

*LINES OF DEFENCE OF THE BIBLICAL
REVELATION.*

III. UNITY AGAINST PLURALITY.

A. ISAAH.

ARISTOTLE tells us that a work of art should be so constructed that the removal of any part should cause the whole to fall to pieces. We can therefore easily tell whether such a work is a unity by seeing what will happen if we take any part away. If the experiment results in leaving two unities where we fancied there was one, there will have been no original unity of plan. But if the result of the first experiment leads to endless dissection, then it will have been shown that the work was originally an organized whole.

If this canon be applied to the results of modern criticism on Isaiah, we shall be disposed to find the unity of the works ascribed to that Prophet brilliantly vindicated. To bisect Isaiah at the end of chapter xxxix. might seem an easy and legitimate process; but the result has been such as to justify Aristotle's worst fears. To speak of a theory of two Isaiahs is to intentionally mislead. Even the earliest dissectors of the Prophet were forced to turn him into three or four. If the newest Introduction to Isaiah be taken as representative of the newest criticism, the number of Isaiahs required is more than can be easily counted. The world, till about 1790, thought it had the works of a great Prophet, the productions of a mind sublimely, if not uniquely, gifted. But that was a childish mistake. What it really had was a patchwork made of scraps produced by a number of obscure

individuals so insignificant that posterity thought their names unworthy of record, or so dishonest that they dared not avow them. It is a cento of scraps of that sort that humiliated the literature of Greece and Rome and won Europe for Christ!

Now it is the business of science to produce results that are either certain or probable. Either they have their place in the chain of experience, or they are in harmony with it. Where a style of literature is common to many races, the scientific method is to master the history of the case which is most perfectly recorded, and to use the results to provide a working hypothesis for the cases that are more obscure. Thus Greece has epics, India has epics, and Persia has epics. In the case of the Greek epics history is silent both before and after their composition. The Indian epics can be located with rather more ease; for though India has no history, it is certain that Sanskrit literature does not begin with the epics. But in the case of the Epic Cycle of the Persians the whole history of the structure of the poems lies before us in faithful records. Therefore the working hypothesis for the cases of Greece and India should be supplied from the literary history of the Persians; for the inquiry will have been started in accordance with the principles of science.

In the case of *Prophecy* we have to deal with a class of literature unrepresented anywhere but in Israel. The Greek oracles bear some resemblance to the Prophecies as regards matter, but no collection of them ever formed a literary monument of consequence. They were moreover thought to be the actual compositions of the god, and Plutarch naïvely points out how extraordinary it seemed that the deity who inspired the poets should be so poor a composer himself. Therefore the only analogies that can guide us must be got from Hebrew literature. And, happily, we have one that is amply sufficient to serve as a touch-

stone for the twenty-Isaiah theory. By the side of the lengthy roll of Isaiah is the less lengthy roll of the twelve Minor Prophets. Few of these Prophets figure in history; and the judgment of mankind on their literary merits places none of them in the first class. They neither thrill as Isaiah thrills, nor have they influenced mankind as Isaiah has influenced it. How comes it then, if it was really the fashion of the Israelites to lump the oracles of different Prophets together, that the works of the whole series are not ascribed to the first? Why are not the prophecies of Haggai ascribed to Hosea? Some of the Minor Prophets have produced one chapter or thereabouts; but the tradition has not forgotten their names. How then comes it that the brilliant authors of the Isaianic oracles are for the most part utterly forgotten and neglected?

In order to give some colour to this paradox one piece of external evidence is adduced: "Rabbi Simon, quoted in the Midrash Rabbah, states that the verses 19 and 20 of Isaiah viii. were really by Hosea's father, but incorporated with Isaiah for fear lest they should get lost." The Midrash Rabbah appears not to have been committed to writing before about 1000 A.D.; and the Jews attach to it far less authority than they attach to the legends recorded in the Talmud. The Rabbi Simon referred to is probably the pupil of Rabbi Joshua Ben Levi, and his *floruit* may be placed about 250 A.D. We begin, then, by assuming that the oral tradition by which this saying was assigned to Rabbi Simon was faithfully preserved for some 750 years! Truly this is a large assumption. Writers such as Weiss, who make no very great pretensions to scepticism, place little faith in the lemmata of the Midrash. But supposing Rabbi Simon to have said it, how are we to suppose he got his information? Either the oral tradition preserved the correct account of the authorship of the verses from Isaiah's time to Rabbi Simon's—another 1,000 years—or he discovered it himself.

If he discovered it himself, his authority is simply worthless; a work in which such an opinion is even alluded to except for the purpose of ridicule may be safely branded as unscientific. Yet that Rabbi Simon did discover this himself is perfectly clear. His name figures fairly often in the Midrash and in the Jerusalem Talmud, and he clearly is an exegete of the Talmudic type. In the first section of the Midrash on Leviticus he is cited for the observation that the Books of Chronicles were written to encourage allegorical interpretations. He proceeds to show that Jared (1 Chron. iv. 18) means Moses, because Jared means "command," and Moses was a king. The word "Jewess" is applied to Jochebed, he says, in the same passage, because she, though of the tribe of Levi herself, gave the Jews a footing in the world. Elsewhere (*Jer. Rosh ha-shanah* i. 3) he infers from Genesis xxi. 17 that God judges men at the time of their actions, though the verse has no connection with the subject. To suppose, therefore, that this precious comment on Isaiah viii. has any other source than the imagination of some Rabbi is to misunderstand the Midrash. Rabbi Simon of course *inferred* that those verses were written by Hosea's father, and I will undertake to reproduce most of the steps of his reasoning. One premiss is that when the father of a Prophet is mentioned in the Bible, the father must have been a Prophet as well as the son; for this I may refer to the ordinary commentary on the Midrash. Therefore Beer, father of Hosea, must have been a Prophet. In Isaiah viii. 20 we read, "Assuredly they shall say unto you like this word which have no dawn." Stars can, it is said, be seen at midday at the bottom of a well; since the dawn in ordinary cases chases the stars, one who lived at the bottom of a well would have no dawn. But the name of Hosea's father means "the man of the well." Therefore "which have no dawn" means Hosea's father. Hence Isaiah viii. 20 was written by Hosea's father; and since it

contains the phrase "like this word," which probably refers to the preceding verse, verse 19 was by the same author. But has not the text, "*they shall say unto you*"? Because the same prophecy was to be uttered by Isaiah, the plural is used; or "do not read 'they shall say,' but 'he shall say.'" That this was the line of reasoning followed by Rabbi Simon is practically beyond question; and since the stream cannot rise above its source, the Biblical criticism of the nineteenth century apparently *approves* methods of reasoning which a child of ten could confute.

But suppose that we have here not an absurd inference, but a valuable fragment of history: what follows? Place the value of Rabbi Simon's statement as low as you like, provided you allow it *some* value; then remember that the Isaianic authorship of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is assumed by all the Rabbis and attested by many of them. The statement of an isolated Rabbi, recorded in a work of no authority, about a matter that happened 1,000 years before his time, is worth something; then shall the evidence of *all* the Rabbis be worth nothing? However atomic the value assigned to Rabbi Simon's statement, if it be once admitted as evidence, the case for the dissection of Isaiah is hopelessly lost. For it must be observed that the theory that Isaiah viii. 19, 20 were written by Hosea's father does not conflict with traditional views, for Isaiah himself confesses in one case that he has incorporated an earlier oracle with his prophecy: Rabbi Simon's statement adds to our knowledge, but does not alter existing conceptions. Hence this argument, if admitted, in no way helps the dissecting theory, whereas it brings in a cloud of witnesses who effectually ruin it.

But stay. Perhaps these Rabbis are better friends of the dissecting theory than you think. "The book of Isaiah in the Hebrew canon seems to have stood after Jeremiah and Ezekiel." This is proved by a reference to the Gemara of *Baba Bathra*, 14b, where reasons are given for placing

Isaiah after Ezekiel. The terms "Hebrew canon" and "Gemara" are too vague for science; let us try to limit them more closely. The Babylonian Talmud (Mishnah and Gemara) was compiled and written down about 800-850 A.D. The best accredited traditions were given a place in the Mishnah, less accredited ones in the Gemara. The "Hebrew canon" is a less accredited tradition. And justly so, for it is not regularly followed. Saadyah Gaon (ob. 942 A.D.) won the case for the Talmud, and a pupil of his provided a canon for the Arabic *Fihrist*, compiled in 987 A.D. His order is, Isaiah Jeremiah Ezekiel Kings Minor Prophets. In the fourteenth century another Jew provided a canon for the author of the *Irshad al-kasid*. His order is, Isaiah Jeremiah Ezekiel Minor Prophets. Hence it appears that, in spite of the Babylonian Gemara, this order obtained no great following after the Talmud was compiled. Then had it any before the Talmud was compiled? Melito made inquiries before 200 A.D. of Palestinian Jews, and their order was, Isaiah Jeremiah Minor Prophets Daniel Ezekiel. The order of the Syriac and Armenian versions is, Isaiah Minor Prophets Jeremiah Ezekiel. The order of the LXX. is, Minor Prophets Isaiah Jeremiah Ezekiel.

The date of the tradition in *Baba Bathra* can be fixed not with certainty, but approximately, as the seventh century of our era.

Hence we have the following alternatives before us. The Babylonian Gemara may retain a tradition of an ancient practice that goes back earlier than any other authority. In 270 B.C., when the LXX. translation of Isaiah was made, uncritical people had already wrong notions about the order of the books, which were shared at the end of that century by Ben-Sira. But the critical historians through whose hands the Talmudic traditions passed kept up a vestige of the truth. What a splendid vindication we have here of the Talmud as a source of history! Authors many cen-

turies earlier went wrong, and authors many centuries later went wrong; but the accurate and critical Talmud retains the truth! Unfortunately, when a conservative critic proceeds to quote the evidence of the Talmud for the *unity* of Isaiah, he is certain to be told that it is grossly uncritical to cite such an authority. The witnesses are to be believed only when their evidence favours a particular side.

How comes it, we may parenthetically ask, that the mediæval Rabbis were so much more critical in their Biblical studies than the scholars of the nineteenth century? for it is quite certain that neither Saadyah nor Rashi would have employed Talmudic evidence in this way. The reason is that they did not ordinarily comment with a particular interest in view. *Now* the interest is the ejection of the supernatural; and the desire to accomplish this leads at times to very curious results.

Secondly, we may suppose that the order was originally as one of the ancient authorities has it—was then altered, and altered again. In this case the tradition is of no use for the purpose for which it is cited.

Or, thirdly, we may suppose that there was no order. The Bible was a collection of books, which might be arranged according to the fancy of the owner. The order mentioned in *B. Baba Bathra* was the order of a casual copy. There is an accommodation to common sense in this view which I fear will render it unpopular.

Here, then, the impugners of the unity of Isaiah call in a witness who is either useless, or proves far more than can be desirable.

Before quitting the Introduction referred to, we may notice what is, according to it, a *certain* proof of non-Isaianic authorship. The mention of Cyrus or the use of an Aramaic loan-word is, we learn, flagrantly opposed to the possibility of authorship by Isaiah.

Let us take the second test first. Aramaic loan-words

are found in hieratic documents many centuries earlier than Isaiah. In Deborah's song, which is assuredly a very early specimen of Hebrew, there occurs an Aramaism *yethannu*, "they shall celebrate"; for there is no ground for severing this from the Aramaic. In the patera of Baal-Lebanon (800 B.C.?) there occurs the Aramaic loan-word *reshith*. Then we know from 2 Kings xviii, 25 that the Aramaic language was learnt by court officials in Isaiah's time; hence, if Isaiah's oracles were full of Aramaic loan-words, we should have no occasion for surprise. The only Aramaic loan-words that prove anything are words that we can date; and when words known to have been introduced into Aramaic later than 700 B.C. are found in any part of Isaiah, it will be proper to pay them due respect.

With regard to the mention of Cyrus, that involves questions concerning the power of God which are scarcely worth discussing, because agreement is not likely to be arrived at.

These few examples of arguments have been dealt with chiefly out of respect for the chief authority on Isaiah in this country. If science have an even balance, and deal in certainties and probabilities, we may safely brand both the methods and results which we have noticed as *unscientific*. Worse authorities than Rabbi Simon and the Babylonian Gemara we could not cite; when either is cited on the conservative side, the argument is received (and often rightly) with a burst of laughter. More inaccurate statements than that about Aramaic loan-words could not easily be made; let such a statement be made on the conservative side, and he who makes it will repent. Hence the arguments that are to be adduced cannot be less scientific than those in which "Biblical criticism" is wont to indulge. Let us hope that they may be found more so.

My first reason, then, for assailing the theories that split Isaiah is that the result to which they lead is uncritical, and even ludicrous. That two authors of stupendous merit

might accidentally get bound up together, and so the works of the second get attributed to the first, is exceedingly unlikely, but not so unlikely as to be impossible; in the case of Isaiah, however, not only is the analogy of the Minor Prophets decidedly against it, but that of Ezra and Nehemiah still more so. Owing to the similarity of the subject of which these authors treat, they appear in several canons under the single head of Ezra; but the Jews, though they probably often bound them up together, never confused them. Still, if the division of Isaiah between two authors gave satisfaction, and further dissection did not immediately follow, this solution would not go so far outside the bounds of experience as to be called uncritical. But the fact that this first dissection leads to innumerable others renders it useless. The assumption that we can locate disjointed fragments of Hebrew is to be summarily rejected. Even if we knew the Hebrew language as well as we know, say, Greek, and Israelitish history as well as we know, say, Greek history, and if we could be sure that we were familiar with all the forces which go to the making of history, such an assumption would be arrogant. But the case is infinitely less favourable than that supposed. We know so little Hebrew that the simplest correction of a Biblical text is a hazardous undertaking. Of Israelitish history we know little in any case; on the showing of the Biblical critics that little has been fraudulently altered over and over again to suit religious prejudices current at different epochs. Moreover, the world—and a world including men like Bacon, Locke and Newton—has till very recently been convinced that forces entered into the development of Israelitish history, of which the history of other nations exhibits but faint traces. What chance is there, then, of any form of criticism that ventures far from documents and monuments finding its way? There is none. And science disdains all results that are neither certain nor probable.

Next, it must be perceived that the author of chapters xl.-lxvi. is either a Prophet, or a very great rogue and impostor. The mention by him of the name of Cyrus (xl. 4-6) is declared to be a tremendous miracle wrought in order that the whole world from East to West might know that Jehovah was the only God. If the fact was that the prophet of an unimportant and oppressed community mentioned in the name of his god a conqueror whose fame was filling the world, what miracle was there in this? The world might as well ring with the fact that Vergil mentioned Augustus. Yet the "second Isaiah" claims foreknowledge so constantly and so emphatically that he has left himself no loophole. "Let the strange gods come forward and tell us what is going to happen, and then we shall know that they are gods (xli. 23). See, the former things have come to pass, and now I am telling you of the latter things (xlii. 9). Who is there like Me, who can tell things in their order, and proclaim coming events and the future? (xliv. 7). Be not afraid—have I not told you of old and made you hear and ye are my witnesses? (*ibid.* 8). Let all the nations be gathered together—which among them can foretell this? Let them tell us the former things (*i.e.*, show that they have foretold things that are now realized), and produce witnesses of good character who shall assure us that they heard the prediction and confirm the assertion. Ye are *my* witnesses (xliii. 9, 10). I foretold the former things long ago; they went forth from my mouth so that I could make them heard; then suddenly I wrought them and they came about. This was because I knew that thou art obstinate; thy neck is like a bar of iron, and thy brow like brass. Therefore I told thee of them long before; before they came about I announced them to thee; lest thou shouldst say 'my idol wrought them, my image ordained them' (xlvi. 3-5)."

These are not all the passages in which this writer

insists on the fact that he, as God's spokesman, has foretold events with certainty, whereas the representatives of other gods have been unable to predict. The author therefore speaks like a man of *science*, who is aware that the truth can submit itself to tests. God, who is the Author of phenomena, can also predict phenomena; and in order that genuine inquirers may be able to test the truth of Israelitish monotheism, He has empowered His servant to predict events before their arrival, and in certain cases long before their arrival. The earlier predictions have been realized, therefore the later predictions will be realized. Care was taken to have the earlier predictions properly attested *before* the event, so that when the realization took place the fact of the prediction could not be doubted. The predictions have been *public* (xlv. 19; xlvi. 16), so that there can be no doubt of their genuineness. And in the case of the predictions which occupy chapters xl.-lxvi. all Israel is their witness.

The false gods, or rather their worshippers, are asked to produce similar cases of prediction. Such predictions must, says the Prophet, be attested by witnesses of good character; if they can be produced, and be shown to have been realized, then the false gods have a claim to be regarded as true gods. But the Prophet declares that no such predictions and no such attestation can be produced.

It is undoubtedly providential that we have before us a record of some of the oracles of false gods, preserved in the work of Herodotus. Cræsus, who very rightly thinks the oracles ought to be tested, finds the Delphic oracle satisfy *his* test, viz., it can tell his messengers what he (Cræsus) is doing many hundred miles away. But when he proceeds, after lavish gifts, to ask the oracle what will be the result of his war with Cyrus, the oracle *flinches*; it devises an answer which can have no other purpose than to save its credit in any contingency. Now, the "second Isaiah's"

oracles about the event of Cyrus's campaign against Babylon are positive and uncompromising. Either, then, they were before the event, or they were after the event. If they were before the event, then the Prophet has undergone his own test satisfactorily; but, in order to make it unquestionable, it ought to have been uttered before the name of Cyrus was ever heard. If, on the other hand, it be after the event, then the "second Isaiah" is a rogue of no common order; for the worst sort of impostor is one who not only practises without authorization, but, in addition, forges a certificate.

It is noticeable that the passages in which the "second Isaiah" declares that he has foretold events begin very early in the second half of Isaiah. What then are the events which he has predicted? "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus"—whoever reads these words infers at once that the author of the Acts must be the author of the Gospel ascribed to St. Luke; for no one would commence a book with a reference to a former work that never existed, unless he meant to deceive. If, therefore, we regard chapters xl.-lxvi. as the *continuation* of the first half of Isaiah, the references to the former events which had come about as the prophet had predicted are intelligible; the failure of the invasion of Sennacherib, which his lying annals conceal, is attested by the Greek historian; and we are justified in ascribing that failure to providential interference. That was, doubtless, the most striking of Isaiah's predictions, but in other cases he took the wise precaution of having his oracles properly attested (viii. 2 and 16; xxx. 8). Either, then, we are to suppose that the "second Isaiah" had foretold events successfully, but that his predictions attracted so little attention as to be lost; or we are to suppose that this profession of his is a piece of imposture; or, thirdly, there remains the old and traditional theory that the oracles on the fulfilment of

which the "second Isaiah" bases his claim to credibility are the oracles of the "first Isaiah." Rejecting the first proposition as absurd, and the second on the ground that a claim so forcibly put forward would certainly have been challenged unless substantiated, we are driven to the third alternative; the "former events" to which the passages quoted allude must be the events predicted by the "first Isaiah," and duly realized.

Either, then, the first Isaiah wrote the work ascribed to the second, or the "second Isaiah" wrote the work ascribed to the first; for the idea that the "second Isaiah" claimed falsely to have produced the oracles which were really by the first Isaiah may be excluded. Either the first Isaiah was gifted with astounding knowledge of the future, or a false prophet of the time of Cyrus forged a whole series of oracles, some of which corresponded well with past history, in order to attach to them an appendix of oracles referring to events in the then future. This latter supposition may be refuted when any serious writer maintains it.

Out of the oracles of the first Isaiah it seems impossible to banish certain leading ideas which perpetually recur. *A remnant shall return.* This is the name which the Prophet gives one of his sons. It is asserted in the middle of the very oracle in which the failure of Sennacherib is foretold (x. 21). It is the burden of the opening chapter; were it not for a *remnant*, Judah would be like Sodom or Gomorrah. The nation must undergo a process of purifying similar to that by which silver is extracted from lead. The *relics* of the nation will one day be gathered together from the four corners of the earth (xi. 11) by a miracle resembling that whereby Israel was in old times delivered from Egypt. The children of Israel will be picked up one by one from the nations whither they have been banished (xxvii. 12, 13). If, then, the true and genuine message of

Isaiah is that a remnant shall return, and yet that remnant is not to return from Assyria, whence is it to return? Chiefly from Babylon, as the historically attested oracle in chapter xxxix. implies; and what is clear is that the "second Isaiah," like the first, knows little of Babylon but the names Babel and Chasdees; and that except the name Cyrus the second possesses no detailed foreknowledge of later events that is not also at the command of the first.

Leaving alone the references to Cyrus and Babylon, let us see whether the date of chapters xl.-lxvi. can be fixed by other considerations. There is some geography in these chapters, and there is also some in Jeremiah and in Ezekiel. If the "second Isaiah" wrote in the time of Cyrus, he must have had the works of these two prophets before him, and can scarcely have been less familiar than Ezekiel with the geography of the countries that entered into Babylonian politics. But it is the fact that the "second Isaiah" is ignorant of what was commonplace to Ezekiel.

The races Meshech and Tubal, to the Assyrians Muski and Tabali, to the Greeks Moschi and Tibareni, formed a natural couple, like Holland and Belgium, or Norway and Sweden. Ezekiel mentions them together *five* times (xxvii. 13, xxxii. 26, xxxviii. 2, 3, xxxix. 1); and they are named together in the genealogical tables, which couple Javan (the oriental name for Greece) with them. To Ezekiel, therefore, it was well known that Moshech (as Meshech should be corrected) was a *proper name*, belonging to a nation or country. But Isaiah thought it a Hebrew word, meaning "drawer," and he interprets it "drawers of the bow." Thus the verse lxvi. 19 reads, "I will send refugees of them to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, *drawers of the bow*, Tubal, and Javan." But the Hebrew for "drawers" is *Mosh'che*. If we compare the lists in Ezekiel and in the genealogical tables, it will seem clear

that "Drawers of the bow" is not an epithet of Lud, but the name of a race, viz. *Moshech*.

For in the first place there is no reason why Lud only out of the whole list should have an epithet, least of all an epithet which has no connexion with the operation in which the visit of the refugees to them will result. Moreover if the fame of the Lydians as archers were such as to justify the employment of "archers" as a perpetual epithet, irrespective of the context, the ancient Greek writers ought to know something of it. But what Herodotus says (i. 79) is not that they were archers, but that their mode of fighting was on horseback, that they carried long lances, and were clever in the management of their steeds. If the lance was the national weapon of the Lydians, the bow was not so characteristic of their mode of warfare that a perpetual epithet could be taken from it.

What is remarkable is that Jeremiah had this passage of Isaiah before him, and stumbled over it curiously. In enumerating some warlike tribes (xli. 9) he mentions Cush and Put, bearers of shields, and *Ludim*, bearers treaders of the bow. This variation is highly interesting. In the first place his grammatical sense dislikes the coupling of a collective tribal name with the plural of the adjective; therefore the plural of the individuals is substituted for the tribal collective. In the second place we have the ungrammatical "bearers treaders" in place of Isaiah's "drawers." The verb *mashach* is so rarely used of "the bow" that the Prophet might well doubt whether Isaiah's phrase meant "draggers" of the bow or "pullers" of it; *i.e.* whether it referred to the carrying of the bow, or to the employment of it in actual warfare. The alternate suggestions, curiously enough, remain side by side in the text; but the reason of the association of the bow with the Lydian lancers is lost.

Jeremiah is, however, one step further than Isaiah in that he has the correct form *Put* for the incorrect *Pul*. The name *Pul* is probably due to a reminiscence of the name of an Assyrian king.

How are we to suppose that the Israelites became acquainted with the names of these distant nations? Probably one of the chief sources of ancient geography was a source that is still highly productive—interest in the doings of the great. How many of us a year ago had ever heard the names of Mafeking and Magersfontein? But now they are household words, not only in England, where they have a terrible interest, but wherever there are newspapers in any language. Because the interest of England was focussed on those places, the interest of the whole world was focussed on them. We cannot doubt that the vicissitudes of Assyrian politics were closely followed by the inhabitants of those countries which stood in danger of depopulation from the freaks of Assyrian kings. Some rough translations of the Assyrian kings' despatches were probably circulated, at any rate orally, and from these the surrounding peoples would learn something of the names and localities of foreign nations. Now the *Moshech* figure repeatedly in the *Annals* of Sargon, in whose reign they played an important part. Their king entered into more than one coalition against the power of Sargon, and we at present have only Sargon's account of the issue of the campaigns. Like the Greek and Hebrew writers, Sargon mentions *Moshech* and *Tubal* together (*Annals*, ed. Winckler 9, 173-4). It is almost surprising that any Israelite, writing *after* 711 B.C., should have mistaken the name *Moshech* for a Hebrew appellative; yet the report of Sargon's campaigns that reached Jerusalem may have been sufficiently inaccurate for this. Isaiah, moreover, does not display anywhere the erudition that characterizes Ezekiel. The forms of the name that

appear most frequently in Sargon's *Annals* are Muski and Mushki, and it is this latter form transliterated into Hebrew characters that Isaiah knows. That word seemed to mean "drawers of" to which the word "bow" formed a natural supplement. It is not probable that Isaiah meant it as an epithet of Lud; he probably regarded it as the name of a tribe, like the "Man-eaters" of Herodotus. Jeremiah supposes it to be an epithet of Lud, and we have seen his curious attempt at reproducing it. Ezekiel is thoroughly familiar with the name Moshech—it has been suggested that Ezekiel could even read cuneiform—and hence we see from this passage in the *last chapter* of the "second Isaiah" a proof of priority to Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

To see whether this argument will stand, let us try to elude it. The simplest way is to emend the text; to speak more plainly, to falsify the evidence. But as this method will be required in order to meet the argument from the name *Pul*, it must not be employed again in the same verse. And indeed in order to bring Isaiah's knowledge up to date we should have to strike out "bow," and emend the preceding word. This method is useless, because the even balance of science requires that both parties should be allowed to exercise the same rights; the defender of the second Isaiah will also be entitled to strike out of the text whatever goes against him, and so the whole affair be taken out of the hands of science. Since, then, the words are genuine, either they constitute an epithet of Lud, or they do not. If the former be the case, how comes it that the Lydians are made archers, whereas they really were lancers? If the latter be the case, let a tribe of "Drawers of the bow" be localized.

If the passage of Jeremiah be not an imitation of that in Isaiah, Jeremiah's mistake (in making the Lydians

archers) remains unaccounted for, and also his hesitation between two possible interpretations of the word *māshach* is still obscure. But if we conjecture that the passage of Jeremiah is also an interpolation, we are making too many hypotheses.

Hence I believe the explanation given to be the *only one* which will account for the phrases in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and this explanation makes Isaiah earlier than Jeremiah, and also earlier than Ezekiel. But if the last chapter of the prophecies of the "second Isaiah" is so much earlier than Jeremiah that the latter *comments* on it somewhat unintelligently, its genuineness is practically demonstrated. And the last chapter of a book is ordinarily the latest portion of it.

The next geographical argument is one from silence. The "second Isaiah" knows the name of Cyrus, but he does not know the name of Persia; and if chapter xiii. be by him, then he knows the name of Media, and thinks that it is Media which will overthrow Babylon. If chapters xli.-xlvi. be by him, he only knows that the destroyer of Babylon will come from the north-east. But of course the real contemporaries of Cyrus were as familiar with the name of Persia as we are with that of Germany. And Ezekiel, who belongs to the captivity, is quite familiar with the name, though he does not seem to know the locality. He names it by the side of Lud and Put (xxvii. 10) or Cush and Put (xxxviii. 5). Ezekiel, therefore, knows more geography than Isaiah or Jeremiah, and probably more than the genealogical table. For the old suggestion that in that table (Gen. x. 2) *Tiras* stands for *Paras*, "Persia," seems highly attractive. Since no copier of Genesis after the fall of Babylon would have made a mistake in transcribing the name *Pāras*, that table is earlier than the fall of Babylon. The error must, therefore, rest with the genealogist, who must be earlier than the

time of Ezekiel. But if Ezekiel was familiar with the name of Persia, it is impossible that it could have been unfamiliar to a contemporary of Cyrus; and though it would be no gross inaccuracy to speak of the Medes taking Babylon, it is unlikely that a contemporary who hoped to derive priceless blessings from the success of Cyrus would make the mistake of calling him a Mede. And it is practically impossible that a contemporary of reasonable intelligence could describe Cyrus as God's Messiah, and yet know no more about him than that he came from somewhere in the north-east. Hence the prophecy about Cyrus is earlier than the time of Ezekiel.

A geographical name that is deserving of keen attention is that of *Seba* (xliii. 3 and xlv. 14). This nation is mentioned in company with Egypt and Ethiopia, and its eponymous hero is called by the genealogist a son of Cush (Genesis x. 7). In Psalm lxxii., which is of the same *spirit* as Isaiah xl.-lxvi., it is coupled with Sheba, probably on account of similarity of sound. Isaiah, however, by no means confuses the two nations, but rightly names Sheba (more correctly Saba) in company with Arabian races. He, then, is the only author who knows anything about the people Seba, beyond the fact that they are connected with Ethiopia. They are a *tall* race, apparently employed as slaves, and as such they are to be brought to Jerusalem. There seem good grounds for identifying the Sebans with a race mentioned in the oracle of chapter xviii., where it is said that a nation dwelling apparently far beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, of lengthy stature and close-shaven, shall be brought as an offering to the Temple at Jerusalem. Now when could an Israelite know anything of a race that dwelt beyond the rivers of Ethiopia? Only when a Cushite dynasty was reigning in Egypt. The Ethiopian rule in Egypt came to an end in 662 B.C. or thereabout. While lower Egypt was in Cushite hands

there would be opportunities for Israelites to associate with Cushites, and learn something of the geography of the interior of Africa. I do not assert that the weird description of chapter xviii. is derived from anything but prophetic second sight; but the repetition of the description makes it likely that we have here a formula perhaps borrowed from despatches. The fact that the passage about Seba in chapter xlv. and the oracle of chapter xviii. fit together like pieces of a puzzle, and a puzzle that can only have been constructed before the fall of the Cushite dynasty in Egypt, makes very strongly for identity of authorship, and also for the traditional date of the "second Isaiah."

The geographical names in chapter lx. are also of some interest. Camels bred in Midian and Aifah are to come from Sheba (Saba); sheep from Kedar, and rams from Nebaioth. Aifah is named after Midian in the genealogical table (Gen. xxv. 4); since Isaiah knows something about Aifah, whereas the genealogical table cannot be shown to know anything, probably the name of Aifah is inserted in the table from this passage. Kedar figures elsewhere in Isaiah; xlii. 11: "Let the wilderness and *its cities*, the *courts* wherein Kedar dwells, lift up their voice." One would have thought the wilderness had no cities: "that made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof" (xiv. 17); "they wandered in the wilderness in a solitary way; they found no city to dwell in" (Ps. cvii. 4). The Hebrew for "its cities" is *'arav*. Now compare Ezekiel xxvii. 21: "*Arabia* and all the princes of Kedar." The Hebrew for Arabia is *'arabh*, scarcely to be distinguished in pronunciation from "its cities." Hence it would seem that Ezekiel's geography shows the same advance here on Isaiah's as we noticed above in the case of Moshech. Arabia and Kedar are almost synonymous in the annals of Assurbanipal; but the name Arabia is not

known to the author of the genealogical table, whereas the name Kedar is (Gen. xxv. 13). The word has come to Isaiah's ears, but he thinks it means "his cities," just as he thought Moshech meant "drawer"; but in Ezekiel's time the name has become thoroughly familiar to Hebrew writers.

That the mistake is the Prophet's, and not that of a copyist, is shown by the fact that the genealogical table has not got Arabia, whereas we have seen that it takes Aifah from Isaiah.

These are, I think, the only geographical names whence any chronology can be obtained that meet us in the "second Isaiah." From them we gather that the author was earlier than Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and was utilized for the last edition of the genealogical table, which, however, is further advanced in geographical knowledge. That it takes no notice of *Pul* may be due to its identifying this land with Put; that it does not mention the mysterious *Sinim* (xlix. 12) is probably due to the supposition that this referred to the wilderness of Sin, mentioned in the Pentateuch, or Sinai. The indication of date got from the Prophet's mistaking *Moshech* and *Arab* for Hebrew words seems convincing. We learn from it, moreover, that the Prophet cannot have been acquainted with the cuneiform script, in which it would have been impossible to commit such errors.

Before quitting this "line of defence," we may first see whether it would lead to sound results if applied to books of which the date is certain. In the Koran it seems clear that the author thinks the Arabic name for "Christians," *Nasārā*, is derived from the verb *nasara*, "to help" (Sura iii. 45); but the geographer Yakut is aware that it means *Nazarenes*, i.e. the followers of Jesus of Nazareth; hence we infer that Yakut is later than the Koran—as he is indeed by more than six hundred years.

Secondly, are we saving the unity of Isaiah at the expense of his intelligence? Since this is a scientific inquiry, that question cannot be asked; however, in the case of Vergil, who is not only a great poet but a man of learning also, errors worse than those noticed have to be condoned. The island Inarima is acknowledged to be due to an erroneous reading of Homer's "in Arima." The wish, "let everything be the middle of the sea," is a *Verballhornung* of "may the whole course of nature be changed." Isaiah's geographical errors will have sufficient justification if they serve to save his date.

Thirdly, is the mention of the Lydians by Isaiah consistent with the statement of Assurbanipal (Rm. i. col. 2 line 96) that Lydia was "a far-off country, the mention of whose name the kings my fathers had never heard"—a formula which, it must be confessed, seems to be the basis of the phrase which follows in Isaiah—"the distant islands which have never heard the rumour of me"? Assyria, it must be remembered, was very much farther from Lydia than Palestine. The style in which Lydia is mentioned in that most interesting passage is not inconsistent with the supposition that the fame of Lydia may have reached Palestine a half-century before.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

No doctrine of the Catholic Faith has been more keenly debated than that which defines the Church; for while Christian people unite with their lips in saying, according to the final form of the fifth century, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," they differ widely in their hearts about the spiritual content of the words. There are some, both of