

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

LINES OF DEFENCE OF THE BIBLICAL
REVELATION.

III. UNITY AGAINST PLURALITY.

A. ISAIAH (*continued*).

OF the archæological notices contained in Isaiah xl.-lxvi., some have already been seen to be based on the Wisdom of Solomon. There are besides some of great importance in chapters lvii., lxx., and lxxvi. The abominations described in chapter lvii. include (verse 5) the worship of *elim* under green trees; the only other place in which this technical term appears is Isaiah i. 29 ("Men shall be ashamed of the *elim* which ye have desired"). The ceremonies rebuked in chapter lxx. include sacrifices in *gannoth* (verse 3), and the same technical term figures in chapter lxxvi. (verse 17); the only other place in which it is found is also Isaiah i. 29 ("Ye shall be ashamed of the *gannoth* which ye have chosen"). That *gannoth* here does not mean ordinary gardens, but is a technical term, appears from the threat in i. 30, where the votaries of these *gannoth* are told that they shall become like a *garden* that has no water. For this threat evidently derives its suitability from a play on words, and resembles that of lxx. 11, 12, "Those who fill a libation to *Mina*;¹ and I shall *commit* you (*manithi*) to the sword": a similarly contemptuous jest being found in lvii. 6, "Thy lot is in the stones of the wadi," where the words for "lot"

¹ The Massoretic pointing *Mānī* agrees with *Al-Mānī*, "the Dispenser," which is used as a name of God in a verse quoted by Yakut; but as the word in Isaiah has not the article, the vocalization of the local name *Mina* seems more likely to be right.

and "stone" are almost identical. If the word *gannoth* were not technical, the play on the words would be pointless; and we may observe that the threat of i. 30 is matched by the promise of lviii. 11, "Thou shalt be like a well-watered garden," where (owing to the absence of any other allusion) the ordinary form of the word for "garden" is used. As we shall soon see, the worship with which these terms *gannoth* and *elim* are connected was exceedingly elaborate, and therefore characteristic of a period. We learn, therefore, that the authors of Isaiah i. and of Isaiah lvii. and lxxv., lxxvi. were contemporaries. That the first chapter of a great classic could be attributed to any one but its right author is too wild a surmise to deserve consideration. We start, then, with the remarkable fact that the "first Isaiah" uses two technical terms with which the "second Isaiah" and no other Hebrew author is familiar. And the "second Isaiah" acts as interpreter to the "first Isaiah," by enabling us to locate, and to some extent comprehend, the nature of the cults to which these technical terms belonged. And from this observation a very easy step leads to the identification of the two authors.

The description of chapter lxxv. would seem to apply particularly to the worship of the gods Mina and Gad. The former name seems identical with that of a place that still figures in the ceremonies of the pilgrimage to Mecca; but the feminine form *Manāt* is better known as an actual object of worship. Owing to this idol having been named in the Koran (Surah liii. 20) the Arabic antiquarians¹ have preserved some useful notices of its character. According to one authority this feminine form merely means "a stone," whereas the masculine would mean "stones," or "rocks"; and that the idol named *Manāt* was not an

¹ Azraki in Wüstenfeld's *Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*, i. 78-84; Al-Baghawi's *Commentary on the Koran* (lithographed at Bombay); Yakut, *Geographical Lexicon*, s.v. Mina,

image, but a rock or stone, appears from some of the stories which the antiquarians preserve. According to one account it was a flat stone on which a man clarified butter; when he died, some people appropriated the stone and made a god of it. Clearly the clarified butter must have been an offering to the stone, similar to the milk which, according to Azraki, was offered to another idol. According to several authorities, Manāt was set up on the seashore—perhaps was a rock on the coast.

“The full libation,” which, Isaiah tells us, was offered to Mina, was therefore an idolatrous practice common to Israel with the Arabian tribes, and the “table spread for Gad” was doubtless of the same order. We notice that just as Manāt was a rock by the sea, so in Isaiah lvii. it is the stones of the torrents that are objects of worship, while other hideous rites are performed under “rocky crags.” An authority, followed by the geographer Yakut, who states that idols were brought into Arabia first in the form of ordinary stones, adds that the worshippers gave as their reason for propitiating the stones the fact that they could be petitioned for *rain*. This notice seems to give us the light we require. The sea and the rivers were personified as gods from whom water might be sought; and the propitiatory rites were chiefly for the purpose of securing rain or water, the constant need for which permeates all Arabic poetry, and the poetry of Isaiah even more. Sacrifices by lakes, rivers, and rocks were common among American races, *e.g.*, the Chibchas; ¹ and even Horace, in a familiar ode, describes a sacrifice to a spring.

Isaiah (lxvi. 17) informs us that the worshippers in these cases claimed a special sort of sanctity. This was apparently in virtue of their being houseless and eating weird food, such as the ordinary law forbade. The notices of the

¹ Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iv. 363; for Africa, see ii. 175; and for human sacrifices to appease water-gods, ii. 198.

Arabic antiquarians illustrate this. At certain periods the worshippers of these stone idols thought it improper to come under a roof, and we learn from the Koran that they prided themselves greatly on this form of asceticism. To some similar custom the prophet alludes (lxv. 4) when he speaks of those who dwell in holes (?) and graves, and who, owing to their superior sanctity, refuse to let others come near them. To the custom mentioned in this text we can easily see a reference in Isaiah ii., where it is said that men will have to retreat into holes in order to escape the Divine vengeance. There will then be a reason for the practice, which is at present an idolatrous caprice.

The customs described in lvii. 5-10 may also be identified with the practice of the Arabian idolaters: "those who heat themselves with *elim* under every green tree." The commentator on the passage of the Koran that has been quoted tells a story of a man who took three stones, set them up under a tree, and then told his tribe that this was their god, to be propitiated by circuits. The ceremony to which the word "heating themselves" refers will then be a circuit of this kind, in which the worshipper ran round the object of his worship. The circuit of the Kaabah is probably the only relic of the practice in Arabia. "Slaughtering the children in the wadis under the rocky crags." This reminds us of the offerings of children to water-gods practised by African negroes.¹ Among the Chibchas a young man captured from the enemy was dedicated to the sun, beheaded in the open air on a mountain, and his blood sprinkled on a rock.² The sacrifice of children, especially of the first son, was observed as a practice of the Peruvians.³ The Greek custom of presenting a lock of hair to the river-god is probably a relic of a more barbarous form of propitiation; while the Roman antiquarians, doubtless with

¹ Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, ii. 198.

² *Ibid.* iv. 364.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 461. Compare iii. 207 for Florida.

justice, regard the practice of throwing straw figures to the Tiber as a relic of human sacrifice. But this form of infanticide also reminds us of that which was practised by the pre-Mohammedan Arabs, which Mohammed has the credit of having abolished. The antiquarians confine the custom to the burying alive of female infants; and this, they say, was done by only a few tribes. There is, however, some ground for thinking that it was carried on on a larger scale. One of the women of Mecca, who, after the city had yielded to the Prophet, was asked to accept the conditions of Islam, being told that she must not kill her children, replied, "We reared them when they were small, you killed them when they were grown."¹ This answer would be off the point if the slaughter of male children was unknown.

That the offerings recorded by Isaiah were originally intended to procure rain seems most likely. The "stones of the brook" would represent the river-god, where, as is the case with the torrents mentioned in Scripture, the river has water only at special seasons. Where the rivers are deep, the victim can be thrown in,² and this is a common practice. But where the water is insufficient for that purpose, the victim has to be dispatched as in the scene recorded by Isaiah.

A remarkable suggestion that has been made to account for infanticide is worth repeating. The soul of the newborn child, being absolutely pure, is thought to be best able to act as intercessor with the god. This theory seems to group several of the notions current in Arabia together. That a son is the natural intercessor for his father is asserted even by Mohammedan writers.³ The old theory is said to have been that the idols were God's daughters, and carried on intercession, and these ideas Mohammed seemed at one time willing to adopt. If, therefore, the superior sanctity

¹ *Al-Fachri*, ed. Ahlwardt, p. 126.

² Waitz, l.c. iv. 363.

³ *Letters of Abu 'l-'Ala*, p. 131.

of which we read in chapter lxv. and lxvi. were claimed by those who had tried this method of acquiring it, we can understand both the tenacity with which the claim was maintained and also the indignation which it provoked.

Verse 6 proceeds to describe the offerings of food and drink to the stones of the torrent, which have already been illustrated. In verse 7 he adds, "On a high and lofty mountain thou hast set thy bed." This worship on mountain-tops is attested for the Arabs by Azraki ; it belongs to a very early form of Paganism. The mountain-top is thought to be nearer God than any lower part of the earth. The description that follows seems to refer to licentious rites, but in the language of the Prophets on the subject of idolatry it is difficult to distinguish simile from realism. In the declaration of chapter ii. that every high mountain shall feel the wrath of God and be brought low, we recognise an allusion to the rites described in this verse.

Verse 8 continues, "And behind the door and the doorpost thou hast set thy remembrance that thou hast gone away from me." This seems to be an allusion to a custom whereby a woman who left her husband's house for good put some mark indicating that she had done so. In Exodus xxi. 6 we read that permanent adoption by a family was indicated by a ceremonial in which the door and the doorpost figured ; whence it seems natural that permanent emancipation from a family should be indicated by a ceremony in which they figured also. The verb here employed for "to emigrate," or "to run away," is ordinarily used of forcible expulsion ; but the earlier sense, "to migrate," is known to Isaiah in v. 13, and also appears in 2 Samuel xv. 19. When this word had once become indissolubly connected with the melancholy exile of the Jews, it is unlikely that the earlier sense could remain ; whence these passages must be pre-exilian. "Thy remembrance" probably refers to some article specially characteristic of the

mistress of the house, which would be hung "behind the door and the doorpost" as a sign that the position was abandoned.¹

The rest of the verse is too realistic for discussion. Verse 9 begins, "And thou didst . . . for Molech with oil." The figures here, and in what follows, are taken from the practice of courtesans, who employed unguents and perfumes to render their persons charming; the sense, therefore, will be correctly represented by "thou didst anoint thyself," though the actual meaning of the verb used is lost. There follows, "And thou didst send thy messengers unto a distance, and didst send them down even unto Sheol." In the first of these phrases we recognise the author of xviii. 2; and in the second, the author of vii. 10. The practice referred to would appear to be that of seeking foreign alliances, whereas, in the opinion of the Prophet, the Jewish kings should have trusted entirely to Divine aid; of course, such a charge would be ridiculous after the exile. "If sending down into hell" is to be taken literally, the reference is to the necromancy suggested by viii. 19.

The purpose of the illustrations of these ceremonies is to prove that the latter were relics of extreme antiquity. Some of the closest parallels come from the American savages; while in some cases we are able to identify the rites with those current in Arabia from time immemorial, and finally abolished by Mohammed. The source, then, of these practices in Palestine must have been ancient and undisturbed custom; they had been brought by the Canaanites with them from Arabia, and the Israelites had learned them from the Canaanites. They were kept alive by attachment to particular mountains and particular rivers, and in part were based on the system which con-

¹ Compare the custom of the southern Kaffirs, among whom the bride was presented with "ein Besen, ein Napf und ein Mühlstein" on the wedding-day (Waitz, l.c. ii. 388).

nected and even identified the gods with particular localities. The cultivation of them involved an insult to the Temple (lxv. 11), which, therefore, must have been standing at the time of the rebuke. These passages are in consequence so clearly pre-exilian, that even some of those who were in favour of the dissecting theory have been unable to place them any later. While, then, the "first Isaiah" is supposed to be interpolated with post-exilian matter, the "second Isaiah" is supposed to be interpolated with pre-exilian matter. Naturally, a theory that involves so much complication can make little claim to probability.

The author of chapter lxv. 8, 9, takes the same view of the purpose of the exile which is taken throughout the book, and, indeed, throughout the Bible. Attachment to these savage and primitive rites could only be dissolved by removing the worshippers from the soil on which they were practised; hence, the exile was not only a punishment but also a corrective. From it there returned those whose progenitors had not bowed the knee to Baal, while those whose interests were far removed from the objects which Israel was destined to accomplish lost their nationality. Those who came back were cured, or rather purified, from this particular form of evil. That they were not faultless we know from the Prophets of the return; but, to attribute to them fetish worship of a primitive sort is a gross anachronism. One might as well accuse the English of the 19th century of burning heretics or using ordeals as evidence.

That the rites described in chapters lxv. and lxvi. are of the same sort as those so vividly depicted in chapter lvii. need not be doubted; indeed, it was from chapter lxv. that the clue was obtained which led to the search for parallels in the works of the Arabic antiquarians. The phrase "behind one in the midst" of lxvi. 17 reminds us of the Arabic *imām*, or leader of ceremonies, who does not face the congregation, but goes through the performance in the front place

while the congregation do the same behind him. That word is certainly taken over into Mohammedanism from the earlier cult.

Next after the idolatrous rites rebuked by the "second Isaiah," we may consider some other crimes which he condemns. One of the most serious impeachments is to be found in lix. 2-9. The Prophet there states that the sins of his countrymen have been a bar between them and God; they have caused God to hide His face and prevented Him from hearing. This is the same message as that in i. 14, 15, with a slight difference in the tense and the expression. He then proceeds: "for your hands are polluted with blood." This also is identical with the accusation in i. 15, "your hands are full of blood"; or, perhaps, "tainted with blood." Now this is as grave an accusation as can be made; to what it precisely refers our slight knowledge of Israelitish history does not enable us to say; the Prophet may have in mind either judicial murders (such as that in old times of Naboth), or recklessness of human life among loose livers, or the infanticide just discussed. Whichever of these it be—supposing it does not refer, as many have thought, to a judicial murder in the distant future—the two "remonstrances" must clearly belong to the same period. And that period can only be pre-exilic; the mere notion of such a remonstrance being addressed to the returned exiles seems to involve anachronism. Indeed, the Prophet's idea is clearly that the exile was a sort of sea in which these offences were to be washed out.

The terrible impeachment of his contemporaries which follows strongly resembles that contained in chapters i. and v. It is illustrated by similes taken from natural history, in which words otherwise only used by the "first Isaiah" are employed. Verses 9 and 11 contain a free paraphrase of v. 7; but the play on the words in the earlier chapter is intentionally altered; an imitator would probably have repro-

duced it. In lvi. 10-12 the impeachment is confined to the rulers; they are accused of drunkenness, corruption, and incompetence, just as they are in v. 22, 23, iii. 12, and ix. 15. That the same impeachment could be made with justice at such different periods as the time of the "first Isaiah," and the close of the exile or commencement of the return, seems unthinkable; but to deny the authenticity of the early chapters of the book is uncritical. How could such a forgery have remained undetected?

In chapter lix. the people are accused of lip service; they ask why their punctilious performance of ceremonies is unproductive of results, and are told that it is owing to the fact that their service is not accompanied by a corresponding reform in their conduct. The same is the burden of chapter i. and of xxix. 13. Surely the remonstrances addressed to the Jews before and after the great crisis in their national existence cannot have been so similar.

Let us now see whether the second half of Isaiah tells us anything about the Prophet's person. Ewald seems to have rightly interpreted viii. 18, "Verily I and the children which the Lord has given me are for signs and tokens in Israel," of the names Isaiah, Shear-yashub, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Clearly the names "A remnant shall return," and "Hasten the spoil, hurry the plunder," were too full of meaning to escape notice; therefore the Prophet's own name, "The salvation of the Lord," must also have been of notable significance; and, indeed, that theme, "the salvation of the Lord," pervades the whole book.

But it follows that the Prophet must have taken this name himself. Thus only would its significance be forced on the minds of his contemporaries. It was thus that at the time of the French Revolution men took such names as Publicola, Timoleon, Harmodius, to be able to exhibit their republicanism to the whole world. Similarly at the

time of the Civil War in England Puritans took verses of Scripture for their names. Such designations were significant only if they were intentionally taken or given. Hence the name "Salvation of the Lord" must have been adopted by the Prophet with prophetic intent. What then was his original name?

This appears to be given in xlii. 18-21. The way to translate these verses seems to me the following: "Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, so as to see. Who was blind but my servant, or deaf as my messenger whom I send? Who was blind as *Meshullam*, and blind as the servant of the Lord? Seeing much without noticing; open-eared without hearing. The Lord was pleased of His grace to make a great and notable example." The name *Meshullam*, as will be seen by consulting the Concordance, is by no means uncommon; it belongs to a root which gives a great number of proper names both in Hebrew and Arabic; they all mean "safe and sound," and are names of good omen; *Salim*, *Selim*, *Salman*, *Shallum*, *Sulaiman*, *Solomon*, *Maslamah*, *Musailimah*, *Salma*, *Sulma*, *Salama*, *Musallam*, mean all practically the same. The "great and notable example" then lay in the fact that he, *Meshullam*, had been enabled to see; why then should not others?

Let us compare this with the most autobiographical chapter in Isaiah—chapter vi. In the first place, the vision there justifies the description of himself in the above passage as "My messenger whom I send." For there he heard the question asked by God, "Whom shall I send, and who shall go for us?" And he answered, "Here am I; send me." And he was told to go and say to the people, "Hear, but understand not; see, and know not"—the very condition wherein, according to xlii. 20, the messenger himself had been.

Then we see that in verse 5 he identifies his condition with that of his countrymen until the live coal had touched

his lips. The immediate result of that was to be the removal of sin; but assuredly the image is meant to suggest "the scholar's tongue," which in l. 4, he says, was given him by the Lord, to utter the words which (as Ben-Sira says) blaze like a fire, and, indeed, however inadequately they are translated, thrill the reader and hearer more probably than any other form of utterance. Hence it would seem that the verses xlii. 18-21 give us a very needful supplement to the biographical notice of the chapter vi.

But is the supposition that Meshullam is a proper name a wild conjecture, or an observation that is likely sooner or later to be generally accepted? I trust the latter, because modern scholars see the necessity of correcting the text, owing to the fact that, taken as a substantive, the word gives no satisfactory meaning. Now we have already seen that the correction of the text in the case of Hebrew writers is an operation which is very unlikely to lead to satisfactory results. It is only in rare cases that such a proceeding is dictated by the canons of science. On the other hand, I can imagine no reason grammatical or other which stands in the way of the interpretation given above. And seeing how deeply this Prophet is imbued with the feeling that a new condition calls for a new name (cf. lxii. 2), the conjecture of Ewald that the name Isaiah was meant to mark the Prophet's new condition seems highly probable.

Whether the Prophet was accurate in describing his own state as equally forlorn with that of the blindest it is difficult to determine. There are many cases of men called to humbler stages of the same vocation who have painted their former lives in colours which those who knew them would not have recognised. But surely the verses in chapter xlii. must proceed from him who saw the vision of chapter vi.

We learn, then, from chapter vi. that the mission under-

taken by the Prophet was without hope of brilliant success; it was only when Jerusalem was reduced to a ruin that it was to begin to be heard. In l. 6-10 we hear the Prophet complain of its ineffectual character; the reception of his message was just what had been promised; it was greeted with contempt and ridicule, with blows and buffets. The consolation that he had was the same as that which nerves all those who are defending the cause of science against tremendous odds, viz., that the truth is permanent, and must slowly approve itself, whereas the opponent is transitory. Naturally it might be said that this was too often the fate of those who interpreted the purposes or work of God aright for the first time to serve for scientific identification; but then it must be observed that we have no other justification save this passage for the oracle of chapter vi. For the personal narrative in chapter xx. refers to a symbolic act, such as other prophets, both true and false, practised; from the remainder of the personal notices in chapters i.-xxxix. we should gather that Isaiah had the enviable post of court Prophet, particularly enviable in the case of one who had to announce good news; for the office was ordinarily connected with announcements of the contrary import. According to current notions he would, in the scene recorded in chapter vii. have had the good fortune to have uttered with impunity a foolhardy challenge. Many of his oracles, moreover, were concerned with the fate of foreign nations, whose disasters were not likely to cause the Prophet's fellow-countrymen very acute suffering. But if these oracles were only occasional, whereas the Prophet's constant message was that sketched in chapter vi., of frequent recurrence in chapters i.-xxxix., and thoroughly elucidated in chapters xl.-lxvi., then the contempt and scorn which he had to endure are easily intelligible, and consonant with experience. The occasions on which he was called in were occasions

on which desperate remedies were required ; Ahab calls in the services of Micaiah, and the murderers of Gedaliah those of Jeremiah under somewhat similar circumstances. The bulk of his time was spent in remonstrances which were ridiculed, and uttering predictions to which few attached any significance.

That we should not know the name of an author who has told us in verses 4-11 so much of his personal history would be remarkable ; what could have put it into any one's mind to attribute them to the successful court Prophet of chapters xxxvi.-xxxix ? Jeremiah would be the author with whose fate they would apparently correspond best. The valuable notice in xlii. 19 of the author's former name Meshullam seems intelligible only on the hypothesis stated above. Had it not been known that the author of that chapter bore the name Isaiah, the chapter (and the collection in which it occurred) would be of course attributed to Meshullam. Any one who has ever catalogued MSS. is aware that the first expedient adopted for finding out the name of an author is to search through his book for some proper name that may from the context be his. To those with whom classical Hebrew was a living language a proper name would be as easily distinguishable as to us in reading English ; in such a sentence as " who is so pathetic as gray," the absence of the capital would confuse no intelligent reader ; and hence, had not the readers of these oracles from the time they were first issued in a roll been convinced that the author's name was Isaiah, it would never have occurred to them to render Meshullam as " perfect," or " requited," or " devoted." But since the fact of the Prophet having changed his name was only recorded in the allusion of chapter viii. 18, his former name was forgotten. That " who so blind as Meshullam ?" meant " who so blind as Isaiah before his mission ?" was not perceived by those who only knew of

Isaiah. Even in this country, where a change of name is usually preceded by the most important work in a man's life, the name by which a peer was known before his elevation is constantly forgotten by the majority of the public. But where the change is preceded by no important work the original name is likely to be lost altogether. How many educated persons could say offhand what was the original name of Voltaire or Neander or Lagarde?

The arguments that can be drawn from language and style are ordinarily too inconclusive to have scientific value. The same writer, in different works or at different periods of his life, may employ wholly different sets of words and phrases; just as on the same day (as S. Ephraim well observes) he may hold contradictory opinions. On the other hand, admiration for a model may lead an imitator to employ with preference words and phrases found in that model; in which case what might at first sight seem to be an indication of identity is in reality an indication of the contrary. Still less can be built on those more subtle nuances which scholars profess to perceive without being able to state precisely what they mean. When a scholar of even the greatest eminence declares that he can tell by intuition that such-and-such an ode is not by Horace, or such-and-such a play is not by Shakespeare, it is best to attach no value whatever to the statement. For if such intuitions had scientific value, it is clear that every scholar who had acquired a certain degree of proficiency would feel the same; for that is the case with all intuitions that are really the result of skill. Those, *e.g.*, who have acquired a certain proficiency in photography know by intuition the right exposure to give in order to obtain a particular effect; and, therefore, they all give the same exposure. The intuition in such a case merely means extreme velocity in conducting an operation, which, in the case of less skilful operators, has to be gone through in detail. That in

the case of literary criticism these supposed intuitions are valueless is shown by the extraordinary divergence of the opinions of the highest experts. Of the Satires of Juvenal the tenth has won the poet the most lasting fame; it is more often quoted, and has been more frequently imitated than the others. But the foremost Latinist in Germany in recent times assured the world that it was not by Juvenal. The writings of Horace are supposed to be marked by so strong an individuality as to be inimitable; but there has during this century been a school in Holland and Germany which denies the Horatian authorship of every other ode; and that school contains some names of first-rate eminence. Bentley, whose fame to some extent rests on his exposure of ancient forgeries, held that the Epistles of Plato were genuine; but the majority of Greek scholarship is against him. What one expert thinks the finest line in Vergil is condemned by another as a silly interpolation. Hence to adduce arguments from any of these regions is to take the question out of the region of science.

A scientific argument can be drawn from the use of words only when they can be dated either before or after. By the latter method of dating I mean the case in which we can show that by a certain date the sense of a word had been entirely forgotten in a community; for then whoever is found using it in the old sense will almost certainly be earlier than that date. The discovery of this scientific principle is the service rendered the world by the Greek critic Aristarchus; let us see whether it will help us to determine the date of the "second Isaiah."

1. There is a verb *nāshath* used by Isaiah once in the first half of the book (xix. 5), and once in the second (xli. 17). In both those passages it clearly means "to be dry"; "the waters shall dry up from the Nile," and "their tongue is dry with thirst." It is well to know the etymology of a

word before we base any argument upon it : and here the surest source of Hebrew etymology, classical Arabic, does not fail us. The verb *nashifa* has from time immemorial been used by the Arabs precisely as Isaiah uses this. Thus the excellent native dictionary called "The Arabic Tongue" begins its article on this word as follows : "*nashifa*, used of water, to *dry up* : also used of the earth, *sucking it in*." After other illustrations we are told that it may be used of the udders of camels drying up, *i.e.* being without milk. Dozy, in his Supplement to the Arabic dictionaries, quotes from mediæval writers phrases in which this verb is used of the eyes being dry from tears, and of the saliva being dried by long talking. The sense, therefore, of this Arabic verb is precisely what is required in the passages of Isaiah. The change from *th* to *f* is certified in the case of some Arabic words.¹ The Arabic *sh* ought to be represented by Hebrew *s* ; but this rule is not invariable, and in the present case the pointing may be to blame. What, therefore, appears is that the authors of both parts of Isaiah are acquainted with a verb *nashath* or *nasath*, meaning "to be dry," and in all probability identical with a very familiar Arabic verb meaning the same.

Now let us examine two passages of Jeremiah. The first is li. 30. "The champions of Babylon have ceased to fight ; they sit in their fortresses : their manhood is *nashath* : they have become *women*" (*nashim*). The second clause is here evidently in explanation of the first ; it tells us what *nashath* means, *viz.*, "to become effeminate." The author regards it as a denominative from *nashim* "women," probably through an abstract *nāshūth* "womanhood." Hence between the time when Isaiah II. wrote and the time of the composition of Jeremiah li. 30 the meaning of the verb *nashath* must have been forgotten. Therefore

¹ *Lisān al-'arab*, xv. 356.

the author of Isaiah xli. is earlier than the author of Jeremiah li. *by some generations.*

That this observation is correct is shown by Jeremiah xviii. 14. "Can the cool flowing waters be *destroyed*" (*nathash*)? That men do not speak of water being destroyed or plucked up is evident; the author must mean "can they dry up?" The phrase, then, is modelled on Isaiah xix. 5, but the later Prophet being no longer familiar with the old verb *nashath*, "to dry up," substitutes *by conjecture* the more familiar *nathash*. By the time li. 30 is written he has remembered that Isaiah uses not *nathash*, but *nashath*, in connection with waters drying; hence he gives it a special application, adding an etymological explanation. The process is very similar to that which was traced in the last article in reference to "the Lydians, drawers of the bow." Just as Isaiah utilized the lost book of Wisdom, so Jeremiah utilizes the language of the existing classic Isaiah. In the case of obsolete phrases he makes guesses, which, as philology is not the purpose of Holy Scripture, by the fact that they are unfortunate, give us valuable clues of date.

To show that this account of the passages in Jeremiah is in accordance with experience, I may produce a parallel from an author who has already been of help—Theocritus. The ancients were in doubt as to the meaning of a difficult word in Homer—*ἔκηλος*. Some thought it meant "peaceful, undisturbed," others thought it meant "idle." When Theocritus wrote Idyll xvii., he took the former view, and said (v. 97), "the people work at their business *ἔκηλοι* undisturbed." But when he wrote Idyll xxv., he had changed his opinion, and, speaking of the labourers on a farm, says, "there was no man *ἔκηλος* idle" (verse 100), but in order to show that he means this, he adds in the next line "in want of employment." So in Jeremiah xviii. 14 the view represented is that Isaiah's word for "to be

dry" is a transposition of a verb meaning "to extirpate"; but by li. 30 he has changed his opinion and connects it with the word for "women." Whence we may infer that Isaiah's works were to Jeremiah somewhat as Homer's were to Theocritus.

2. The book of Isaiah is rich in words for "sorcery" and "witchcraft." One of these, *shachar*, is homonymous with a word meaning "dawn." It is familiar in Arabic, where, indeed, it habitually stands for the "black art." The Armenian *shkharēli*, "wonderful," "bewitching," cannot very well be separated from it; but to which language it of right belongs is not so clear. The word occurs first in a text of Isaiah which we had before us in the last paper: "assuredly they shall say unto you thus: 'there is no witchcraft for it'" (viii. 20). The corresponding verb is used in the second half of Isaiah (xlvii. 11), "there shall come upon thee an evil which thou canst not charm away." The fact that among the various synonyms for enchantment that occur in the Old Testament, this (which is so familiar in Arabic) is found only in the first half of Isaiah and in the second half of Isaiah, seems to me to be a striking mark of identity of period. Moreover, if the second Isaiah had borrowed the phrase from the first, we could scarcely imagine him handling it so freely as to make a denominative verb from it. There is, therefore, ground for supposing that this particular synonym for "sorcery" fell out of use shortly after Isaiah's time; probably because of its identity in form with the ordinary word for "the dawn," whence these two passages were wrongly explained till the methodical application of the study of Arabic to the explanation of the Hebrew text.

This seems to me a case of extreme interest as supplying an argument which cannot easily be eluded. For it is the phrase of Isaiah ii. which supplies us with the right, though not the obvious, explanation of that in Isaiah i. As we have

already seen, the explanations given by a later writer of first-class competence, Jeremiah, are by no means philologically correct; therefore a *later* writer would almost certainly have supposed Isaiah i. to mean "there is no dawn for it," as indeed we have seen that "Rabbi Simon" interpreted it. The amount of skill required to see that the words meant "there is no witchcraft for it," and freedom in handling the language requisite for the alteration of the phrase as it appears in Isaiah xlvi. 11, seem to me far beyond what any imitator could possess. On the other hand, if we consider the number of words used to denote things connected with witchcraft, and the frequency with which references to it occur in the Old Testament, it seems right to regard the equivalent of the Arabic *sühr* as a mark of date. This makes the authors of Isaiah viii. and xlvi. contemporary and probably identical.

Let us, as before, take some example nearer home than the Hebrew of the Old Testament to see whether this reasoning is correct. In a familiar passage of *Sartor Resartus* Carlyle speaks of a Baphometric Fire-Baptism, a phrase which occasioned his earliest reviewers some difficulty. But he who reads the *Miscellaneous Essays* will find in the Essay on the Life and Writings of Werner a passage that will completely explain the phrase. It came from a German play to which Carlyle had access, but which very likely no other English writer of the time had read. We have seen that the word for "sorcery" used by Isaiah may be Armenian, in which case it may have been learned from some Hittite. Isaiah would then have been familiar with a name for "sorcery" which was not in ordinary use.

3. In Isaiah x. 18 there occurs a difficult phrase, rendered in our Authorized Version "as when a standard-bearer fainteth." The meaning of this expression is probably lost; but it must have been known to the author of Isaiah lix. 19, "the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a

standard against him." For the same word (*nōsēs*) is here used, but in an entirely different context. There can, therefore, be no question of imitation; the Prophet must have known the meaning of the word though we do not know it, and the argument is unaffected by the question of the meaning which should be assigned it.

These three words would appear to be of real importance, because the argument drawn from them is of a sort that science recognises. The manner in which identity can best be proved in a court of law (where there has been no continuous residence) is by finding, if possible, some facts known only to a few persons, of whom the person with whom the claimant seeks to identify himself must be one; if, then, the claimant knows those facts, he gives fair presumption of the justice of his claim. The argument in this paper is of the same sort. No one save Isaiah appears to know anything of the worship connected with *gannoth* and *elim*, or to know the meaning of the words *nashath*, *shachar*, or *nōsēs*. Jeremiah, as we have seen, if he had claimed to be Isaiah I., would have had his claim disproved by the third of these words. Now the author of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. makes the same claim, and, when questioned on these five matters, turns out to know all about them. Whence it would appear that his claim is just.

The second class of examples are not as valuable, but still they seem deserving of consideration. Agriculture and natural history seem clearly to interest the author (or authors) of these oracles very much; and allusions to these subjects lead to the employment of a considerable number of technicalities. Whether a member of the exiled community would have had the opportunity of becoming so familiar with these subjects seems doubtful; but documents illustrating the life of the exiles may some day be discovered, which will enable us to speak positively on this matter. There are some facts about the use of these terms

in the two parts of the book which seem to me scarcely explicable on the hypothesis of divided authorship.

In the Parable of the Vineyard (v. 1-6) there occurs a word for "to hoe" (*adar*, verse 6), and also a word for "to stone," meaning "to remove stones" (*sikkel*, verse 2). Both these verbs have other meanings, which are more familiar; but in the case of the vineyard there could be no mistaking their import, whence they are used without any explanation. However in vii. 25 the Prophet has occasion to use the word for "to hoe" in a less technical context, so this time he adds "with the hoe" that there may be no error. The author of lxii. 10 has occasion to use the word for "to stone" of a road, where it would be ambiguous; for "to stone a road" might mean to put stones on it or to remove them from it. Hence he adds "from stones" that there may be no error. Now either there never was an Isaiah, or the oracles of chapters v. and vii. are Isaianic. Therefore lxii. is also Isaianic. For it must be remembered that these words in their technical sense only occur in these two places. The theory that another author felt the same scruple about the second as Isaiah had felt about the first scarcely commends itself; a later imitator would have thought Isaiah's authority sufficient to justify him in using "to stone" for "to remove stones."

In xxxiv. 15, and twice in lix. 5, a verb (meaning literally "to split") is used of hatching serpents' eggs; it does not occur elsewhere in this sense. In xxxiv. 15 a special verb is used for "to be delivered of," "produce," which only occurs in lxvi. 7 besides. Jeremiah (xvii. 11) is apparently acquainted with part of this scientific vocabulary, but not with the word for "produce." Now the author of xxxiv. seems on other grounds identical with the "second Isaiah"; the reference to Edom and Bosrah in verse 5 cannot with any probability be separated from that in lxiii. 1, and the address to the "nations and peoples" in

xxxiv. 1 is evidently in the style of the author of xli. 1. The threat in xxxiv. 3 closely resembles that with which the book of Isaiah closes. Chapter xxxv. also cannot with any probability be separated from chapters xl.-lxvi.; both the thought and the language are closely akin to, and in part identical with, those of the "second Isaiah." On the other hand, it is by no means easy to separate xxxv. from what precedes; verse 5 takes us back to xxix. 18, and verse 4 to xxxii. 4. Now this fact hits the splitting theory very hard, for the apparent simplicity of the assumption that the prophecies of B being anonymous were tacked on to those of A is lost. Instead of the analysis A + B, or A + C + B, we get A + B + C + B, which has no probability; for why should B have got divided in two? And yet this order is really far simpler than any which a serious critic of the dissecting school could adopt.

A word for "a rush" (*agmōn*) occurs twice in the early chapters of Isaiah which seems also to have been known to the author of Job. As before, however, it is the "second Isaiah" who can tell us something definite about it: "to bow thy head as a rush" is a scornful utterance in lviii. 5. A word for a "branch" or "sucker" (*neser*) is found in both parts of the book, but is only used besides by Daniel. A word for a "tree trunk" occurs in xi. 1; this is also known to the author of Job, but it is from Isaiah xl. 24 that we are able to be sure of its signification.

These seem to be sufficient as additional illustrations of the fact that the "second Isaiah" is the best interpreter of the language of the "first Isaiah"; the limits of the ancient Hebrew vocabulary are unfortunately too little known to us to justify us in building much on identity of diction, except in the cases in which we can prove the words used to have been lost to the later language. If any ordinary book were divided near the middle, we should assuredly find that a certain proportion of the words used

in the first half recurred in the second; but the nature of that proportion would vary so very much with a variety of conditions that science has at present no use for calculations of this kind. It is clear that the employment of precisely the same vocabulary and entirely different vocabularies would be due to design; but probably no other inference of value could be drawn. Although, therefore, the tabulation of the Isaianic vocabulary gives the sort of proportion of identity and of diversity which would harmonize with the theory of a single author, it is best not to use arguments which science cannot recognise.

We may now arrange in order what seem scientific grounds for believing in the Unity of Isaiah.

1. The external evidence, so far as it can be traced, is unanimously in favour of it; and, since the second part of Isaiah has enjoyed exceptional popularity, it is improbable that the name of the author would have been forgotten within 200 years of the time when he wrote, and his work merged in that of a writer of a few scraps of 150 years before.

2. The theory which bisects Isaiah leads by a logical necessity to further and further dissection, and so to results which are absurd.

3. The geography of chapters xl.-lxvi. is earlier than the geography of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and a geographical notice in the last chapter of Isaiah was mistaken by Jeremiah.

4. The idolatrous practices rebuked by the second Isaiah are pre-exilian rites, such as we cannot, without anachronism, attribute to the Israelites either during or after the exile. They can only be explained as relics of a very primitive fetish-worship, connected with particular localities.

5. Other crimes rebuked by the second Isaiah are identical with crimes rebuked by the first Isaiah, and are

of a sort which imply the existence of an independent community long established on the soil.

6. The "second Isaiah" gives us some personal details which enable us to identify him with the Prophet of chapter vi., and, what is most important, tells us the name borne by the Prophet before he took the name Isaiah.

7. The second Isaiah employs words only known otherwise to the first Isaiah, of which the meaning was lost by Jeremiah's time.

8. The second Isaiah shows himself otherwise possessed of a scientific and technical vocabulary which the first Isaiah only shares with him.

Is there, then, nothing in the splitting theories? To my mind nothing at all. The phenomenon of prophecy is one which is at present scarcely understood; it belongs to a class of experiences which are not yet brought into the region of science, though it is conceivable that they may be. The words used by the prophets to describe their experiences imply that they were not ordinary; that they were bestowed only on particular individuals; and that they were often falsely claimed by persons who did not really entertain them. The process, therefore, by which the ostensible results of these experiences are denuded of their supernatural character and treated as ordinary utterances is only scientific if the profession of the prophets be shown to be false, *e.g.*, if the scene described in chapter vi. be shown to have been either a delusion or a dishonest invention. How this can be demonstrated is not obvious; but until it is demonstrated, the assumption that such experiences must be delusions is to be classed with the theory that nature abhors a vacuum, or with the belief that the orbits of the planets must of necessity be circular. Such assumption may lead to the writing of books, but they are not *science*.

Interpreting as commonplace that which is ostensibly extraordinary is unlikely to lead to a sound result. It is a process decidedly analogous to that of assuming that the colours of objects will affect the photographic plate precisely as they affect the eye, or that the tinting of the photographic plate will affect all colours equally. Nothing would seem more natural than such assumptions; but nothing would in reality be falser. When the laws of chemistry and optics are correctly made out, the picture seen by the eye can be interpreted in terms of the photographic plate; but before they are made out, such a process is impossible. It would appear that either the photograph must be incorrect or the eyesight must be defective. Science shows that neither is the case; the eye is correct and the plate is correct. But the optics of prophecy is a science that has not yet been started; and though such a science may never make much progress, nothing of value will result from the substitution of arbitrary assumptions for scientific deductions. Hence we have within the last few years seen a writer of eminence start a theory of Maccabean Psalms on a series of arbitrary assumptions and modify it on the faith of a forgery of the eleventh century A.D., which he grossly misdated; but had the former results been based on sound premises, nothing could have ever shaken them. It is on that ground that science is worth pursuing. The deductions which it produces may be important or they may be trifling; but once produced they last as long as this world shall last.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.