessions bring Yahweh to do in
the present, He would do in the future. It was not as if He could not redeem Israel in the present as easily as in the future but that the qualities of His character demanded its judgment now, and in the future the same qualities would work its salvation. Succeeding prophets drew for Israel this picture of Yahweh's future with increasing definiteness. In Amos it was a promise of the preservation of the good grain, though scattered from the threshing floor of judgment; in Jeremiah it was a prediction of a return after seventy years of exile and of a new covenant made with new hearts in a re-created nation; in Ezekiel it was a further elaboration of these basic ideas into his amazing picture of the priest state where Yahweh's holiness is to be preserved by Israelites whom Yahweh has made new. In that day of redemption God would give His people far more than His prophets had been denied in the present time. It was a sound faith, based probably upon their knowledge of His power to recreate their own lives.

What became of prophetic intercession after the experience which these prophets had of it? An examination of all the sources shows that what was denied in these prophets' experience was not intercession per se, but only intercession for what was contrary to Yahweh's known character and purposes. To petition Him to save the nation either at 722, or at 597, or at 586 was disloyal in the true prophet; but to fail to petition Him for what was in accord with His purposes was equally disloyal. The great prophets learned not to pray for the nation's escape while it went free and unpunished; but once the punishment began to be inflicted the ban was lifted from intercession. Thus we find Jeremiah praying for a remnant of the Jews after the assassination of Gedaliah. Indeed, intercession is a duty to which the prophets of the new Israel
are called, according to the latter part of the Book of Isaiah. This prophet summons his fellows to be Yahweh's remembrancers and to call to His mind by their prayers the need of His people and the promises which He has made for their welfare. This prophet himself intercedes for the nation and is answered by the promise that Yahweh will remember and bless those Israelites who have remained faithful to Him, but the others are to be rejected like their pre-exilic fathers. Thus as the time for the Return drew near, the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel of a nation re-created by the power of Yahweh, which they seem to have associated with the Return, seemed still a long way from fulfilment. Yet in Isaiah l iii. 12 a new turn is given to their prediction by the presentation of the Servant of Yahweh as one whose interposition by act and prayer bore "the iniquity of us all." The Return itself brought very meagre realization of these glowing prophecies, and in the type of religion which it established prophetic intercession went into eclipse along with prophecy itself. The prophets' place was taken by priests and angels, and even the prophets of the period ascribe to priests this intercessory function.

From the above it may be seen that prophetic intercession sheds a certain light upon the difficult problem of the manner of divine revelation to prophets and others. Thus Amos' expression of his natural wish to have Israel forgiven was utilized as the basis for planting in his mind a very different attitude. In a vision which suited his logical nature he was shown why Yahweh could no longer forgive, and so well did he learn the lesson that it became the spear point of his whole message. Jeremiah, a man of the very opposite type, was not taught by presenting a principle to his mind, but in a way suitable to him as a man of feeling.
He was taught right feelings. His conflicting loyalties to Judah, of which his intercessions were the expression, and to Yahweh became the foundation upon which his characteristic teachings were based. For when the conflict had ended in inner harmony it had brought him to a personal relation to God which was new to Old Testament religion and because of which he could conceive of an Israel of the future in which all had this redemptive relation to Yahweh. These two cases suggest that what was distinctive in a prophet's message came to him partly by the honest facing of the issues of life, both personal and national, with that Other, their God, along the lines of their natural capacities. Revelation was, from this point of view, the development and realization of what was within him, his own life, directed and used by the Spirit of God.

The greatest weakness of Old Testament prophecy was that it was so exclusively a preaching office. The prophets delivered their messages from Yahweh, which ran the gamut of threat, positive instruction, exhortation and judgment, with such force and incisiveness that their value persists to the present day; but for all their insight and power of expression they wrought little change in the people of their day. They were like John the Baptist, "a voice crying in the wilderness." This is not to say that they effected no changes and had no influence, for Isaiah was responsible for changes in the time of Hezekiah and was also the first to gather about him a band of men loyal to Yahweh. Josiah's reformation also was for the most part a triumph for the prophetic movement, but it was not effective enough for Jeremiah. And Ezekiel was appointed pastor of the exiles; but if he made much progress in his work with individuals we are not told. Yet in spite of these instances it
is safe to say that the literary prophets were far more effective in enunciating truth than in applying it. They did not know how to make people different and by them to re-create the nation, though they realized that Yahweh could do this, had done it, even, in them. Traditional prophecy furnished them with one method by which to end the quarrel between people and God, and intercession they used; but it was a useless expedient, since the nation would not change its manner of life, and the oil of its sin would not mix with the water of Yahweh's righteous character. The strength of prophecy, on the other hand, was its acceptance of the supremacy of this character of God, for which the prophets sacrificed when necessary their patriotic hope and loyalty. By their loyalty to His character they were enabled to teach the principles of true religion, one of which was God's power and intention to re-create human lives and the social order. But, except for the enunciation of truth, they had no real part as human agents in this transformation, which is religion's ultimate goal.
APPENDIX A

Old Testament Hebrew expresses the idea of intercession in a number of ways. In many cases the intercessory prayer itself is given, often introduced simply by חננה, as in Gen.xvii.18, xviii.16, Ex.xxxii.11,31, Num.xiv.13, II S.vii.18,29, xxiv.17, II K.xix.19, I Chr.xxix.10,18,19, Am.vii.2,5, or more elaborately, as in Ezek.ix.8, xi.13.

The verb most commonly used to express intercession is סדר. In the Piel it means to mediate, to judge; in the Hithpael to supplicate, to pray (especially to God). In the latter form the meaning is made more specific by a preposition, as by the addition of צ in Ps.v.3, I S.i.26, II S.vii.27, Jer.xxix.12, etc., of צ in Dan.ix.4; of צ in I S.i.10; of המ in I K.viii.28, Neh.i.4,6, etc. So also סדר comes naturally to mean to supplicate or pray for, to intercede for, when aided by the appropriate prepositions, as by לְ in Gen.xx.7, Num.xxxi.7, Dt.ix.20, I S.vii.5, xii.23, I K.xiii.6, etc.; by לְ in Job xlii.8; by ל in I S.ii.25; by ל plus נ in I S.vii.5, Jer.xxix.7, xlii.2,20; and by צ, as in Gen.xx.17. In the instances of intercession covered by this thesis, סדר is used sixteen times in the Hithpael imperfect, five in the Hithpael imperative, four in the Hithpael participle, and twice in the Hithpael infinitive. For the cases, see the list at the end of this appendix.

לְ is a verb less frequently used to mean intercede. In the Kal (= Hiphil) it means to pray, to supplicate (always to God). Again, by the addition of the fitting preposition it may mean to intercede, as in Gen.xvx.21 (Kal impf.), Ex.viii.4,24 (Hiph.impv.), 25 (Hiph.impf.), 26 (Kal impf.), ix.28 (Kal impv.), x.17 (Hiph.impv.), 18 (Kal impf.).
In the Niphal it means to be intreated, or to let oneself be intreated, as in Gen.xxv.21, II S.xxvii.25.

וַאֲדוּ is the last of the three more common words for intercede. In the Kal one of its meanings is to assail with petitions, to encounter with requests, to intreat, with כ in Jer.vii.16, xxvii.18; and with י of the person on whose behalf, as in Gen.xxiii.8. In the Hiphil one of its meanings is to assail with prayers, to make intreaty, to intercede, to interpose (preferred by BDB), as in Isa.liii.12 (imperf. with י, person on whose behalf), Jer.xxxvi.25 (perf. with י), Isa.lix.16 (part.).

Of the less important verbs, רָעַע means to cry, to cry out, to call; and with שָׁעַר, to cry unto, to implore, as in Ex.viii.8, Num.xii.13, Lam. ii.13. רָעַע, a form of רָעַע, is similarly used, as in I S.vii.9, xv.11, Neh.ix.4, Joel i.14. In all the above cases the specific meaning of intercession is found in the context rather than in the verb.

שֹׁפַט (used only in the Piel) has as one of its meanings to beseech, to supplicate, to intreat the favour, as in Gen.xxxii.11, Zech.vii.2, Mal.i.9.

שָׁמַע (Piel, to seek, to seek the face of a ruler or Yahweh) is used in II S.xii.16 in the Piel imperfect with ישע to mean to beseech for.

שָׁמַע (Kal, to call) is used in I K.xvii.21 and Jon.i.6 with to mean to cry unto, to call upon.

Hebrew has no single word meaning intercede, and being unable to form a compound from verb and preposition as has been done in Latin and English, it has made use of the variety of rather loose expressions given above. Thus not only the verb but the phrase and its context have to be studied to see whether intercession is meant.
There follows a list of verb forms meaning *intercede* in their context, together with the English translations of the AV, RV, ARV and JV. The translation is common to all unless otherwise indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Verb</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. xx.7</td>
<td>Hithp. impf. of ‏שָׁפֵר‏ shall pray for thee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv.21</td>
<td>Kal impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ intreated the Lord for his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niph. impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ Lord was intreated of him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. viii.4</td>
<td>Hiph. impv. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ intreat the Lord, that he may take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kal impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ intreat for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiph. impv. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ I will intreat the Lord that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kal impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ intreat the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.28</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.17</td>
<td>Hiph. impv. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kal impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ intreated the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii.11</td>
<td>Piel impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ besought the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. xii.13</td>
<td>Kal impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ pray unto the Lord, that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiph. impv. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ Moses prayed for the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiph. impv. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ I prayed for Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. ix.20</td>
<td>Hithp. impf. of ‏יָשַׁע‏ cried unto the Lord for Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cried unto the Lord, and said

prayed unto the Lord

Elisha prayed, and said

prayed unto the Lord, and said

prayeth before thee

prayeth before the God of heaven which I pray before thee

cried with a loud voice

Job shall pray for you

when he prayed for his friends

Hezekiah prayed unto the Lord

made intercession for

that there was no intercessor

pray not thou for this people

neither make intercession to me

pray not thou for this people

pray not for this people

let them now make intercession

pray unto the Lord for it

had made intercession

JV - had entreated

pray now...for us

pray for us unto the Lord

I will pray unto the Lord

cried unto

prayed unto the Lord...and said

cry unto the Lord
Jon. i.6 Kal impv. of קָר call upon thy God
Zech. vii.2 Piel inf. of נָר to pray before the Lord
Mal. i.9 Piel impv. of " beseech God that he will be gracious

RV,JV - to intreat the favour of God
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