

Prophets 12.

received the call of the Lord to go and prophesy. I mean the beginning of a man's work as a prophet. The reason I mention that is that usually this and F., The Mode of Reception of the Prophetic Revelation, are confused by one or two in the class. I usually find that in the final examination. I don't think there has ever been more than one or two, but when I ask for one of them there is always one or two who give the other one and so I just want to be sure that you understand the difference between the two points of the outline as I give them now. E. The Call of the Prophet, and that means, of course, his beginning of his ministry, and under that, 1. Negatively. a. The prophets were not men of one particular tribe. The call of the prophet is not hereditary. The Levites served at the sanctuary and their call was hereditary. A man was born to a Levitic family and it was understood that he would go into this function. A descendant of Eli in the proper line, the high priest, would be called to be trained to be high priest or to be one of the priests. That was a hereditary call. Such is not the case with a prophet. The first born of the house of David right down the line is called by his birth to be the king. That is a hereditary call. Such is not the case with the prophet. They are not restricted to any particular family or tribe. God calls the prophet from any group He chooses, even some from outside of Israel, though that is rare. b. The prophets are not men of one social class. In England a few years ago it was quite customary to be extremely surprised if anyone who had not gone to Eaton or Herald or one of those leading great private schools which they call public schools, if somebody who hadn't gone to one of them should claim to show leadership in the nation they would be very much surprised. I remember my father thirty years ago speaking of Lloyd George when he began to come into prominence to an Englishman and he said, "Oh, he's just a common country . ." He'd never gone to Eaton or Heralds. He could have no leadership in the government. It was expected that a man who had leadership would belong to one particular social class or one particular background. That, of course, is no longer to so great an extent the case there. It has never been the case in this country. It was true of the kings as a rule. They came from particular social backgrounds, and it was true of the priests. It is not true of the prophets. We have David a prophet who was a king. We have Amos a prophet who was a tender of sycamore trees. We have Isaiah who came from a prominent family who was a prophet. We have Micah who probably came from much inferior social