

ARTICLE III.

ISAIAH THE MYTH AND ISAIAH THE PROPHET.¹

BY HOWARD OSGOOD.

ISAIAH THE MYTH.

THE multiple division of the prophecy of Isaiah is not new. It is more than eighty years old, and the successors of the first great divider have not yet quite attained to the vigor and number of divisions by their learned and bulky forerunner. In 1816-19 Eichhorn, at sixty-four years of age, published his "Hebrew Prophets" in two volumes. It was the ripe fruit of more than forty years' study. He divided the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah, containing 1,292 verses, into sixty-four sections, and of these he assigned only 300 verses, less than one-fourth of the whole, to Isaiah. The other 992 verses he divided among many "unnamed" writers living from B.C. 710 to 465. Eichhorn made these divisions and assignments because he felt them. As he tells us in his former work,² "The most convincing passages can only be felt." One of the most imposing ex-

¹ S. R. Driver. Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York, 1891 and ff.

———Isaiah. New York. n. d.

T. K. Cheyne. Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. London, 1895.

———The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Polychrome Edition. New York, 1898.

J. Skinner. Isaiah. 2 Vols. Cambridge Bible for Schools. 1896-98.

George Adam Smith. The Book of Isaiah. 2 Vols. New York, 1889-90.

———Isaiah. Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. 1899.

H. Cornill. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Freiburg, 1892 and ff.

B. Duhm. Jesaja. Nowack's Handkommentar z. Alten Testament. 1892.

² Introduction to the Old Testament (1803), Vol. iii. p. 65.

amples of the firm conviction induced by this ability to feel is found in his treatment of chapters xv. 1-xvi. 12, twenty verses. He says: "For experts in fine appreciation of the Hebrew language who have long accustomed themselves to distinguish the fine differences of expression and ideas in ancient writers, there are more numerous and convincing proofs from the contrast of language, of idea and treatment, of coloring, in short, of the whole manner in which the various parts in Isaiah are wrought out. What a difference, for instance, between the parts undoubtedly belonging to Isaiah and the oracle against Moab [chaps. xv. and xvi.] of which I have spoken! Does he work up and round off his expressions elsewhere as he does here? Does he in his pictures show such palpable hardness and roughness? Does he thus ardently strive to appear learned? Does he needlessly heap up geographical names? Is there in the whole piece a single trace of the customary manner of Isaiah?" Feeling thus with the fine appreciation of an expert in the Hebrew language (which he had then studied for over thirty years, being fifty-one years old), it was to him unthinkable that Isaiah could have written chapters xv. and xvi. If this ground of judgment was secure, it would have stood all coming tests. But a further study of thirteen years blasts the diagnosis by "fine appreciation of the Hebrew language," so that in 1816, the same Eichhorn quietly assigns chapters xv. and xvi. back to Isaiah. Eichhorn on Eichhorn is a far more instructive study than Eichhorn on Isaiah. His work on "The Hebrew Prophets" has been so seldom rescued from the dust that Gesenius and, alas, Cheyne misquote it.

After eighty years, what is the latest word on the division of Isaiah by the followers of the school of Eichhorn? It has been suggested that six of their foremost writers be taken, and their results compared. Two shall be of the Episcopal Church of England,—Driver and Cheyne; two

shall be British Presbyterians,—G. A. Smith and Skinner; and two shall be Germans,—Cornill and Duhm. They are all of the same school of criticism, able, learned, and in high position, and their latest works quoted are all of the past ten years and easily found. There are no better exemplars of this school. There are none who can more truly tell us of each other. We shall therefore be saved from mistaken criticism by the repeated and clear decisions of these learned men.

All these writers make the basis of their assignment or denial of parts to Isaiah to be the correct date of the writing and the events of history about the correct date. For to them prophecy is the foresight of leading men aroused by the special events of periods in their career. The time with its events and the words, ideas of the writer, answer to each other as matrix and type. The date is most important because every year from 740 to 700 B.C. was seething with the cross-purposes of Egypt and Assyria to gain the land of Canaan; with invasions, and schemes to avoid invasions; with contests against confederate Israel and Syria; with slavish submission to Assyria; with the final overthrow of Israel. The capitals of Israel and Judah were only forty miles apart, and the southern boundary of Israel was only some fifteen miles north of Jerusalem. What happened to the one was of supreme importance to the other. The territory of Israel and the western parts of Judah were the common runway of hostile forces during all the activity of Isaiah. No period of the history of Israel was filled with more numerous and more startling occurrences. The changes were so swift, so vast and dominant, that Judah was not the same for any two years together. Hence, if the time and the events are the only correct interpreters of the writings, the first need is to get the right point of view as to the date and its history.

A careful comparison of the works of these writers

shows us that they agree in assigning to Isaiah, or to his time, 310 verses out of the 1,292. On 246 verses they disagree; some assigning and some denying them to Isaiah. On 736 verses they agree in denying that they are Isaiah's.

We will take these divisions in order and see how far they agree in their chief reason, the dates, for assigning or denying these parts to Isaiah.

First: those parts which these writers unitedly assign to Isaiah's time. On chap. i. 1-31, they differ from 1 to 39 years; on ii. 5-iii. 26; v. 1-30, they differ from 5 to 18 years; on vi. 1-13, they differ from 5 to 35 years; on vii. 1-viii. 22, they differ from 8 to 39 years; on ix. 7-x. 34, they differ from 5 to 39 years; on xiv. 24-27, they differ from 10 to 21 years; on xvii. 1-14, they differ from 1 to 39 years; on xviii. 1-7, they differ from 1 to 10 years; on xx. 1-6, they agree; on xxii. 1-25, they differ from 7 to 21 years; on xxviii. 1-29, they differ from 1 to 39 years; on xxxi. 1-9, they differ from 1 to 4 years.

With the exception of Smith, who most often agrees with Driver, there is no constant accord between these critics. For instance, on i. 1-31, Driver and Smith put it all at 740-735; Cornill, part 735-722, and part after 701; Cheyne, part 701, and part 722; Duhm, part 740-735, part 711, part 701; Skinner, 734. Driver and Smith are in the minority; two-thirds are against them. What Driver and Smith say is a whole of a certain date, Cornill, Cheyne, and Duhm say is a mosaic of far-separated dates. The events out of which that chapter arose Driver and Smith say were those of the beginning of Isaiah's writings in the troubles of the closing reign of Jotham; Cheyne says they were partly those of the latter part of Hezekiah's reign and partly of the bitter struggle before the overthrow of Israel; Cornill says they were partly those of the bitter struggle before Israel's fall and partly of the latter days of Hezekiah; but what Cheyne says arose in 701

Cornill says arose in 735-722, and what Cheyne says arose in 722 Cornill says arose in 701. And so we find unceasing change throughout all these attempts at dating these writings they ascribe to Isaiah, but never a majority agreement, except on xx. 1-6; there they agree, for the chapter was dated by the original writer.

The average of differences in dating these 310 verses would be about twenty-two years. When we remember what is told us of the boiling caldron of Isaiah's times, these differences are sufficiently large and decisive to induce much thinking on the part of the reader of these works. Our own land has seen mighty changes within thirty-nine years. What should we think of six critics who were as far apart in dating the speeches of our best statesmen during these thirty-nine years? Or of six British critics who were as persistently contradictory in dating Milton's writings?

There are still larger prospects before us. On the 246 verses which some assign and some deny to Isaiah, we find the following differences: On ii. 1-4, 490 years; on iv. 1-6, 540 years; on ix. 1-6 and xi. 1-16, 202 years; on xii. 1-6, 490 years; on xiv. 28-32, 375 years; on xv. 1-xvi. 12, 620 years; on xix. 1-25, 390 years; on xxi. 1-17, 163 years; on xxiii. 1-18, 397 years; on xxix. 1-24, 184 years; on xxx. 1-33, 165 years; on xxxii. 1-20, 485 years; on xxxiii. 1-24, 545 years; on xxxvii. 6, 7, 22-35, and xxxix. 5-7, 401 years. The averages of these differences would be about 378 years. Eichhorn's stumbling-stone, xv. 1-xvi. 12, is still making trouble to his followers. Driver and Smith do not know. Skinner knows that it is not Isaiah's. Cheyne says 722 or 589, a query to a single mind of 133 years. But Cornill knows that it must be dated before Isaiah's time, 780, though Duhm is just as sure that it could not have arisen before 160; a slight divergence of 620 years on 21 verses. While this is the

highest figure reached in these differences, it is only a little in advance of others. There are four divergences of over 400 years, and two of over 500 years. Minor deviations are hardly worthy of regard beside these abysmal chasms.

There remain those parts which all these writers deny to Isaiah. On xiii. 1-xiv. 23, they differ 12 years; on xxiv. 1-xxvii. 13, 410 years; on xxxiv. 1-xxxv. 10, 378 years; on xxxvi. 1-xxxix. 4 (exc. certain parts previously mentioned), 320 years; on xl. 1-lv. 13, 17 years; on xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-liii. 12, 155 years; on lvi. 1-lxvi. 24, 250 years. The average divergence on these sections would be about 220 years.

When we ask these critics for the latest word of their science on Isaiah we are told, We agree in referring 310 verses to Isaiah and in denying 736 verses to be his; on 246 verses we disagree as to their belonging to Isaiah or his time. When we ask further for the reason why they assign certain verses and deny other verses to Isaiah, they point us to the verses as showing the date, and to the date and events as giving rise to the verses. But as soon as we look at these foundation-stones of their several edifices we find that they are absolutely contradictory. Here are six learned critics, each one of whom is in the smallest minority, condemned by his fellows in that he does not know when any part of Isaiah arose and, therefore, cannot rightly interpret it. If an outsider ventured to suggest that possibility, it would be assigned to traditionalism, to ignorance, to inability to judge these deep things fairly. But their friends do not assign any of these states of mind to these critics. And yet they without scruple condemn each other as wanting in the basis of all true knowledge of the writings before them. The decision of this court must be accepted.

Let us suppose that a book written in English, extending over seventy-five pages octavo, is placed before six

eminent critics of English for their decision as to the date of its composition. They decide that it is a compilation, but they cannot agree as to when the parts were written. One of them decides that a certain part bears the stamp of the age of Chaucer and Wycliffe; another decides that that very part is plainly stamped with all the marks of the age of Victoria. Another declares that a section could only have arisen in the age of Elizabeth; by still another that section is assigned to the present day. And so they stand utterly antagonistic to each other on all parts of the asserted compilation. The writing remains. But those critics very thoroughly discredit their claim to a science of English criticism. No man in the day of Chaucer could so write English as to make it seem in any respect like that of the present day, and no man to-day could successfully imitate the writing of Chaucer's day. Shams in literature are as certain to be discovered as shams elsewhere.

For one hundred and twenty years the dissection of Isaiah, beginning with feeble attempts, has gone on, and now we can trace its whole course down to this self-contradiction by the school that has claimed this dissection as its own, and smiled at the backwardness of those who would not follow them.

Not only do these critics condemn each other, in every new edition they condemn their own past judgments. Where one has dated a number of verses in one edition, we find in his next edition that he dates it two hundred years later. In one edition he is sure the verses belong to Isaiah, in the next he tells us they certainly do not belong to Isaiah. If they can so easily change one way, they can, like Eichhorn, just as quietly change back again. For a long time chaps. xl.-lxvi. were by all this school denied to Isaiah and assigned to a single writer in the exile, and it was thought a mark of advanced views to believe in the "second Isaiah." That has now passed to old tradition-

alism. Those chapters are now divided by this school among three writers, whose dates float in the air down the centuries. The "second Isaiah" used to be praised as excelling in all the marvelous powers possessed by the first Isaiah. But now with Wellhausen, Smend, and others, the second, third, etc., Isaiahs have sunk to mere wooden copyists, without an original thought.

There is another primal point on which these writers are very instructive,—the question of style. No man, not even Herbert Spencer, has been able to tell us what style is, further than it is the expression of the man. For a hundred and twenty years there have been discussions of the style of Isaiah by those who claim to dissect the writings. What was long certified as Isaiah's because it was his style is now denied to him because it is not his style. What was denied to Isaiah because it bore no marks of his style is now assigned to him because it is undoubtedly in his style. Beginning with Koppe in 1779, the history of ascription and denial of parts of the book to Isaiah with the reasons given by each critic is interesting reading.

Our six critics profess to tell us what is written in Isaiah's style and what is not his style. The style answers to the date and events, and knowing these they can without fail detect the style. A glance at the Polychrome Isaiah will show how many colors are needed to indicate the shadings of style, not merely in long sections, but in verses and parts of verses. In Eichhorn's words, "Experts in fine appreciation of the Hebrew language who have long accustomed themselves," etc., now can tell to a word or particle just where and to whom it belongs. There are even fine points where a small word is decided not to belong to any of the numerous writers of the parts of Isaiah, but has been inserted by some ignorant copyist or tyro of an editor. Such things astonish us as the outcome of much learning.

Whether our critics are justified in their attempted minute distinctions of style will be exemplified by taking large sections where there is a wide field to put in play all knowledge of lexicon and grammar, all the science of Hebrew philology, all acquaintance with the events of history, and from this vantage-ground to decide the style of writing. Let us take the twenty-four verses of chapter xxxiii. Driver, Smith, and Skinner put this in 705-701, during the turmoil of Sennacherib's invasion; Cheyne says, it reflects the peaceful days just after the exile; Cornill says before 250, that is, it reflects the days when Judæa was ground small between the Ptolemies and the Selucidae; Duhm puts it in 160, when the Maccabees were making their death struggle for liberty. Or, let us take the twenty-five verses of chapter xix. Driver says 720, that is, two years after the ruin of the ten tribes, and when Sargon was marching through the land to Egypt; Smith says 703 or after 700; Cornill says after 701; these were the last years of Hezekiah, filled with fears of Assyrian conquest; Cheyne and Skinner say after 538, that is, in the calm of Cyrus's protection; and Duhm says 330, when Alexander had conquered and ruled all western Asia. And so we could go through a long list. Where one tells us it is the style of peace, another assures us it is the style of war; where one declares that it is the style of ruin, another decides that it is the style of repose, and another is certain it is the style breathed by the last hopeless battle against overwhelming forces. If it is the child of one, it cannot be the child of the other. All human experience and knowledge for six thousand years are against the supposition that the same child can be born of three mothers living two hundred years apart from each other. Whatever the style may be, one thing is certain, these critics, by their own testimony against each other, decide that they have utterly failed to comprehend the style, and, by

that same testimony, know not what and whence it is. It seems well-nigh incredible that, after a century of its life, a school that prides itself on applying its science to the solution of questions raised by it, should present to the world a host of self-contradictory hypotheses as "the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical inquiry." Can that be called a science where its most eminent men are all at odds on the fundamental facts?

How is it possible that learned men can on seventy-five pages of writing reach merely an unending whirl of decisions as to date and style and interpretation? There is only one solution,—the one given and exemplified by the very learned Eichhorn; that it is the criticism of personal feeling, and not of established laws drawn by induction from a great mass of facts. What Eichhorn asserted eighty years ago as the basis of judgment, Cheyne continues to assert,¹ that the judgment of passages is founded upon impression; or, as stated more bluntly by another, "What I think, that is scholarship." It is the school of impression and sensation. Each one gives his impression, his varying impressions; and, when we gather these impressions together, instead of being a bunch of fruit or a bouquet of roses, they are a knot of thorns. Instead of the calm inductions of an acknowledged and united science, we have the Polychrome display of personal impressions. But no amount of learning can give weight or authority to mere impressions, and a world of impressions can never make a science. In the words of a distinguished German critic, "A science which offers us a chaos of unproved hypotheses as verified facts cannot arouse in us any remarkable confidence in the justice and propriety of its method." These are "the oppositions [antitheses] of knowledge falsely so-called" from which we are exhorted to turn away.

¹ *Isaiah*, Vol. ii. p. 209.

These are of the myths and interminable genealogies to which we are charged not to give heed. Myths are the progeny of impressions.

THE PROPHET.

The book of Isaiah, whether in Hebrew or English, still stands complete. Nothing has been lost, nothing can be lost from it. It is published in too many million copies, spread all over the world, ever to return to Lagarde's phantom, a single copy, and so be despoiled. Men's views of the book may be as diverse as the winds, but the book itself is secure. It stands now and invites the most thorough search, as it has stood for nearly three thousand years. Each reader has the right to form his own opinion.

In spite of the hundreds of volumes written upon this book, it is a matter of surprise to find, that, whether read in Hebrew or English, the words used are among the simplest. Exclusive of proper names, there are in the Hebrew Bible about 6,413 words used; of these 1,800 (1,798) occur only once, about 724 occur only twice, about 448 occur only three times. So that there are only about 3,443 words used more than three times. That is, the Hebrew Bible, of about fourteen hundred octavo pages, is all written by the common use of less than four thousand words. Remembering the results achieved,—historical prose, poetry of the highest order, prophetic prose that vies with poetry in its lofty flights, all concerned with the deepest, highest thoughts and aspirations of the mind,—it is amazing that such results should be attained with means so small. The eighteen hundred words that occur but once prove, that, beyond the small number of words commonly used in the Old Testament, there was a large stock from which the writers drew very sparingly. The Hebrew writers of the Old Testament deliberately chose the popular speech, a small section of the

whole language, and by that expressed all they had to say. This becomes very apparent on comparing the various books of the Old Testament. Isaiah, in 76 pages octavo, uses 2,186 words, of which 262 are unique. The Psalms, in 97 pages, uses 2,170 words, of which 165 are unique. Jeremiah, in 96 pages, uses 1,653 words, of which 103 are unique. Ezekiel, in 84 pages, uses 1,535 words, of which 160 are unique. Isaiah makes larger use of the current Hebrew vocabulary than any other book, and yet he makes use of only one-half of it. Jeremiah and Ezekiel find less than one-half amply sufficient for all their purposes.

The same is true of the Greek New Testament. Exclusive of proper names, its vocabulary consists of about 4,867 words, and of these about 1,613 occur but once, and about 654 occur but twice; leaving only about 2,600 words as the common usage of the New Testament. Considering all that is said and taught in the New Testament, this vocabulary is extremely small. Yet Christ and Paul and John and Luke find ample stores there to express all they had to say. In the Bible, and in the best writing in any language, it is not the extent of the vocabulary, but the use made of the vocabulary; not the words, but the meaning the context gives to the words; not the letter, but the spirit breathing through the words, that distinguishes the writing and the writers. To express great thoughts on the loftiest themes in simple, popular words is the work only of minds of the highest class thinking clearly. Swollen words may be the sign of learning, but they are not the mark of clear thought. He whose clear thought has never been excelled, and who could speak in more tongues than all those around him, preferred to speak five words that he might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue not understood by those who listened.

That positive choice also marks the book of Isaiah. Clear thought on the highest themes is there expressed in

the simplest terms. That fact stamps the book as the production of the highest intellectual powers. Want of intelligence and command of proper expression cannot be truthfully urged against this book. The reason why one must read this book over and over again before he can feel at all sure that he has gained its thoughts is because the thought is pressed down, shaken together, running over, in these simple words. Like the Gospel of John, its clear expressions are guiding stars in the infinite depths of the heavens. It is not art concealing art, but an overpowering theme has caught up the writer and carried him along to its end. What Macaulay said of Bunyan may easily be applied to *Isaiah*: "The vocabulary is the vocabulary of the common people. . . . Yet no writer has said more exactly what he meant to say. For magnificence, for pathos, for vehement exhortation, for subtile disquisition, for every purpose of the poet, the orator, the divine, this homely dialect, the dialect of plain, working men, was perfectly sufficient."

A striking feature of the whole book, as it lies upon the surface, is that it is the intense pleading of a loving Father's heart over erring, disobedient, suffering children. From the agony of a rejected Father in the first chapter and second verse to that most tender promise in the last chapter, "as one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you," there is the unceasing call in words of yearning affection with promise of blessing: "Seek ye Jehovah while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto Jehovah, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."

This rejected but yearning tender Father is Jehovah, the only God; "the first and the last, and besides him there is no God"; "besides him there is no Saviour"; "he created the heavens and stretched them forth, he spread abroad

the earth and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth breath unto the people and spirit to them that walk therein"; "the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth"; "the Creator of Israel; your King." Before the only God, all idols, all thoughts of another God, are "vanity and naught, wind and confusion," "a lie in the right hand," and bring upon those who harbor them the flame and flood of Jehovah's destruction.

Jehovah, who abundantly pardons, who blots out their apostasies for his own sake and no more remembers their sins, is set forth by the whole book as the God of holiness, "the Holy One of Israel." He would bring the rebellious from sin and apostasy to their Father's home, that they may be holy, walk in the way of holiness, and abide in holiness. From the first to the last of the book there is utter hatred and indignation against all forms of unholiness, and the terrors of its recompense are spread before the people as though a volcano shot up into the heavens its fountain of fire, and covered the earth with streams of lava.

Jehovah is throughout the whole book the God of truth; all his counsels are faithfulness and truth. His supreme abomination is a lie. That is the mark of all who depart from him; their refuge is a lie, and treachery to God and man. In justice and righteousness the lie and the liar, the hiding-place and the hidden, shall be swept away by the hail of Jehovah's wrath.

There is one further point that is of importance. From the beginning to the end this book is filled with foretellings. The future of individuals, of nations, the outcome of treachery, the result of wars, the ruin of the false, the glory of the true Israel, follow one another without a break. It is absolutely denied again and again in this book that man can foretell the future. All pretenders to foretelling are called liars, and Jehovah makes their madness plain.

All the foretellings in this book are ascribed to Jehovah, who alone can foretell (xli. 1-5, 21-29; xliii. 8-21; xliv. 6-9, 24-28; xlv. 1-17; xlvi. 8-13; xlvii. 11-15; xlviii. 3-17). The foretelling of Cyrus by name (xliv. 24-xlv. 7), of which so much is made by those who do not believe in foretelling, is interwoven all the way through with the repeated statements that it is the word of Jehovah, "who maketh all things, . . . that frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners [foretellers] mad." "He declares the end from the beginning."

There is not in the whole book one word of palliation for sin, of collusion with deceit, of apology for guilt of obliquity towards unchastity of thought or act. The purpose, everywhere apparent, is to manifest Jehovah, the only God, as the God of holiness and truth, who pardons all rebels that return to him with their whole heart, but who will surely destroy all who persist in sin. Everywhere and equally it proclaims the highest standard of morals, whose fountain-head is the God of truth, to whom every one on earth, from the king to the beggar, is directly answerable.

In the face of this purpose and this standard of morals, pure as God is pure, the book presents itself everywhere as Jehovah speaking in the first person through the writer, or in words which he has commanded to be spoken. More than four hundred times does Jehovah use verbs in the first person, and one hundred and thirty-six times are long passages ascribed to Jehovah, "Jehovah said," "Jehovah spoke," "Jehovah commanded," etc. But these are only a small portion of the words ascribed to Jehovah in the first person; for long passages occur where Jehovah speaks, using the pronoun "me," "mine," etc., but not the verb in the first person. These passages could not be the words of the writer, unless he is to be charged with insanity or intentional blasphemy. We refer to such passages as v. 1-7; x. 25; xiii. 2, 3; xix. 25; xxxiv. 5; xli. 1; li. 4-11; lii. 13;

lv. 8, 9, etc. A careful search of the whole book will glean only a few words or short passages, except in the historical chapters xxxvi.-xxxix., where it can be the prophet speaking his own, and not the words directly commanded by Jehovah. The book is open. Any one who will read the book through with care can see for himself.

In the first part of the book (chaps. i. 1.-xxxix. 8), some eighty-two verbs are used in the first person by Jehovah, and fifty-six times passages begin with, "Thus said, spake Jehovah," etc.; while in the second part (chaps. xl. 1.-lxvi. 24), there are some three hundred and twenty-five verbs used in the first person by Jehovah, and eighty passages begin with, "Thus said, spake Jehovah," etc. Both parts of the book, therefore, are covered with these ascriptions of its own words to Jehovah, but they are more than three times more numerous in the second part than in the first.

Now before its own teachings in every part, before the only God, the God of truth and holiness, whose burning wrath shall surely destroy "the prophet teaching lies," were these ascriptions of the whole book to Jehovah as the author made in conscious truth or in a conscious lie? There can be no escape from that alternative. Either God spoke, commanded those words to be spoken, or he did not speak them, command them to be spoken. If God spoke them, then the whole book is immediately exalted to the God of truth's revelation of himself, his grace, and his purposes in the world. But if God did not speak all these words, then the ascription of them to him many times on every page is a lie, perjury of the deepest dye, while the book affirms by every argument and quoted example the purest morality. Is there in the literature of the world in all its ages a companion picture to that? Is it possible for the human mind to hold and exploit at one and the same time a whole truth and a whole lie fused into a solid mass? Until another instance is found of teaching the loftiest

morality proceeding from God as its author, permeated everywhere with blackest perjury, it will be held to be inconceivable.

The book of Isaiah presents the same alternative as does our Lord Jesus Christ. He professed to be God, to come from God, to speak the words God gave him and commanded him to speak, and on the heart acceptance or rejection of these words by men depended their acceptance or rejection by God. If God never spoke through him or by him, if eternal salvation does not depend upon the acceptance of Christ's words, then before God and man what was Christ but the greatest deceiver the world ever knew? The only seeming way of escape from this alternative is by denying, as is often done, the validity of the writings in the New Testament. But the denial of this validity does not solve the difficulty. The writings remain, and the question, How could intentional liars reach the greatest heights of morality, and draw in life and death the only perfect character the ages have ever seen?

This book, then, is characterized by the highest intellectual power expressed in the simplest terms, by the knowledge of the only God, the God of holiness and truth, who hates and will punish all who persistently oppose him, but who calls his disobedient children to return that he may pardon and bless them; and by the purest morality. And with all that it claims to be the word spoken by God himself.

It is time now to ask, Have we any certain knowledge as to the human writer? Isaiah is mentioned in i. 1; ii. 1; vii. 3; xiii. 1; xx. 2, 3; xxxvii. 2, 5, 6, 21; xxxviii. 1, 4, 21; xxxix. 3, 5, 8. Nowhere in the book itself is it said that Isaiah was the writer of all its parts. No reputable author ancient or modern on issuing his book states that he wrote it all. They put their names at the beginning of their writings, and that is received as a guarantee that what

follows is their writing. Isaiah did that. But we are not left to inferences. To those who believe that God is the real author of the New Testament and that its writers wrote "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth," the witness of God in the New Testament will be amply sufficient to put to rest all doubt as to the writer of the book Isaiah.

We will take first those passages in Isaiah which the New Testament ascribes directly to God:—

Isa. vi. 9, 10: "Well spake the Holy Spirit by [through] Isaiah the prophet" (Acts xxviii. 25).

Isa. vii. 14: "Spoken by the Lord through the prophet" (Matt. i. 22).

Isa. viii. 17, 18: "He [Jesus] . . . saying . . . and again" (Heb. ii. 11, 13).

Isa. xl. 6-8: "The word of God which liveth and abideth. For" (1 Pet. i. 23).

Isa. xliii. 6: "Saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor. vi. 18).

Isa. xlix. 6: "For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying" (Acts xiii. 47).

Isa. xlix. 8: "That ye receive not the grace of God in vain, for he saith" (2 Cor. vi. 2).

Isa. lii. 11: "Saith the Lord" (2 Cor. vi. 17).

Isa. lv. 3: "He raised him up from the dead . . . he hath spoken on this wise" (Acts xiii. 34).

Isa. lxxv. 17; lxxvi. 22: "According to his promise" (2 Pet. iii. 13).

It will be observed that three of these ascriptions to God are taken from the first part, and seven from the last part of the book.

Secondly, passages ascribed to Isaiah.

Isa. i. 9: "As Isaiah hath said before" (Rom. ix. 29).

Isa. vi. 9, 10: "The prophecy of Isaiah, which saith" (Matt. xiii. 14); "For that Isaiah said again" (John xii. 39); "By [through] Isaiah the prophet" (Acts xxviii. 25).

Isa. vii. 14: "Spoken . . . through the prophet" (Matt. i. 22).

Isa. ix. 1, 2: "Spoken by [through] Isaiah the prophet" (Matt. iv. 14).

Isa. x. 22, 23: "Isaiah crieth" (Rom. ix. 27).

Isa. xi. 10: "Isaiah saith" (Rom. xv. 12).

Isa. xxix. 13: "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you" (Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 6).

Isa. xl. 3; "Spoken of by [through] Isaiah the prophet" (Matt. iii. 3); "Written in [through] Isaiah" (Mark i. 2); "As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet" (Luke iii. 4); "As said Isaiah the prophet" (John i. 23).

Isa. xlii. 1-4: "Spoken by [through] Isaiah the prophet" (Matt. xii. 18).

Isa. liii. 1: "The word of Isaiah the prophet . . . which he spake" (John xii. 38); "These things said Isaiah" (John xii. 41); "Isaiah saith" (Rom. x. 16).

Isa. liii. 4: "Spoken by [through] Isaiah the prophet, saying" (Matt. viii. 17).

Isa. lxi. 1, 2: "The book of the prophet Isaiah . . . where it was written" (Luke iv. 17).

Isa. lxv. 1, 2: "Isaiah is very bold and saith"; "But as to Israel he saith" (Rom. x. 20, 21).

All parts are equally assigned to Isaiah. It is most instructive to mark how the Lord Jesus Christ quotes the book of Isaiah.

Isa. vi. 9, 10: "Unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which saith" (Matt. xiii. 14).

Isa. xxix. 13: "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying as it is written" (Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 6).

Isa. liii. 12: "For I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in me" (Luke xxii. 37).

Isa. liv. 13: "It is written in the prophets" (John vi. 45).

Isa. lvi. 7: "It is written" (Matt. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46).

Isa. lxi. 1, 2: "There was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened the book and found the place where it was written. . . . And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears" (Luke iv. 17, 21).

The Saviour attributes both parts of the book to Isaiah the prophet. But he also quotes its passages with special intensity by the simple form, "It is written," for by the Saviour's teaching what was written in the Scripture "must be [i.e. a moral necessity] fulfilled" (Matt. xxvi. 54, 56; xxvii. 9; Mark xiv. 49; Luke xviii. 31; xxi. 22; xxiv. 44). Following the Saviour's method of special insistence, the following passages are quoted in the New Testament by the introduction, "It is written": Isa. xxv. 8; xxvii. 9; xxviii. 11, 16; xxix. 10; xli. 16; xlv. 23;

lii. 5, 7, 15; liv. 1; lix. 7, 8; lxiv. 4. The following are ascribed to the prophet or in the prophets: liv. 13; lxii. 11; lxvi. 2. The following are termed by Christ and the New Testament writers, "Scripture," i.e. what is written: xxviii. 16; xli. 8; liii. 7, 8; lxi. 1, 2.

These passages are by no means all that are quoted in the New Testament. They are all that are introduced by some form of ascription to God, to Isaiah, to a prophet, to Scripture. But other passages are quoted without any form of introduction, of which the Saviour's awful description of hell is a striking example, "Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," Mark ix. 48, taken from the last verse of the book of Isaiah.

If from this we pass on to the New Testament use of Isaiah's thoughts and terms we should need a volume and not a single article to show the overflowing of that abundant stream from Matthew to Revelation. The New Testament has not left us in any doubt. It agrees with and puts its stamp upon every claim of the book of Isaiah: it was spoken by God through Isaiah; it contained foretellings, some of them fulfilled in Christ's person and day, and others await fulfillment; it is "the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet."

"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto men rather than unto God, judge ye."