

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVIII.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1916.

575TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7TH, 1916,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. PREBENDARY H. E. FOX, M.A., TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced the election of Sir T. Victor Buxton, Bart., M.A., and the Rev. Herbert Parry Thornton, M.A., as Members of the Institute, and of Miss K. M. Bond, Mr. W. J. Canter, C.I.M., R.N., and of the Rev. R. Wright Hay as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN regretted to have to announce that Chancellor Lias would not be able to be present in person. In view of the inclemency of the season, and of his advanced age and delicate health, it would certainly have been unwise for the venerable Lecturer to have undertaken the journey. But he had sent his paper, and he would ask the Secretary to read it.

*THE UNITY OF ISAIAH.** By the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A.,
Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral.

GROUNDS WHEREON THE UNITY OF THE BOOK HAS BEEN
CHALLENGED.

THE Germanic schools of criticism of the Scriptures which have met with so much acceptance here in England have owed their influence to many causes, of which I consider the principal to be the unwillingness of believers in the authority and inspiration of Scripture to discuss minute details of evidence when they base their belief in revealed religion upon arguments of a much higher order and wider range. It seems to such persons a waste of time to enquire whether the fact of revelation

* For a much fuller treatment of this subject, see my paper in the number for October, 1915, of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, published quarterly at Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.

supported by arguments so cogent could possibly have been transmitted on insufficient authority. If God, they say, has revealed the secrets of His will to mankind, no doubt He has also taken care that this revelation shall have been unmistakably proclaimed by competent witnesses. But, on the other hand, we have to remember that the prominence which the criticism destructive of the testimony of those witnesses has attained has been reached by ignoring that testimony and by attaching undeserved importance to a number of minute details lying in quite a different plane from the great and important arguments above referred to. That prominence cannot be safely ignored. Investigation along these lines of secondary importance has obtained control of the universities and great public schools, and is still spreading. I fear that it cannot be prevented from spreading still further, unless it is met upon its own ground.

One point comes to the front when we study this criticism. It takes high ground. It declares that its conclusions are "irreversible," and that they are "scientific." But they are reached through the medium of history and literature, and it is only fair to ask whether, in the strict sense of the word, historical and literary criticism can really be scientific. Science means knowledge involving exactness in the comprehension of facts. In historical and literary criticism there is large room for the influence of mere opinion. Scientific certainty is far from being attained in those lines of research. The critic's conclusions are at best only probable, and "probability" does not mean certainty.

One more preliminary observation. What are the methods of the literary and historical criticism which has thus seated itself in the chair of infallibility? They are these. Certain principles are laid down and conclusions drawn from them. But these conclusions are at variance with the facts, as those facts have been handed down to us. To the ordinary mind, and much more in the case of the scientific inquirer, this would seem to invalidate the conclusions. Not so to the critic: *Tant pis pour les faits*, he replies, and proceeds to strike out of his documents everything which conflicts with them, and to assign it to authorities of a later date.

This method proves too much. On such lines the earth could be proved to be flat or the sun to revolve round it. Yet this, and this only, as the works of the critics themselves demonstrate, is their method of "scientific" investigation—a method received in so many quarters as irrefragable.

Another alleged "scientific" ground for laying down the principles mentioned above is the following. The narratives in question presuppose a revelation attested by miracles and supported by prophecy. But science has shown that miracles and prophecy are impossible; therefore the narratives cannot have been authentic. The miracles related could never have occurred, and the prophecies must have been uttered after the event. Here is the real reason for repudiating the histories and splitting up the prophecies, as we shall see they have been split up. There is, however, no justification for this attitude. Men of science do not nowadays, as a rule, pronounce miracles and prophecy to be impossible, and the bitter antagonism between religion and science which existed fifty or sixty years ago no longer prevails.

The Unity of Isaiah was not denied at first altogether on account of the supposed opposition between religion and science.

It was largely due to the distinction in character between the former part of the writings of the prophet and the last twenty-seven chapters, which are separated from the former part by four chapters purely historical. Not only is the earlier portion of Isaiah for the most part a vision of calamity and ruin, and the latter a glowing one of prosperity and hope, but the latter seems to have a Babylonian atmosphere about it—or so at least the German school of critics among us believed until the present Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge expressed the opinion that its atmosphere was Maccabæan. The earlier portion of the prophet's writings contained prophecies which, if they were his, were beyond the capacity of man's unassisted ideas. The later critics have therefore split up this portion into nearly a dozen parts, since they must, of course, have been written after the event. Why they should have been written in the prophetic, and not in the historic, form, the critics do not think it necessary to explain.

There are, indeed, many points in the critical theories which seem to need explanation, but for which explanation is seldom given. Professor Sir George Adam Smith, in his fascinating volume on Isaiah, has given the most intelligible account of the principles upon which the investigation is grounded. "Our study," he says, "completely dispels, on the *authority of the Bible itself*, that view of inspiration and prediction so long held in the Church." He then describes what the "view" is in language which certainly does not describe it accurately; indeed, I may venture to say that nothing like it has ever been seen in any treatise on prophecy. The view of the believer may

possibly be as the Professor confesses, "difficult to understand, but this is a strange way to describe it :—

"The prophet beheld a vision of the future in its actual detail, and read this off as a man may read the history of the past out of a book or a clear memory."

This description will, I think, seem to most of those present the exact opposite of that presented by prophetic writings, except, perhaps, in a few passages such as we find in the 22nd and 69th Psalms.

But to proceed :—

"Isaiah prophesied as he did from loyalty to two simple truths . . . that sin must be punished, and the people of God must be saved."

He is credited with "wonderful knowledge of human nature and ceaseless vigilance of affairs." He had "no magical means for foretelling the future, but simply his own spiritual convictions and his observations of history."

It will be noted that Professor Smith does not tell us whether the above character of Isaiah is based upon the whole book as we have it now, or only upon the few chapters left us after the critical dissection has been effected. Further, the use of the word "magical" in describing prophecy is surely begging the question. And lastly, if this criticism is scientific, these assertions should surely have been accompanied by some demonstration. There is, however, this difference between the "science" of criticism and other sciences, that the latter are founded upon demonstration, but the former is content with very little or none at all.

DR. SKINNER'S DISSECTION OF THE BOOK.

According to the analysis given by Dr. Skinner, in the Cambridge Bible for Schools, the following is the dissection of Isaiah, chaps. i-xxxv: Isaiah is credited with the first ten chapters, and with xi to the end of verse 9, or, as some say, verse 10. The rest of the chapter is not supposed to be his. Neither are chaps. xii-xiv, verse 23; xv; xvi (though to this last Isaiah is asserted to have written two verses as a *postscript*); xxi, xxiv-xxvii, xxxii-xxxv. It seems to me most unfortunate that young people in colleges and schools should be given insufficiently digested theories of this kind for their intellectual nourishment, instead of a straightforward exegesis of the prophet's writings.

Dr. Skinner, himself, calls the result "somewhat surprising," but instead of furnishing the full and formal demonstration necessary for a scientific enquiry, attempts to defend it in some paragraphs in which figure prominently such phrases as "may be," "appear to," "probably," "must have," "might have," and the like. In the physical sciences, such for example as astronomy, how would a theory or treatise be received if it were based upon such uncertain premisses as these?

This analysis leaves to Isaiah only some 24½ chapters, yet the critics constantly speak of Isaiah's characteristics and style, as if these could be fully deduced from such slight material.*

CHARACTERISTICS COMMON TO THE ENTIRE BOOK.

I proceed to certain striking characteristics of the whole of the book that bears the name of Isaiah, many of which may be seen at a glance and plead strongly for its essential unity.

(1) The marked detachment of Isaiah's personality from his prophecies. If we examine the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, we find that in these we cannot get rid of the personality of the writer. Jeremiah is pessimistic, sensitive, anxious, and frequently shrinks from delivering the message with which he is entrusted. Ezekiel constantly sees visions, and introduces himself into his prophecies; the personality of Daniel is even more prominent; but Isaiah relates only one vision, and only once describes the circumstances under which his prophecy was delivered. In the four historical chapters, no doubt, Isaiah appears as a prominent actor, but these four chapters are history, not prophecy; they are his contribution to the Jewish national records. In all the rest he goes his solitary way: his own personality completely lost in the wondrous message with which he is commissioned.

(2) The majestic imagery in which the writer revels, the poetic elevation of style, the love of nature, all of which characterize every chapter, almost every verse of the whole book. The Isaiah of the critics, who wrote but 24½ chapters or less, has no monopoly of these remarkable qualities, as every genuine student of the book knows, even though he be limited to our English translation. The style of the book throughout is unique

* Professor Skinner, in his *Commentary*, intended for immature minds, makes the admission (p. lxxi) that a considerable number of recent critics "deny several other passages to Isaiah," while others "dispute the genuineness of all the promises of salvation found in a particular section."

in literature. A well-known critic of the German school says of chap. vii, 2,

“And the heart (of King Abaz) was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind,”

that “this fine simile is sufficient to prove that Isaiah himself is the narrator.” I may safely challenge him or anyone who agrees with him to show me any chapter in the entire book, no matter to what author the critics may have assigned it, in which the same acute sensitiveness to the beauties of nature is not found. It is not even absent from the four chapters of the historical fragment.*

The critics draw a distinction between the “genuine” and the “second” Isaiah from the alleged fact that the more gloomy and terrible passages are to be found in the former, and the more alluring and peaceful in the latter. But the distinction is as great between the “second” Isaiah and the eight or ten “fragments” (not written, according to the critics, either by the genuine or by the “second” Isaiah), with the exception of chap. xxxv, which, though a “fragment,” far transcends anything else in the whole book as a picture of radiant beauty and prosperity. The critic forgets, conveniently, such passages as these when he endeavours to establish a distinguishing contrast between the genuine and the “second” Isaiah.

(3) The tendency to repetition, of which we find instances in the undisputed Isaiah in twelve instances, one of them being a fourfold repetition of a whole sentence. It is also repeatedly found throughout the whole volume. The use of the phrase, “woe unto you,” in chap. v, is an instance. The same phrase occurs in chap. xlv, ascribed to the “second” Isaiah. In the “second” Isaiah repetition often assumes such forms as “Awake, awake,” “cast ye up, cast ye up.” All these are for the sake of emphasis.

(4) There is an analogous tendency of the prophet to quote his own words, a habit not quite peculiar to Isaiah but much more common with him than with any other prophet. Thus

* I may mention that the three most striking and sustained descriptions of natural phenomena in the whole book are chaps. ii and xi, 1-9, in the undisputed Isaiah and chap. xxxv in the “fragments.” The first is one of the finest descriptions to be found in any author, illustrating Nature in her awfulness, and may be compared with the powerful passage of the desolation of Moab, chaps. xv and xvi, in the “fragments.” Hundreds of shorter passages of the same character can be found in the whole book.

there is the reappearance in the "second" Isaiah of portions of that beautiful description of a land of peace given in chap. xxxv, beginning :

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ;
And the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose,"

and ending :

"The ransomed of the Lord shall return,
And come to Sion with songs
And everlasting joy upon their heads :
They shall obtain joy and gladness,
And sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

This seems to show that Isaiah revelled in the word-picture he has drawn, which has no superior in the whole range of literature.

This language is often quoted in what is called the "second" Isaiah ; sometimes at length, sometimes in allusion, but at least nine times in all.

Similarly the almost equally beautiful picture in chap. xi, 6-9—

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb,
And the leopard shall lie down with the kid ;

.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain :"

is reproduced in chap. lxxv, 25—

"The wolf and the lamb shall feed together,
And the lion shall eat straw like the bullock :
And dust shall be the serpent's meat.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain, saith the Lord."*

Continual allusions are made to Lebanon, Carmel, Sharon and the Forest, often associated together, though these are frequently obscured in our versions by the translation of Carmel† as "fruitful field." Such allusions are found in chaps. x, 18 ; xvi, 10 ;

* Jeremiah and Ezekiel have their own special peculiarities of expression, but they never quote passages of their own at length, as Isaiah does.

† Carmel is used ten times in Isaiah as meaning "fruitful field" ; it occurs twice in Jeremiah, but one of these cases refers to Mount Carmel. Elsewhere it is apparently not used at all. It occurs in this sense and context seven times in the undisputed Isaiah, once in the historical chapters, and twice in the other portions of the book.

xxxii, 15, 16; xxxiii, 9; xxxv, 2; xxxvii, 24; lxv, 10, and in a dozen or more other passages distributed amongst nearly all the writers to whom the book has been ascribed. The foregoing are only examples of similar repetitions and quotations from undisputed and disputed passages alike, of which I have published elsewhere a lengthy list. If such repetitions do not appear in every one of these supposed writers, it must be remembered that some of them contribute only a chapter or even half a chapter.

Two more instances of the kind deserve special notice. We have "treacherous dealers," a phrase which occurs repeatedly in several of the writers among whom the book is divided. The words "treacherous" and "treacherously" occur amongst the other prophets, but never together, and they are never repeated twice, as in Isaiah xxi, 2—

"The treacherous dealer dealeth treacherously,
And the spoiler spoileth."

And again in chap. xxiv, 16, we have—

"But I said,
My leanness, my leanness, woe unto me!
The treacherous dealers have dealt treacherously;
Yea, the treacherous dealers have dealt very treacherously."

And in chap. xxxiii, 1, we have—

"Woe to thee that spoilest and thou wast not spoiled,
And dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously
with thee!
When thou shalt cease to spoil, thou shalt be spoiled;
And when thou shalt make an end to deal treacherously, they
shall deal treacherously with thee."

And these three passages are assigned to three different authors.

The phrase "in that day" occurs nearly forty times in Isaiah i—xxxv—chapters ascribed to the undisputed Isaiah and some eight other authors. If we include analogous phrases such as "the day of the Lord," "the day of the Lord's vengeance," "the day," and other similar expressions, they occur more than fifty times. In the "second" Isaiah they occur only once—in chap. lii, 6—but the reason is obvious. The words are invariably used of a day of vengeance and judgment, but the last twenty-seven chapters of the book are devoted exclusively to God's promises.

(5) The abundant use of *paronomasia* or the repetition of the same sound. Thus we have *hoi* (ah), *goi* (nation), in i, 4;

enachem (ease) and *anakmah* (avenge), in i, 24. In v, 7, we have *nishpat* (judgment) paired with *nispach* (iniquity), and *tzedakah* (righteousness) with *tzeghakah* (cry). In the second Isaiah *mal'ah tzeba'ah* (xl, 2); also xl, 12, *maim w'shamaim*; (21) *halo tedghu*, and *halo yishmaghu*; *yaggishu w'yaggidu* (xli, 22); and in the other alleged "pseudo-Isaiahs" *habbogēd bogēd* and *hashodēd shōdēd* (xxi, 2, see xxiv, 16, xxxiii, 1). Also xxiv, 3, *hibbōk h'bbōk . . . hibbōz h'bbōz* and *pachad w'pachath w'pach* (verse 17). These are merely specimens of what is found everywhere throughout all the *whole* prophecy, and though it may be occasionally found in other writings, it stamps the whole Book of Isaiah as one written by a man who has the ear as well as the mind and heart of a poet.

(6) Expressions peculiar to Isaiah. The most remarkable of these is "the Holy One of Israel." This occurs twenty-eight times in the book, twelve being in the undisputed portion, fourteen in the "second" Isaiah, one in the "fragments," and one in the historical part. It is almost entirely confined to Isaiah, occurring only six times elsewhere in the Old Testament, the passage in II Kings xix, 22, being Isaiah's contribution to his country's history. The late Dr. Kennedy connected it with the ineffaceable impression made upon the prophet by that awe-inspiring vision given to him, "in the year that King Uzziah died." The cumulative force of such minute touches is very great.

"Lord of Hosts." This occurs in Isaiah's vision, just referred to. It is found in a few of David's Psalms, and twice in II Samuel, among books written before Isaiah's time; in the later prophets it is found infrequently, except in Haggai, but it occurs very often in the undisputed Isaiah, and also in the "fragments," and occasionally in the "second" Isaiah. The critics deal very cautiously with the agreements between what they have left of Isaiah and the "fragments,"—a good deal more cautiously than they are accustomed to deal with Hebrew literature generally.

"Mighty God of Jacob" or "Israel." These words are almost peculiar to the Book of Isaiah, occurring elsewhere only once in Genesis and once in the Psalms. They do not occur in the "fragments," but are found once in the undisputed chapters and twice in "second" Isaiah.

"The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." The expression occurs once in the undisputed and twice in the "second" Isaiah, but very similar expressions are found in the undisputed Isaiah and four times in the "fragments."

The phrases "Holy Mountain," "Mountain of the Lord,"

“Mountain of the Lord’s House,” are common in Isaiah and Micah. One passage occurs in both prophets; but, as usual, every conceivable explanation of the coincidence is defended. Some think that Isaiah quoted Micah; others that Micah quoted Isaiah; and others again that both quoted some older prophet. What is of importance is that the expressions are not common elsewhere, and that Micah and Isaiah were contemporaries.

“Set up an ensign” (or “banner” or “standard”). It is found four times in the undisputed Isaiah, three times in the “fragments,” twice in the “second” Isaiah. It occurs very seldom elsewhere in the prophets, and is used in the Pentateuch in a different sense.

We are all familiar with the words “creep” and “creeping thing” in Genesis i. The same word occurs in Isaiah, where it means “to trample.” It occurs seven times in the undisputed chapters and twice in the “fragments.” Here, then, we have a sign of identity of authorship between Isaiah and the “fragments.” In Genesis i the word is spelt differently and has a different meaning. It is therefore certain that Isaiah is not quoting Genesis in this case, nor can Genesis be quoting Isaiah; but there is evidence that Isaiah does quote Genesis i, and in such a way that his quotation of it disposes of the theory that Genesis i and ii are by different authors. The use of the three Hebrew words translated “create,” “make,” “form,” in Genesis i and ii has been used to prove a difference in the authorship of the two chapters, but in Isaiah xlv, 18, *both Genesis i and ii are quoted*:—

“For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens;
 God Himself that formed the earth and made it;
 He hath established it,
 He created it not in vain,
 He formed it to be inhabited:
 I am the Lord; and there is none else.”

The words translated “created,” “formed,” “made,” are the words used in Genesis i and ii; and the word (*tohu*) translated “void” in Genesis i, 2, is also used in Isaiah xlv, 18 (translated “in vain”). If they do not involve a different author in the last passage, neither can they in the former. The date of the “second” Isaiah is, it is true, brought down by the critics to the same period as that which they assign to Genesis i, but Genesis i and ii are now supposed to have been combined together in one volume at a later date still. Critics have not explained how it is that the “second” Isaiah quotes them as though they had already been combined at the time he wrote.

(7) The tendency to break suddenly into song. This is another feature common to all the portions of the book and altogether peculiar to Isaiah. It is true that Habakkuk has a song at the end of his poetry, but it does not break out in the midst of it. In the undisputed Isaiah there is a song in chap. v, 1-7—

“Now will I sing to my well beloved
A song of my beloved touching his vineyard.”

In the “fragments” we have (chap. xii, 1-6)—

“The Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song ;
He also is become my salvation.”

And chap. xxvi, 1-4—

“In that day shall this song be sung in the Land of Judah ;
We have a strong city ;
Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks.”

while in the “second” Isaiah invitations to break into singing occur and many songs. Even the historical portion breaks out into poetry in Isaiah’s message to Hezekiah, and it includes Hezekiah’s song of thanksgiving, and this in the space of four chapters.

(8) The piling up of ideas or imagery is a peculiarly Isaianic feature—the building up of ideas, sometimes of a similar and sometimes of a contrary nature, with a most powerful effect. Take the three following instances from the undisputed Isaiah, from the “fragments,” and from the “second” Isaiah respectively:—

“The day of the Lord of Hosts shall be
Upon every one that is proud and lofty,
And upon every one that is lifted up ;
And he shall be brought low ;
And upon all the cedars of Lebanon, that are high and
lifted up,
And upon all the oaks of Bashan,” etc. (chap. ii, 10-17).

“It shall be
As with the people, so with the priest ;
As with the servant, so with his master ;
As with the maid, so with her mistress” (chap. xxiv, 2).

“Behold 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”
(chap. lxv, 13-14).

Shorter passages of a similar kind occur in every page. No other writer but Isaiah supplies us with such examples.

(9) Closely connected with the above is the unique way in which parallelism, a characteristic of Hebrew poetry in general, is used by Isaiah.

Usually poetic parallelism consists simply in the repetition of the same idea in different words. But in Isaiah's hands parallelism is a most powerful instrument of emphasis. Two or three examples out of a thousand must content us here. We will take from the undisputed Isaiah, chap. ii, 10-12:—

“Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust,
For fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty.
The lofty looks of man shall be humbled,
And the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down,
And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.
For the day of the Lord of Hosts
Shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty,
And upon every one that is lifted up ;
And he shall be brought low.”

And from the “fragments,” chap. xxiv, 3-5:—

“The land shall be utterly emptied,
And utterly spoiled :
For the Lord hath spoken this word.
The earth mourneth and fadeth away,
The world languisheth and fadeth away,
The haughty people of the earth do languish.
The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof ;
Because they have transgressed the laws,
Changed the ordinance,
Broken the everlasting covenant.”

And from the “second” Isaiah, chap. liii, 3-5:—

“He is despised and rejected of men ;
A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief :
And we hid as it were our faces from Him ;
He was despised, and we esteemed Him not.
Surely He hath borne our griefs,
And carried our sorrows :
Yet we did esteem Him stricken,
Smitten of God, and afflicted.”

It is absolutely impossible, in the space allotted to me, to convey the cumulative force of this line of study to my hearers and readers. A most convincing treatise might be written on the subject of the use of parallelism in Isaiah as compared with

its use by the other writers of the Old Testament; but it would be open to the drawback that few would read it; some would pass it by because they had never doubted the unity of Isaiah, and others because they would not attend to an investigation which might prove in conflict with conclusions at which they had already arrived.

Some of my hearers may ask, "What is the use of these discussions of mere words?" My answer is that the critical argument is for the most part comprised in just this dissection of words and phrases. The only other argument offered, if argument it can be called, is one that we must reject; it is the assumption that miracles and prophesy are both impossible.

TWO ARGUMENTS FROM HISTORY.

In conclusion let me offer two arguments based on historical facts. The first is to be found in one of the latest sermons of Canon Liddon. He is speaking of Isaiah's prophecies of the bringing in of the Gentiles. I will quote the passage:—

"Before our Lord came, the force and beauty of this teaching was warped and withered by the intense and, it must be added, narrow feeling of nationality which set in after the Captivity. The close contact with the heathen in the Captivity did more than anything else towards limiting the range of love in Jewish hearts by the idea of the nation. The law said, 'Love thy neighbour,' but the later Jew answered the question, 'Who is my neighbour?' in the narrowest sense. He even excluded the Samaritan."

The four great evangelical prophets, and most of the minor prophets, insist on the superiority of the spirit of the Law to its letter, the spread of the knowledge of the truth far and wide among the Gentiles, and the coming of One Who by stripes and suffering should bring in the long-promised dispensation of the Spirit. The cruel oppression of the Captivity made the later Jews lose sight of these bright prospects for humanity, and they hardened themselves into a bitter hatred of all nationalities but their own, a hatred which, as Juvenal, Tacitus, and other Gentile writers record, was repaid with interest.

A consideration which has occurred to myself, looks in the same direction. The critics of the Wellhausen school refer the "second" Isaiah to the period of the Captivity; the present Regius Professor at Cambridge to that of the Maccabees. But after the Return, the Jews had become so narrow in their national spirit that the glowing pictures of a glorious future

for all the peoples of the world would have repelled them, and have found no acceptance. As for such condemnations of the worship of idols as we find in many passages of "second" Isaiah, they could not have been written in post-exilic times. They would have been regarded as unfounded and unjust attacks upon a blameless and suffering people. For the outward observances of idolatry had become utterly abhorrent to the Jews of the Return.

It is but fair to add that some of the characteristics ascribed to the book of Isaiah are to be found—though not to the same extent—in other prophetic writings. It was inevitable that Isaiah, who was not only the greatest of the prophets, but one of the earliest, should influence those who came after him. The most striking example of this is found in the forty-eighth chapter of the prophecy of Jeremiah, the denunciation of Moab, in which he largely quotes the Burden of Moab recorded in Isaiah xv and xvi. Much of it is verbal quotation, some of it an amplification of Isaiah's words.

CONCLUSION.

The effect of German destructive criticism is to lower the general credit of the Scriptures. The critics divide by centuries the various authors from the events they profess to describe; the authors, according to them, are not men intimately acquainted with the events they record, and their sources of information are vague traditions, true or false—probably false, except when they are assertions having no particular religious value. Historical statements are supposed to have been "worked over" by men of later date; prophecies must have been written after the event.

But the Bible, throughout all its books, professes to be the communication by God to man of His Divine Will. The Pentateuch may not be all the work of Moses, but it must either have been written under his direction, or be a deliberate and indefensible forgery. The historical books were clearly the work of members of the schools of the prophets, who became the government scribes; the books of Chronicles speak of the works of Nathan and Gad, of Jehu the son of Hanani, and other persons well known in Jewish history. I cannot stop to quote any of the prophecies contained in Holy Writ, not connected directly with revelation, which could not have been written after the event. I can only refer to the one great fact that the prophecies of the setting aside of the Mosaic

Covenant in favour of one which would be written in the hearts of God's people; the description of the entry of the Gentile world into that New Covenant; the picture of the Servant of the Lord, Who should be "despised and rejected of men," and yet exalted above them all;—that all these are fulfilled in the history of Christ and His Church, and in no one and nothing else. And so the Christian Church continues to spread, in fair weather and in foul, and the world, in spite of all drawbacks, does become more and more conformed to the teaching of Jesus Christ. His "sound has gone out into all lands, and His words unto the ends of the world." The days are drawing nearer when "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard lie down with the kid, and a little child shall lead them."

Yes, in spite of this terrific war, in which the last trace of Christ's morality has disappeared from the country which for years has been dishonouring the Scriptures, we may still venture to say this. Europe, which for many hundreds of years had been an armed camp, has, as a whole, had peace for a century. And when this terrible outbreak of the hosts of anti-Christ has been brought to an end, it may well have peace for a century more.

Our criticism is truly scientific. We find our belief in Scripture supported by a comparison with facts. He Whom we preach and in Whom we have believed is truly the Lord from heaven and the King of all the earth. Therefore, we cannot be among those who teach others to look down on the sacred Volume and belittle its contents. From the beginning of the world to the last days,—from the Fall of man to this present hour,—it witnesses to the Lord Whom we worship. We therefore cannot treat it like any other book. We must recognize it as one which from one end to the other testifies authoritatively to the work and to the coming of the Judge and Saviour of the world.

Was there ever a prophecy which, when it was uttered, seemed less likely to be fulfilled than this:—

"Arise, shine; for thy light hath come,
And the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.
For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth,
And gross darkness the people:
But the Lord shall arise upon thee,
And His glory shall be seen upon thee.
And the Gentiles shall come to thy light,
And kings to the brightness of thy rising"?

And was there ever a prophecy which, even already, has received so glorious—and so unexpected—a fulfilment?

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said that they had listened to a remarkable paper, one which, when it appeared in print, he would like to study carefully point by point. He did not know whether anyone there had had his mind unsettled by higher critical theories; for himself he had been kept to the view as to the authorship of the book of Isaiah which had been held by the Christian Church from the earliest times. The Jews had also always in the past considered the prophecies of Isaiah to be a single book; if it were not so, then there was the strange fact that the greatest of all the prophetic writers was an unknown and nameless man, and his work tacked on to the prophecies of another writer. The Jewish Canon included sixteen prophets, and each prophecy began with the name of the prophet. But on the new theory the rule was broken in the case of the greatest prophet of all.

The critics refuse to accept the latter part of the book as genuine, because Cyrus was mentioned by name before his birth; yet Ezra mentions and quotes Isaiah in this very connection.

He had been greatly indebted to a little book by a learned and venerable lady, Mrs. L. D. Jeffreys, entitled *The Unity of Isaiah*, and published by Deighton Bell and Co., Cambridge. The book points out that three objections had been brought against the Isaiah authorship of chapters xl–lxvi. It had been assumed that the historical background of the early part of the book had been Palestine, but of the last part Babylon, but here critics differed hopelessly among themselves as to details. A second difficulty was the change in the theological aspect, which appeared to be different in the earlier and later portions of the book; that simply meant, however, that emphasis was laid on different doctrines or topics as the occasion required, and a similar change might be found in most of the Epistles of St. Paul, as, for example, the Romans and the Ephesians. Lastly, there was the difficulty of the alleged differences of vocabulary and style, but a writer might vary his style from time to time, especially when he wrote under different conditions.

The Rev. MARTIN ANSTEY wished to be allowed to make three remarks. First, there was one phrase which should be written across all the higher critical arguments: *non sequitur*. Their conclusions did not follow their premisses; nothing more remained to be said. Secondly, if the point under discussion was "Did Isaiah write the whole of this book, or did he not?", the discussion must be decided by testimony. The one unbroken historical testimony—and this was evidence—was that the book was written by one man, Isaiah. Third, there was the question of the difference in tone of the two parts in Isaiah: there was the despondent tone and the triumphant. The critics dissected the book on these lines, giving the despondent portions to Isaiah, the triumphant to another author. But for himself, in his own study of Isaiah, he found that the two tones did not divide the book into two main portions as the critics asserted. Isaiah began with a survey of the facts of life, which were depressing, but in chapters vi, xi–xii, xxiv–xxvii, and xxxiii–xxxv he rose above the depressing facts, and saw in prophetic vision the glorious Messianic conclusion in which they were destined to culminate, and in chapters xl–lxvi he reached the grand climax and the triumphant Messianic conclusion of the whole revelation vouchsafed to him. Isaiah had seen Samaria carried away into captivity; he saw that Judah would be carried away to Babylon also, but beyond the Captivity in Babylon he saw the Return, and beyond the Return he saw, and saw from the very first, that the whole earth should be full of "the Glory of the Lord" (Isaiah vi, 3; xi, 9; xxv, 8; xxxv, 10; lxvi, 22, 23).

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said that there was one piece of evidence which had not been mentioned yet, but which appeared to him to be both simple and conclusive. There was a passage in the New Testament in which both portions of Isaiah were quoted, and both ascribed to one man. It was in the Gospel of St. John, chapter xii, 38–41. In verse 38 chapter liii of Isaiah was quoted—that was Isaiah No. 2, while in verse 40 the sixth chapter was quoted, which is supposed to be Isaiah No. 1. But here both quotations were ascribed by the Holy Spirit to one and the same Isaiah.

Moreover, the true division of the prophecy was not a twofold one, but a threefold, which in a wonderful way confirmed the unity of the book. Thus, each section began with a call and ended with a warning. The first division began with chapter i, 2, "Hear, O

heavens, and give ear, O earth," and ended with chapter xlvi, 22, "There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked." The second division commenced at chapter xlix, "Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far;" and ended at chapter lvii, 21, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." The third section began with chapter lviii, 1, "Cry aloud, spare not," and ended at lxvi, 24, "Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." It was also interesting to note that the first call was addressed to the Jews, the second to the Gentiles, the last to the Jews again.

This wonderful prophecy thus contained, in a kind of acrostic form, a revelation of God's plan in His dealings with men through the ages. He first called out the Jews (Genesis xvii) to be His witnesses in the earth. They, proving themselves unworthy, the call was then sent to the Gentiles (Acts xiii, 46). But, "God hath not (finally) cast away his people which He foreknew" (Romans xi, 2); and therefore the third call was again to the Jews, who are yet to be restored: "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Romans xi, 29).

The Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL said: The learned Chancellor's paper is very timely. Many of the evils of the higher criticism arise from attempting to study the Bible as *literature*. It cannot be done without ignoring its purpose and destroying its Divine vitality.

At the back of the higher criticism is the theory of Evolution, and you cannot treat the Bible along the lines of Evolution without rejecting the supernatural. In the prophecies of Isaiah we have the name of Cyrus the Persian mentioned 150 years before his time. How do the critics get over that fact? By the simple expedient of adopting the theory that there were two or ten Isaiahs, the author of Isaiah xlv living nearly 200 years later than the first Isaiah, writing history under the garb of prophecy, and getting the world to accept the fraud. They cannot understand any supernatural inspiration mentioning a man by name 200 years beforehand. But a similar case occurs in I Kings xiii, 2, where a prophet prophesies against the idolatrous altar of Jeroboam, and says: "O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord; Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee." That was fulfilled 350 years later.

But another way suggested out of the difficulty is to tamper with

the Hebrew text under the pretence that somebody else has tampered with it before. The name Cyrus is spelled כִּרְשֻׁשׁ or כִּרְשֻׁשׁ (Koresch). Now, the ingenious suggestion is made that somebody in early times found the word spelt with the initial letter ח (*cheth*) instead of כ (*caph*), and meaning "a workman," so that the objectionable verse would read: "Thus saith the Lord to His anointed, to the workman whose right hand I have holden," etc. But verse 4 is a very awkward one for this interpretation: "I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." Another awkward fact is that the name of Cyrus is found in the previous chapter, vv. 27 and 28, but that is got over by the familiar device of calling those verses an "interpolation," without the least evidence from Hebrew MSS. Josephus knows nothing of any such faking of the text, for he tells us that the passage in Isaiah was shown to Cyrus, and the fact of his own name being in the text greatly encouraged him to carry out the prediction. Such are the shifts to which modern criticism resorts to evade the evidence for the supernatural element in Holy Scripture, and yet this criticism calls itself scientific!

A hearty vote of thanks was passed to the learned and venerable author of the paper, and the meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.

In comment on the discussion the LECTURER wrote:—

I should like to thank the hearers of my paper for their extremely kind reception of it. There are no criticisms. I should like, however, to give the explanation of some of its deficiencies.

1. I desire to say that I was specially asked to confine my paper within as narrow limits as possible on account of the increased cost of printing brought about by the War. It therefore contains barely half what I could have put into it. I trust that those interested in the subject will do me the favour of referring to my fuller paper on this subject, written, as already mentioned in the footnote on p. 65, for the American *Bibliotheca Sacra*, which may be obtained of Messrs. Higham and Company, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.

2. Prebendary Fox (whom I beg to thank for his kind words) has mentioned his indebtedness to Mrs. Jeffreys' little book on *The Unity of Isaiah*. Only want of space prevented me from saying that I am also greatly indebted to that book, as Prebendary Fox must have perceived. I am happy now to be able to make amends

for my previous silence. I have had the honour of an introduction to Mrs. Jeffreys, whose accurate knowledge of Hebrew is vouched for by authorities so competent as Professor Margoliouth of Oxford and my late valued friend, the Rev. Dr. Sinker, Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge. I had the opportunity of discovering that Mrs. Jeffreys was as careful and accurate in her knowledge of New Testament Greek as of Hebrew. Her book on Isaiah should be in the hands of every one who wishes to do justice to the subject. As is usual with the Germanizing critics, no reply has been made to her arguments. Their own arguments, which largely consist of mere assumptions and assertions, are simply repeated. Such methods are not only unfair to their antagonists, but to the general public; and especially to the young, who are led to believe that no reply has been attempted.

3. I am deeply concerned at the curtailment of the activities of the Victoria Institute which the War imposes. I trust that every one who values the work which it has done, and is still doing, will exert themselves to bring visitors to its debates and subscribers to its funds. Years ago the assaults of sceptics were chiefly directed against the possibility of the existence of supernatural, or perhaps we had better say spiritual, forces. These attacks have now largely ceased. They never were raised by our greatest scientific discoverers, who were mostly reverent and humble, but came rather from those who were endeavouring to popularize the study of physical sciences. The present generation has been brought face to face with indirect attacks, endeavouring to undermine the authority of the records, which are based on the existence of such forces. The ground of these attacks is therefore not scientific, but literary; and the methods of defence must consequently take a different form. The existence of such a society as the Victoria Institute is therefore as necessary as ever, and no effort should be esteemed too great to ensure its continued activity.