

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

to be so. It is hardly necessary to give references to the abundant evidence that the system of Leviticus agrees with the chronicler's formula, rather than with that of Deuteronomy. In a succeeding Article will be presented an exposition of Graf's comparison of the Deuteronomic and Levitical laws concerning sacerdotal income. As already stated, the present writer reserves entirely his own conclusions; holding that, thus far, only hypotheses are possible.

ARTICLE V.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

BY REV. WM. HENRY COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

THE *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April and October 1881, and for January 1882, contained Articles aiming to show a linguistic correspondence between the main divisions of the Book commonly ascribed to Isaiah too minute and undesigned to be accounted for on the hypothesis of a diversity of authorship. Since those Articles were written, the thirteenth volume of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* has appeared, with an Article on Isaiah from the pen of Rev. T. K. Cheyne, which may be regarded as giving the high-water mark of recent exegesis, as its author has written the latest, and in some respects the best, commentary on the prophecies of Isaiah.¹ This commentary, especially its appended essays, should be read in connection with the Article in the *Encyclopedia*, as the latter is too brief to express justly the writer's cautious, reverent, and thoroughly Christian spirit. It is gratifying to find him treating the conservative view with far more respect than was evinced in his earlier work.² It is well to remind a certain class of critics that such epithets as "blind conservatism," "hard-and-fast traditionalism," fail to meet the present conditions of the problem. Professor Plumptre, for example, who cannot be accused of an orthodox bias, declares³: "My own conviction is, that the second part of Isaiah bears as distinct traces of coming from the author of the first as *Paradise Regained* does of coming from the author of *Paradise*

¹ London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1880-1.

² The Book of Isaiah chronologically arranged. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

³ Contempor

lost." The British Quarterly Review for last October, in a favorable notice of Dr. Bruce's recent work, remarks: "He accepts the idea of a Deutero-Isaiah, which, on grounds of exact criticism, is, to say the least, a mere hypothesis, and, we think, a gratuitous one." Professor W. S. Tyler, whose accurate and fair-minded scholarship is as conspicuous as his conservatism, stated a few months since that he considered the argument for the unity of Isaiah to come as near a demonstration as is possible in an investigation of this kind.

Mr. Cheyne is far enough from agreeing with the writers just quoted, but his progress during ten years is worth noting. In 1870 he held that Isa. xl.-lxvi. is the work of a single author, who wrote at Babylon in the time of Cyrus; he noted with evident satisfaction that "the principal passage (Isa. lvi. 9-lvii. 11), which has been thought by some to imply the authorship of a resident in Palestine, is given up by Delitzsch as incapable of defense." He also claimed, at that time, that four other anonymous prophets of the exile have contributed to i.-xxxix. The vicarious fifty-third chapter was rationalized as follows: "The genius of Israel rises from the ashes of martyrdom to an undecaying supremacy, and the actual nation is so transformed in character as to correspond to its divine ideal" (pp. 176, 177). At present, Mr. Cheyne gives back to Isaiah the Babylonian prophecy in xxi. 1-10, because a lately-discovered cylinder shows this to refer to *Sargon's* conquest of Babylon. He has also entirely reconstructed his theory of xl.-lxvi., making only xl.-lii. 12 Babylonian; the rest he breaks up into nine different works, all of which were written in Palestine, some of them probably in the time of Manasseh, that is, close to Isaiah's date, some by one or more Jews left in Palestine during the exile, and some as late as the days of Nehemiah. Isa. liii. is assigned to the age of Manasseh, but was "probably based on an older work." At all events, he regards it as typical of the Christ who was to come.

These and similar changes of view are confessed with a frankness which almost disarms criticism; but it is pertinent to remark that Mr. Cheyne's assignment of so many disputed chapters to a Palestinian authorship rests not on the discovery of any cylinder or other antique, but upon the more careful study of the local allusions and historical references in the prophecy itself. He had denied these in his earlier work, but he now says (Vol. II. p. 203): "Such references are really forthcoming as the elder traditionalists rightly

saw." The question of phraseology he examines in some detail (pp. 223, 224, 232-234), but speaks very disparagingly of this kind of argument (see p. 223), considering the evidence from style to be of much greater importance. It is chiefly the variety of style which leads him to dissect so mercilessly the latter part of Isaiah. But surely an author may vary his style to a great extent, without committing *felo de se*; no one has ever invented an instrument for defining the lawful limits of this power. Mr. Cheyne himself says (Vol. II. p. 169): "To me, indeed, it is tolerably clear that xliii. 1-xliv. 5 forms one section in itself, and xliv. 6-xlv. 25 another. But when I find Delitzsch connecting xliii. 1-13 with xlii., and Ewald not only accepting xliv. as an independent section, but even forming xliv. 1-9 into a single paragraph, I am obliged to distrust my own insight."

Mr. Cheyne gives us in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* a much clearer and very amusing, because unconscious, instance of the difficulties of dealing with "style" (p. 379): "No doubt an author may change his style, writing in a different mood; we must, at all events, suppose that the author, whoever he may have been, was in a different tone of mind when he wrote so hardly, obscurely, and awkwardly as in liii." Again he mentions (p. 380) the "harsh, but strong style" of liii., which all will recognize as the description of the Servant of Jehovah in his vicarious suffering. Passing on to the foot of page 381 we read (the italics are mine): "But what shall we say — what language is adequate to the divine beauty of such passages as Handel linked to music almost as divine: 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God;' 'He shall feed his flock like a shepherd;' '*He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth*'? Silver tones of which the ear is never weary; honied rhetoric which thrills like a subtle odor even those who have lost the key to its meaning."

In view of this rhapsody, would it not be preferable to come back to the patient sifting of linguistic evidence, until we have laid a firmer foundation for the higher criticism?

In 1870 Mr. Cheyne states, as though there were no doubt in the matter¹: "With all his originality, our prophet [Isaiah A] was indebted for his most essential doctrine to Joel, Amos, and Hosea, his predecessors." In 1880 he says, on the other hand²: "I have no doubt that Joel belongs to post-exile times." I repeat,

¹ Introduction, p. x.

I have no disposition to cavil at such changes of view when so openly avowed; but it is plain that a science with results so quickly shifting needs a broader base in the patient collation of those facts which lie open to the investigation of all. One who is obliged to confess repeatedly that "the complications of the problems of biblical criticism are only beginning to be adequately realized" ought not to waste his ammunition upon an ally like Mr. Urwick, whose *Servant of Jehovah* (pp. 29-50) contains extended specimens of the diction of Isaiah A and B. Had I seen this latter work before preparing my previous Articles, I should have recognized its helpfulness; it is due to myself to add that the results of the present Article were obtained before Mr. Urwick's book had come to my notice. Mr. Cheyne dismisses him as follows (Vol. II. p. 223): "I am not a professor of philosophy, and cannot think that a valuable 'cumulative argument' is produced for the unity of Isaiah by counting up words like אברו and אבריו, אור and אור, which occur (how could they help occurring?) in both parts of the book; and it is with real sorrow that I notice a 'tutor in Hebrew' priding himself on the discovery that 'ישע and its participle or noun occurs fourteen times in the later portion and seven times in the earlier.'"

Again, Mr. Cheyne speaks far too slightly of the argument from diction when he declares¹ that "the peculiarities of phraseology [in xl-lxvi.] can obviously be explained by the profound influence which so great a prophet as Isaiah must have exercised, and demonstrably did exercise, on his successors." Instead of a general statement of this nature, we ought to have a frank admission that the language of a writer is as important an element in determining his historical position as the coarser facts of scenery and allusion; an element so delicate that it should be examined with the greatest care, but capable of producing as high a degree of conviction as any other, when properly applied. No such rough-and-ready remark as that just quoted can sever the thousand philological tendrils which bind together the two parts of Isaiah.

Putting these aside for the present, I claim that the argument from incidental allusions is very much understated by the advocates of a double, or (as Mr. Cheyne would have it) a multiple authorship. According to their view Ezekiel was the great and only prophet in Chaldea during nearly the whole period of the Captivity; Isaiah B not having appeared till just before its close, and Daniel not till centuries later.

¹ Encycl. Brit., xiii. 383.

It is admitted on all sides that Ezekiel exercised a powerful influence upon both generations of the exiles, and kept alive their hope of a return to Babylon. His prophecies must have been the one fresh, living book of that period, far more pondered than the writings of those earlier prophets, whose word was so much less adapted to their circumstances, and therefore so much less "the word of God to them." To quote the eloquent language of Dr. Stebbins¹: "His vision of God's greatness with which he opens his prophecy; his denunciation of the nations which had been the most implacable foes of his people; his vision of the dry bones, and their restoration to life and activity; and above all, his glorious vision of the recovered land, and its division among the tribes; all this would solace the heart of the sorrowing captive, and his soul would be all aflame with a desire to recover the sacred soil of the fathers, and make such sacrifices as were necessary to gratify it."

Whoever the prophet B may have been, on this theory he had grown up among the exiles; whether or not he had ever seen Jerusalem, the atmosphere he had breathed during the main part of his life was that of Babylonia. He must have eagerly devoured, and been, as it were, saturated with the prophecies of Ezekiel. If, then, Isaiah A could have made so deep an impression upon him as all grant that he did, could it have been otherwise with the influence of Ezekiel? If, again, the connection between A and B can be accounted for by the "profound influence which A must have exerted, and demonstrably did exert, upon his successors," how much profounder must have been A's influence upon Ezekiel than upon B; for Ezekiel was at least fifty years nearer the time of A, and he had been brought up in Judea before the Captivity. If, thirdly, the local allusions in Ezekiel leave no room for reasonable doubt that he wrote in Babylonia, although the formative period of his life was spent in Palestine, we should expect *a fortiori* to find such allusions even more numerous and clear in the case of the prophet B. While some purely abstract writer might use language free from *any* terrestrial costume, yet if local incidental references actually occur in B (and we shall find a multitude of them) then they must be allowed to speak honestly for themselves. On each of these three points we find precisely what we should not expect on the theory of the modern critics, and precisely what we should

¹ Christian Register, Jan. 5, 1882.

expect if the prophet B lived in Palestine. We will once more quote the critical canon of Hitzig, and this time without inserting any brackets.¹ “*That time, those time-relations, out of which a prophetic writer is explained, are his time, his time-relations; to that period he is to be referred as the date of his own existence.*”

It is a singular fact that the critical school desert their own principles in the case before us. Mr. Cheyne admits with the utmost nonchalance:² “*Chapters xlix.-lxvi. have one peculiarity: Babylon and Cyrus are not mentioned in them at all. True, there was not so much said about Babylon as we should have expected even in xl.-xlviii.; the paucity of references to the local characteristics of Babylonia is one of the negative arguments urged in favor of the Isaianic origin of the prophecy.*” As to the affirmative argument from Palestinian references he observes: “*The only allusions greatly worth considering occur in masses in those portions only of the second part of Isaiah which, for a combination of causes, should most probably be separated from the remainder.*” Whether this be true the reader will be in a better position to judge as we proceed to examine the facts in question.

First, as to the matter of local color. It would be difficult to find a greater contrast in this respect than is presented by Ezekiel, on the one hand, and the prophet B, on the other. The former has a *general* knowledge of the Holy land, and, as most of his prophecies relate to it, we find frequent references to its prominent features. The only minute knowledge of Palestine which he displays pertains to the Temple mount at Jerusalem, with which his priesthood would have made him familiar.

Mr. Urwick has called attention to the decided contrast presented in this respect by Isaiah xl.-lxvi., with special reference to agricultural terms.³ The argument has its force, manifestly, in the circumstantial detail with which it is carried out, in those incidental turns of expression which are so hard to counterfeit. I regret the occasion of citing another instance of Mr. Cheyne's unfair treatment of this writer. “*By a similar method,*” he says,⁴ “*it could be proved that the book of Jeremiah was written in northern Israel, because in xvii. 8 a figure is taken from perennial streams, which were unknown in the drier south; and even that the book of the exile-prophet Ezekiel is a forgery, because of his frequent references to the moun-*

¹ See Bib. Sac., April 1881, p. 251. ² Encyclopedia Britannica, Art. “*Isaiah.*”

³ “*Servant of Jehovah,*” pp. 40-49.

⁴ Vol. ii. pp. 202, 203.

tains and rivers of Israel." Mr. Cheyne here quotes from his previous work,¹ and we will turn to that. "A Semitic race, when transplanted to a distant country, preserves a lively recollection of its earlier home. The Arabic poets in Spain delighted in allusions to Arabian localities, and descriptions of the events of desert-life. Why should not a prophecy of the exile contain some such allusions to the scenery of Palestine, and at least one such retrospect of events, some of which had happened previously to the fall of Jerusalem; events, it should be remembered, which had left a deep impression on the religious condition of the Jews in Babylon? It will perhaps not be out of place to compare the allusions in this section to oaks and hills and torrent-beds, with the frequent and touching references of Ezekiel to the mountains and rivers of Israel." The comical thing about this quotation is that the latter portion of it (all after the word Palestine) is suppressed; the whole having been intended in 1870 to show that "this section," chaps. lvi. 9–lvii. 11, is Babylonian, in spite of its Palestinian allusions, while in 1880 the writer has concluded, *because* of these allusions, that it was written in Palestine, and the quotation is intended to apply only to chaps. xl.–xlviii. If, now, whatever may have been true of the Arabic poets in Spain, it should appear from a diligent study of the texts that the local color of Ezekiel is decidedly Babylonian, and that of B decidedly Palestinian, the above inquiry of Mr. Cheyne ("why should not a prophecy of the exile," etc.), will remind us of King Charles II's famous question about the fish. "It will perhaps not be out of place to compare the allusions" in Ezekiel and in B more fully than Mr. Cheyne seems to have done. (In most of what follows, I omit references to chapter and verse, which can easily be supplied from the Concordance).

The stand-point of the Captivity is very manifestly that of Ezekiel. He dates his prophecies by the year, month, and day of "Jehoiachin's captivity" (i. 2), or of "our captivity" (xxxiii. 21; xl. 1). This phrase must be supplied in the many other passages where year, month, and day are specified. He uses a technical word for captivity, גְּלוּת, which occurs eleven times in Ezekiel, and never in A or B. He also uses the common word שְׁבוּי, and the rare words שְׁבוּיָהוּ and גְּלוּתָהּ. He expresses this idea of captivity twenty-three times in all, not counting variants, while B expresses it only five times (שְׁבוּי four times, גְּלוּת once). Why did the latter, "the great

¹ The Book of Isaiah chronologically arranged. n. 201 f.

prophet of the captivity," say so little about it, and never even mention a date in connection with it? ¹

Ezekiel is a man of the city; his favorite illustrations are architectural.² There is no mistaking their Chaldean origin. "He had wandered through the vast halls of Assyrian monuments, and there gazed on all that Assyrian monuments have disclosed to us of human dignity and brute strength combined, — the eagle-winged lion, human-headed bull."³ His references to natural products are pre-vaillingly commercial rather than agricultural. While Isaiah A depicts the farmer casting wheat (חֲטָן), barley (שֶׁבֶר), or spelt (חֲטָן), into the ground, Ezekiel employs the same words in the plural only, to denote articles of produce to be found in the markets of Babylon or Tyrus.

Except the most common words, such as נָהָר, *river*, Ezekiel's references to natural scenery are differently expressed from those of B, besides being very much fewer. He has nothing to say of the שְׁפֵלָה, *plain*, or the בְּקָעָה, *valley*, the מְצֻדָה, *fountain*, or the מְאֵי, *pool*, which meet us so often in other writers. All these are in A and B alike. But Ezekiel uses בְּקָעָה, for plain, מְצֻדָה, for valley, מְצֻדָה, for fountain, מְאֵי, for pool. Now בְּקָעָה is properly a *valley* (lit. a *cleft*); and we frequently find it used with this signification. But the word is also applicable to a low plain, such as that in which Babylon was situated. The first occurrence of בְּקָעָה is in Gen. xi. 2, where it describes this very plain of Shinar (A. V. *vale*). It occurs five times in Ezekiel, always referring to this same locality (A. V. *plain*, except xxxvii. 1, 2, where *valley*; margin, Or, *champaign*). The writers of Palestine employ the word in both these senses, and so we find it in B (*plain*, xl. 3; *valley*, xli. 18 and lxiii. 14). מְצֻדָה, the common word for valley, is found in A and B as well as Ezekiel.

The Hebrew language has several words for fountain, besides the two mentioned above; as מְצֻדָה, מְצֻדָה, מְצֻדָה, מְצֻדָה. But Ezekiel in Babylon never has occasion to speak of a fountain, though the word occurs twice as part of a proper name in xlvi. 10 (from *En-gedi* even unto *En-eglaim*).

B has three different words for fountain, and it is a curious fact that two of these are found once each in A and B.

¹ Strictly speaking, B expresses the idea *captivity* only once; viz. xlvi. 2. In the other cases the meaning is either *captives* or *captive* (adj.). Ezekiel's twenty-three instances, however, all signify *captivity*.

² See Art. "Ezekiel," in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

³ Stanley, *Jewish Church*, Vol. ii. p. 623.

As to **אָבַיָּא**, which Ezekiel uses once for *pool*, it is a rare word, found only once elsewhere, viz. in A, where it means *cistern* rather than *pool*. So in this case also B agrees with A (**אָבַיָּא**), and both disagree with Ezekiel. The latter has a favorite word for *river*, which he employs seven times, **אָרְיָא**. It is found only eight times in other writers, three of which occurrences are in the prophets, viz. Joel² A¹. But A employs it (viii. 7) of the King of Assyria coming up over all "his channels" **אָרְיָא**. B does not use it at all, but has another rare word for *river*, **רִבְבָל**, found once each in A and B, and nowhere else. Let us pause long enough to take in the significance of such facts as these. We will imagine that B is a writer at the close of the captivity, and that he wishes to express the idea *river*. If he desires a common word, he will employ **נָהָר**, **נַחַל**, or **יָאָר**. If an unusual word, he will most naturally choose **אָרְיָא**. If he wishes a word derived from **רָבַב**, *to flow*, how strong is the probability that he will take **רִבְבָל**, Jer. xvii. 8, or **אֲרַבָּל**, Dan. viii. 2, 3, 6, instead of going back nearly two centuries for Isaiah's *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον* **רִבְבָל**. If the latter were a favorite with A, the theory of imitation, or unconscious saturation, would apply; as it stands, that supposition fails. If there were only one word found in A and B and nowhere else, the fact would have less significance; the truth is, **רִבְבָל** is one out of eight such words.¹

Coming back from rivers and fountains to *terra firma*, we observe that B has **יַבְשָׁוּת** for *dry land*, a word not found in Ezekiel, who expresses the same idea by **הַרְבָּבוֹת**, which occurs also in Haggai, but not in B, nor in any early prophet. The plural **אֲרָצוֹת**, *lands*, in the sense of countries, is for the most part a late word. Ezekiel uses it twenty-seven times, Jeremiah seven times. It is found in A, chap. xxxvi. 20; xxxvii. 11, 18; but it is noticeable that in the first two cases Rabshakeh the Assyrian speaks, in the third Hezekiah simply quotes his language. Now since B has frequent occasion for this idea of lands, or countries, is it not strange that he never expresses it by **אֲרָצוֹת**? The contrast between the two prophets is seen in the heavens as well as the earth. B uses **שָׁמַיִם** for *sky*; Ezekiel has no word for *sky*. From the radical idea *to beat fine, to expand*, the same word comes to mean the dust of the earth, as well as the expanse of the heavens. Hence **שָׁמַיִם** Isa. xl. 15. Ezekiel has a different word for dust (besides **עָפָר**, common to all), viz. **אֲבָקָה** xxvi. 10, spoken of the dust raised by horses in running.

¹ See *Two Isaiahs or One?* Bib. Sac., Vol. xxxviii. p. 246.

It will surprise no one to find שֶׁלֶג, *snow*, unnoticed by the writer in Chaldea. But B speaks as though describing a common phenomenon; "the snow cometh down from heaven." Both Isaiahs agree in this, also in the use of חוּל, *sand*, which is wanting in Ezekiel. קֶרֶק and קֶזֶק, *lightning*, are in Ezekiel, but not in A or B. אֶלְגֵּבִישׁ, *ice*, and קֶרֶחַ, *crystal*, are peculiar to Ezekiel. The former is interesting as prefixing the Arabic article אֶל to עִבְרִישׁ, which occurs only in Job. (I use the phrase "peculiar to Ezekiel," here and elsewhere, to avoid the longer, though more strictly correct expression, "found in Ezekiel and not in B." So "peculiar to B," means the reverse).

צוּר, *rock*, is naturally left out from Ezekiel's vocabulary, though very common in the Palestinian writers. A has it eight times, B four times. Ezekiel writes צוּר just once (A.V., harder than *flint*); the word occurs nowhere else. B has a different word for flint, חֲלָבִישׁ.

A very marked, and on the common theory a characteristic, difference between Ezekiel and B appears in their references to precious stones. B alludes to them in only one verse (liv. 12), where two are mentioned, אֶקְקֵדָה and מַרְבֵּר. The former is a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον of uncertain meaning; the latter, translated in the A. V. "agate," margin, "chrysoprase," means probably the *ruby*. The whole subject of the minerals of the Bible is involved in obscurity. The word in question occurs elsewhere only in Ezek. xxvii. 16. Here, of course, is a fact favoring a relationship between the two prophets, but before we give it too much weight, we should understand that this is one of forty-nine cases, in which a word is found once in B and only once elsewhere. Seven of these are in A, and this is the only one in Ezekiel, whose prophecy is about twice as long as A's. Coming back to the matter of local color, we find just what we should expect if Ezekiel, and not B, was familiar with the magnificence of Babylon. The former has another word for ruby (or perhaps garnet) namely אֶרֶם. He mentions also the *topaz*, using two different words, תִּשְׁבִּישׁ and טִשְׁבִּידָה; the *carbuncle*, נֶטָה; *red corals*, קֶרֶסֶת; *jasper*, רֶשֶׁתָּח; *onyx*, חֶזֶלֶם; *emerald*, מֶרְבָּח; *sapphire*, טִשְׁבִּיר; *diamond*, שֶׁטִּיר. All these are wanting in A as well as B. Of other minerals besides precious stones, B has none which are not also in Ezekiel, but the following are peculiar to the latter: שֶׁשֶׁר, *red ochre*, מֶרְנֹל עֶשֶׂחַ, *bright iron*, עֶסְרָה, *lead*, מֶרְיִל, *tin*, סִיג, *dross*, חֶלְבָּח, *rust*, מֶלַח, *salt*, גֶּפְרִיחַ, *brimstone*. Only two of these eight are in A, and none of them in B.

It may be well to observe at this point that the contrast we are drawing out between B and Ezekiel is not weakened by the fact that some of Ezekiel's peculiar words are found in A. At first sight, it might seem as though a parallel between A and B had no more tendency to take the latter out of the age of the Exile than a parallel between A and Ezekiel has to draw the former into it. But a little reflection shows the fallacy of this. The dates of A and of Ezekiel are known; they are fixed points; the question is simply toward which of these points the evidence before us would assign B. Now it is a matter of simple observation that the vocabulary of A is much more extensive than that of B; (1828 words to 1313). On the common view, this is accounted for by the theory that these last chapters were written in the prophet's old age, when he had withdrawn himself from the bustle of life, and would naturally use fewer words. I grant that the presence in Ezekiel of a large number of B's words not found in A would count against this theory; but we do not find this to be the fact. On the other hand, if Ezekiel coincides with A in a large number of words which are wanting in B, it counts nothing on either side. I shall show by and by that B is far more nearly related to A than to Ezekiel, in respect to the *number* of coincident words; at present we return to the examination of their *character*, with no presumption against our results arising from the parallels between A and Ezekiel.

We may group with inanimate objects, for purposes of classification, a few general terms denoting time, quantity, color, etc. Thus the word for *noon*, צִדְרִי, appears in all the seven classes except the one to which Ezekiel belongs. A has it once, B twice. There is no other word to express this idea.

Night is translated by three words, neither of them in Ezekiel; but the most common, לַיְלָה, is found in both parts of Isaiah. Of the seventeen Hebrew words for *darkness*, eight occur in B, six of which are also in A. Ezekiel has only three, חֹשֶׁךְ, חֹשְׁךָ, and חֹשְׁכָה; the first and last of these are in B. A has three not found in B, אֶפְסָל, אֶפְסָה, and אֶפְסָה. The six common to A and B are אֶפְסָלָה, חֹשֶׁךְ, חֹשְׁךָ, חֹשְׁכָה, חֹשְׁכָה, and חֹשְׁכָה. The other word in B is חֹשְׁכָה. We gain a little light out of this "darkness" as regards the integrity of Isaiah; for we observe that the general conception appears under nine different forms in A, and eight in B; of which eight, only two occur in Ezekiel, and all but two in A. Or, confining the comparison to B and Ezekiel, the former has six peculiar words, the latter, one.

מָחָר, *to-morrow*, is in A and B, but not in Ezekiel. חֹדֶשׁ, *month*, is common to A, B, and Ezekiel, while יָרַח is peculiar to B. כָּשָׁל, *double*, is in B and not Ezekiel. רָבַב and רָבָה, *to multiply*, are in A and B; only the latter in Ezekiel, who also expresses the same idea by the peculiar terms צָרַר and שָׁרַץ. קָרָם, *the East*, is in A, B, and Ezekiel; but קָרִים is peculiar to Ezekiel, and סוּדָח to B. קְדֻמּוֹן, *Eastern*, is in Ezekiel only; קְדֻמוֹנִי is also in B. הַדְּרוֹם, *the South*, is thirteen times in Ezekiel, but not in A or B. קוֹמָקָה, *height*, קָפָה, *deep*, תְּכָלֵחַ, *violet*, אֲרָגָזָן, *purple*, מְכֻלֵּל, *perfection*, מִצָּט, and קָטָן, *little*, are examples of words found in Ezekiel, but not in B. קָטָן (*little*), occurs in A and B, but not in Ezekiel.

Ascending a step from the plane of inanimate creation, let us compare the allusions of Ezekiel and of B to the vegetable kingdom. A striking difference is immediately manifest. Ezekiel has very little to do with agricultural life, but this is the native element of Isaiah B. The latter lives among the farmers; the former among the merchants. The words for wheat, barley, and spelt, as already stated, are found in Ezekiel only in the plural, referring to the product, not the growing grain. B makes frequent mention of *chaff* or *straw*, קֶשֶׁת, מִץ, תְּבֵן, describing like an eye-witness its separation from the grain and subsequent dissipation or destruction. (See especially Isa. xli. 2, 15; xlvii. 14). None of these words, nor any similar one, is to be found in Ezekiel. So the verb הִישׁ, *to thresh*, is peculiar to A and B. On the other hand, טוֹל, *beans*, צְרָשִׁים, *lentiles*, הִתָּן, *millet*, only as used for food, and צְרִיטָה, *goats*, סֶלֶחַ, *fine flour*, only as used in oblations, are in Ezekiel, but not in B. Among trees, only one is peculiar to Ezekiel, the *plane-tree*, עֲרִמוֹן (Ezek. xxxi. 8), a word mentioned elsewhere only as "pilled" by Jacob in this same Mesopotamia (Gen. xxx. 37). The common word *rod*, מַטֵּה, is found in Ezekiel and wanting in B; but as it chiefly imports a means of chastisement, it hardly comes under our present head. The only other vegetable peculiar to Ezekiel is the *vine*, גֶּפֶן, with its product, the *sour-grape* בֹּקֵר.

A few other vegetable *products* in Ezekiel remain to be mentioned, which confirm the distinction we are tracing; viz. *ebony* תְּבֵנִי, *balsam* צְרִי, *cassia* קָדָח, and *spice* בִּשְׁט; also a few general terms, *pasture* מְרִעֵה, *foliage* צְמִיחָה, *garden-bed* עֲרִיגָה, and *branch*, for which Ezekiel has seven peculiar words: סִרְעָפָה, סִרְעָפָה, וְסוּרָה, הֶלִית, בֵּר, טֹאֲרָה, עֲקָה.

The above words, and all synonyms for them, are absent from

Isaiah B, except in the case of the last word, *branch*, of which I shall speak presently. If I am not in error, Ezekiel has no peculiar words (or rather, ideas) belonging to the vegetable kingdom, save those I have mentioned. Let the reader remember that his prophecy is nearly three times as long as B's ($83\frac{1}{2}$ pages to $31\frac{1}{2}$), and he will be struck with the contrast, not only in the number of words, but especially in their character. For when we turn to Isaiah B, we find ourselves among the *herbs* וְרִיבְרִים , the *grass* הַשָּׂמָר , הַצִּיר (both these in A also, not in Ezekiel), the *thorns* נֶצְצִיץ , and *briers* סְרָסֵר , of Palestine. This word נֶצְצִיץ may serve to show how the subject before us invites and repays careful study. I find no less than twenty-two Hebrew words for thorn, some of frequent occurrence, others rare. נֶצְצִיץ occurs only twice, Isa. vii. 19 and lv. 13; i.e. once in A and once in B. But סְלִין or סְלוֹן , as it is variously pointed, is found only in Ezek. ii. 6 and xxviii. 24. How almost inevitable the inference that Ezekiel knew the Babylonian thorn, Isaiah the Palestinian, and hence that A = B. A superficial observer might reply by instancing another word for thorn, שִׁטְרִי , which though almost peculiar to A, appears once in Ezekiel, and not in B. But this would show the folly of drawing philological inferences from the concordance alone. שִׁטְרִי in Isaiah has strictly and always the meaning *thorn*; in Ezekiel and the other later prophets the meaning *diamond*. Hence the above argument from נֶצְצִיץ and סְלִין is strengthened rather than weakened; and if any one will calculate the probability that these two words among the twenty-two would occur just as we find them, on the hypothesis that B lived in Babylon after Ezekiel, he will find that this probability diminishes to a vanishing point.

Returning to the botany of B, we observe next the *oak* הַדְּרִי , and הַרְרִי , for which Ezekiel has אֱלִין . אֱלִין is common to both. הַדְּרִי is perhaps specifically the *holm-oak*. B writes הַאֲשִׁיר , *cedar*, but in Ezekiel's day the word has become worn down (it would seem) to אֲשִׁיר . שִׁטְרִי , *acacia*, and הַדְּרִי , *myrtle*, are peculiar to B.

One of the most interesting words is *willow*, which Isaiah expresses by עֲרֵב , a word occurring once each in A and B, once each in Leviticus, Job, and Psalms, and nowhere else. Ezekiel's word for willow is צִנְצָנָה , whose derivation points to places *overflowed* by water. One would naturally suppose that this would correspond to the famous *Salix Babylonica*; and so Forskal takes it, cited by Houghton in Smith's Bible Dictionary, s. v. "W"

mon opinion, however, identifies the *Salix Babylonica* with the עָרְב, on account of the beautiful allusion in Ps. cxxxvii: "By the rivers of Babylon we hanged our harps upon the willows."

But if this Psalm, as many scholars believe, was written in Palestine after the exile, we should expect its Palestinian color to be betrayed by just such minute indications as the word עָרְב. If this conclusion is probable, it becomes highly improbable that a prophet in Babylonia at the close of the Exile would write עָרְב rather than צַעֲצָא. When we bear in mind also that the former word is used once each by A and B, and only three times elsewhere, we find the evidence for the integrity of Isaiah materially strengthened.

From trees the transition is easy to branches. Besides the seven words already mentioned which Ezekiel employs for branches, we find נָצַר in A and B, elsewhere only Dan. xi. 7. Isaiah A has a word for branch peculiar to himself, קָרְיָה, but in the sense *cleft* it occurs in both A and B, elsewhere only Judg. xv. 8, 11. תַּחֲסֵס, *twig*, is peculiar to B. Ezekiel uses זְחִירָה sometimes in this sense. יוֹנֵק, *sucker*, is peculiar to B; יִרְיָקוֹחַ to Ezekiel. Among general words, גַּן, *garden*, is found several times in A and B, but not at all in Ezekiel; the more usual word גֶּן is in B and Ezekiel, but not in A. שָׂדֵה, *field*, and אֲשֶׁמְזִים, *fertile fields*, are peculiar to B. Ezekiel has only שָׂדֵה which is common to all. נֵצֵחַ, *juice*, is found only in B. בּוֹיָל, *produce*, occurs twice; once each in B and Job. There seems no reason for assigning different meanings to these passages, as Gesenius does. Besides the two occurrences in question, the word is found once as a proper name, בּוֹיָל, the eighth Hebrew month. It comes from יָבַל, *to rain*, hence *the rainy month*, and, as a common noun, *produce*, the effect of rain. Ezekiel expresses the same idea by a peculiar word from the same root, יָבַיָל. Another word for this concept is קֵרֵב, peculiar to B, while תְּחִיבָה, from the same root is peculiar to Ezekiel. Still another, which A and B both use for vegetable, as well as other produce, is צַעֲצָאִים, which is wanting in Ezekiel. On the other hand, תְּחִיבָהוֹ, with the same signification, is in A and Ezekiel, but not in B.

We have next to compare Ezekiel and B with respect to their *fauna*. We shall have fewer specimens to examine than we found in the vegetable kingdom.

Of domestic animals, the following are peculiar to Ezekiel. *Cattle*, מִקְחָה (notice that the idea of *property* is prominent in this word, as contrasted with the common בִּקְרָה or רְחִימָה) *fattian*, מְרִיאַת, *lamb*, קֶבֶשׁ, *calf*, עֶגְלָה, *he-goat*, עֲחִירָה.

Of wild animals, he alludes to the *lion* אָרִי, *young lion* בַּעִיר, *lioness* לְבִיָּא, and *whelp* וּבִיר. None of these are in B, who (with Ezekiel) has אָרִיָּה, the *fox* or *jackal*, and צַדְקִיב, *scorpion*, are the only other animals peculiar to Ezekiel.

Turning to B, we find three words for *camel*, of which נָמֵל, the common word, is also in Ezekiel, while בֶּכֶר, *young camel*, and בִּרְדָּוִי, *swift camels* or *dromedaries*, occur only in B. טָלֵחַ, *lamb*, and רְחֹל, *ewe*, are peculiar to B; שָׂדָּה, *sheep*, is in Ezekiel also. The only word for *swine*, חֲזִיר, is peculiar to B. The only word for *bear*, דָּב, is in A and B, not in Ezekiel. The same is true of פֶּה יַעֲנֹךָ, *ostrich*. חֲזָא, *antelope*, is in B; נָחָשׁ, *serpent*, is in A and B; so also אֲסַפְסֵף, *viper* (upon which see a further remark below); חוּלְעִי, *worm*, is once in A and twice in B; חֲנָב, *grasshopper*, is once in B. None of the five last words are in Ezekiel, and among ten words meaning *grasshopper*, not one is in Ezekiel. צַבְבֵּיִשׁ, *spider*, is one of B's peculiar words on which I shall remark further, under another head. B has two peculiar words for *moth*, טָס and קָשׁ, and one for *gnat*, יָב (according to the interpretation of Isa. li. 6 which I prefer on the whole). This finishes the list of animals, unless we include בִּיצָה, *egg*, which is once in A and twice in B, but not in Ezekiel. The Hebrew has no other word for egg.

I have no doubt that the reader who has followed without prejudice this analysis of the terms used by Ezekiel and by B to express objects in the inanimate, the vegetable, and the animal world is persuaded that the environments of these two prophets were very different, and that the latter has close affinities with the great prophet A. When we rise from the lower animals to the field of human activity we find an *embarras de richesse*. The human body with its parts and organs; food and raiment; occupations and conditions of life; artificial objects of all kinds; commercial, military, and religious terms; are among the subjects which present themselves for examination. Space permits little more than a mere list of the contrasts here, though the occasions for comment are tempting. Let it be understood that all words mentioned as found in Ezekiel are wanting in B, and *vice versa*.¹ Taking up the first of the above categories, we find that Ezekiel has a special word for *body*, גִּבְיָהוּ. He expresses *back* by גֵּב, while A and B have גֵּי. B has רֶצֶן, *arm*, which in later Hebrew means *bosom*. שֵׁר is B's word for *breast*; שֵׁר Ezekiel's. B has שׁוֹן, *leg*; Ezekiel יָרֵךְ, *thigh*. עֵרֶךְ, *neck*, is in

¹ Words common to both are omitted, unless the contrary is stated.

B; while Ezekiel has *נִירֹן* and *צִיאַר*. *אָפֶס* means *the sole of the foot* in Ezekiel; while in B it occurs as a noun only in the phrase *אֶסְפֵי אֶרֶץ*, *the ends of the earth*. Similarly, *אֶצְבָּלִים* is *joints* (of the hands), i.e. knuckles in Ezekiel; the same word with a slight change in the pointing *אֶצְבָּלִים* is found in B with the sense *sides* (of the earth). *שֵׁר*, *navel*, *רֵד*, *teat*, *שֵׁן*, *tooth*, *מָסַס*, *moustache*, *זָקַן*, *beard*, are in Ezekiel; *אֶנְרָה*, *fist*, is in B, *תְּחָגִים*, *the two fists*, in Ezekiel. *אֶצְבַּב*, *finger*, is twice in A, and twice in B.

We come next to words for food and clothing, of which there is not a great variety to present. Besides the general words, *צָבַם*, *to fast*, *צוֹם*, *a fast*, *רָעַב*, *to hunger*, *צָצַא*, *to thirst*, *צָצַא*, *thirsty*, in B; and *קָצַן*, *to thirst*, in Ezekiel; we have in B *רָצַק*, *to suck*, *צָלָה*, *to roast*, *צָלִי*, *roast*, *תְּרַק*, *soup*, *תִּירוֹשׁ*, *new wine*, *מִצְטָקָה*, *mixed wine*, *שֵׁר־בַּיְיָ*, *strong drink*, and *צָסִים*, *new wine*; in Ezekiel, *עָיַג*, *to bake*, *בָּטַל*, *to boil*, *רִקַּח*, *to spice*, and *עָנַח*, *a cake*.

As to raiment, we find *רִצַּם* and *עָטָה*, *to clothe*, and *קָסוּיָו*, *a covering* in B, for which last Ezekiel has *גָּלִים*, *מְכַסֶּת*, and *מְטָעָה*, while *לְבִישׁוֹ*, *מַעֲבָדָה*, and *תְּלַבְשָׁה*, *a garment*, are peculiar to B. The latter has *עָרוֹם*, *naked*, to contrast with the *צִירָה* of Ezekiel, and his *צָרִיחַ*, *nakedness*. *צִמָּה*, *a veil*, *שֵׁבֶל*, *a train*, and *צְנִיָּה*, *a turban*, are in B; the last once each in A and B. Ezekiel's words for turban are *מְצַנְנֶפֶת* and *מְבִיבֵל*. He has a number of other words more or less closely associated with clothing; *תָּשַׁר*, *to sew together*, *תְּחַל*, *to swaddle*, *תָּלַא*, *to patch*, *תְּכַחוּחַ*, *pillows*, *תְּכַסְתוּחַ*, *cushions*, *רִבְמָה*, *embroidery*, *תְּאִוֵּגֶל*, *yarn*, *תְּשִׁי*, *silk*, *אֲוִיר*, *girdle*, *תְּהַסִּים*, *drawers*, *תְּהַלְלִים*, *splendid garments*. The reader will perceive a tendency to simplicity in B, and to variety in Ezekiel, confirming our theory of their respective points of view. The contrast comes out more clearly as we pass to the remaining categories.

Of occupations and conditions of life B mentions *זְקֵנָה*, *old age*, *עַלְמוּסִים*, *youth*, *נִצֵּר*, *boy*, *בֵּן*, *son*, *תָּחַן*, *son-in-law*, *צִאֲצָאִים*, *offspring*, (*עַזְבָּרָה* Ezekiel), *אִישׁ* (*עַזְבָּרָה* Ezekiel), *לָשָׁן* and *לָאָם*, *people* (Ezekiel), *אֶמְצָל*, *suckling*, *אֶמְצָל*, *husbandman*, *תְּסַגֵּר*, *smith*, *תְּרַשׁ*, *workman* (Ezekiel once as an adj. meaning *skilful*), *אֶסִּירִי*, *prisoner* (A¹ B² only), *תְּרַחַץ*, *to grind* (A¹ B¹), *שָׂכַר*, *to hire*, *עָרַג*, *to weave*, *סָרִיס*, *eunuch*, *נִבְרָחָה*, *mistress*, *תְּרִיחָה*, *princess*, *עִוֵּי*, *blind*, *אֶלֶם*, *dumb*, *תְּרִישׁ*, *deaf*, *תְּרִיחָה*, *reeling*. Most of these words are in A also. Ezekiel not only has none of them, but has no words for these ideas, except as mentioned above. On the contrary he has the following which are wanting in B; *טַף*, *little children*, *תְּרַב*, *mixed multitude* (A and B use this word

for *willow*, see above), יחום, *orphan*, סבאים, *drunkards*, שטים, *rowers*, חבל and חבלה, *sailor*, גלח, *barber*, שרש, *horseman*, שררה, *governor*, נשיא, *prince*, עמ-העמ, *common people*. This last is a kind of foreshadowing of the Rabbinical *Am-arits*. The above word for governor is of frequent use in the later Hebrew, coming probably from the old Parsee *pakha*, a provincial prefect, the modern *pasha*. It occurs once in A, but only in the speech of Rabshakeh the Assyrian. The similar word סגני, occurring once in B and three times in Ezekiel, has been often pointed out as establishing a Babylonian origin for Isa. xl.-lxvi. But the analogy of שררה shows us how to account for this word on the theory that B=A. In fact Schrader seems to have proved that סגני is Assyrian rather than Babylonian.

The next point in order is *artificial objects*, bringing out a new and very effective contrast between B and Ezekiel. The best comment on this is an attentive study of the catalogue itself. The following are peculiar to B: מצצר, *axe* (Ezek. חרב once, of a military axe; B uses מצצר of a carpenter's tool; see more below), מסצצת, *chisel*, שרר, *graver*, מחונח, *compasses*, מסמר, *nails*, הבק, *soldering*, מיה, *paint*, הלי, *bucket*, זקים, *chains* (Ezek. צבתים), מטקח, *hammer*, מורג, *threshing-sledge*, רחום, *hand-mill*, אששח, *quiver*, מסמר, *net* (Ezek. רשח, מצורת, and חרם, which last A and B use in the sense of *curse*), טויה, *wine-press* (see more below), צב, *litter*, זבל, *dwelling* (Ezek. מושב), ארצה, *window* (A¹, B¹; Ezek. חלון twelve times), חס, *curtain*, חום, *stool*, מטתח, *wick* (cf. Ezek. מטתח, *linen cloth*), קבצה, *goblet*.

Over against these simple implements of the carpenter, the farmer, and the household — a list which excludes only a few words like חשח, *bow*, common to both Ezekiel and B, we meet with a bewildering variety in the Babylonian prophet; viz. צמיר, *bracelet*, חר, *mast* (A¹ in the sense of *signal-pole*), משום and משום, *oar*, נס, *flag*, בניר, *harp*, סיג, *cage*, חחש, *badgers' skins*, חחש, *carpets*, מנגל, *parchment-roll*, חחח, *inkstand*, סיר, *pot* (A, as above, in the sense of *thorn*), חחח, *staff*, חחח, *pan*, חחח, *whitewash*, חחח, *smooth brass*, חחח, *ivory*, חחח, *ring*, חחח, *hooks*, חחח, *wheel*, חחח, *rim* of a wheel, חחח, *pavement*, חחח, *area*, חחח, *ascent* (artificial; A¹ natural, i.e. a *cliff*), חחח, *walk* (a place for walking; elsewhere it means *journey*), חחח, *roof*, חחח, *porch*, חחח, *post* (A, B al. in the sense of *ram*), חחח and חחח, *arch*, חחח, *stairs* (A of degrees on sundial), חחח, *chamber*, חחח and חחח, *threshold* (A and B have the latter in

the sense of *cloud*, which is not in Ezekiel), עַמּוּד, *pillar*, אַחֲזִיק, *gallery* (five times in Ezekiel, nowhere else), סַדְדוֹ, *door*, זָנָח, *corner*, צִנְרוֹ, *ledge* (six times in Ezekiel, nowhere else in this sense), שְׂדֵחָה, *board*. Ezekiel has several words for *wall*, viz. גְּבִיץ (seven times, all in Ezekiel), סֹדֵר, חוֹמָה, גִּבְרָה, חֹרֶץ, חוֹמָה, גִּבְרָה, סֹדֵר. Of these B has only the common words חוֹמָה (A⁸ B⁵ Ezek.¹⁰), and קִיר (A⁸ B¹ Ezek.²⁶).

A more striking contrast than any of the previous ones meets us as we enter the commercial department. Our drag-net brings in from the prophecies of B only a few words in this category; לָבַי, *to buy grain*, סָחָר, *profit* (cf. Ezekiel's סְחָרָה, *merchants*, lit. merchandise, below¹), מְדוּרָה, *price*, בֵּיס, *purse*, סָלָם and טָנָח, *balance* (מֵאֲזוּנִים common to both).

Ezekiel has מִשְׁקָל, *weight*, מְשׂוּרָה, *measure*, and מִדָּה (מִדָּה B¹ in sense *stature*), קָנָה, *buyer*, מֹכֵר, *seller*, רֶבֶלֶת, *merchandise* (four times, all in Ezekiel), סַחָרָה and רֶבֶל, *merchant*, רֶבֶל, *to traffic*, סֹדֵר, *to exchange* (B has רָמַי, but not as a commercial term; see below), קָנָן, *goods*, תְּבוּאָה, *increase*, נִשְׂתָּה, *interest*, חוֹב, *debt*, חֶבֶל and תְּבִילָה, *pledge*, עֲנָבוֹן, *a fair* (Ezekiel also uses this word in the sense of *gains, profits*), חֶסֶן, *treasure* (B has מִטְטוֹן, *hid treasure*), שָׂרָה, *caravan*, שֶׁקֶל, *shekel*, אֵיפָה, *ephah*, בַּח, *bath*, חִין, *hin*, חֹמֶר, *homer*, גֵּרָה, *gerah*, עֹר, *cor*, טָנָח, *pound*, אַמְצָה, *cubit*.

Of military matters B has nothing to say, though how could this have been had he lived at the time and place supposed by the modern critics? Aside from the two comparisons of righteousness to a *coat of mail*, שָׂרָה, and to a *helmet*, עֵבֶב (the latter is Ezekiel too), also of strong arguments to *bulwarks*, צְבָחוֹת, the whole "field" is left for Ezekiel.

An observer so keenly alive to his environment as our previous lists have shown that B was, would hardly, if stationed at Babylon, have overlooked the military terms which Ezekiel has preserved to us; viz. מְצוֹר, *siege*, הֵרֵס, *tower*, סִלְלָה, *rampart*, עֵר and קֶבֶל, *battering-ram*, מְצוֹרָה and מְצוֹרָה, *fortress*, סוֹחָנָה, *host*, מְצוֹרָה, *fierce warriors*, שְׂרָיִשׁ, *chariot-warrior* (B¹ in the sense *tierce*), חֶזֶן, *weapons*, חֶרֶב, *sword* (this very common word is in B, but only five times, while Ezekiel has it eighty-five times), צָנָה, *shield*, טָנָן, *small shield*, קִיבֵב, *helmet* (for עֵיבֵב see above), רֵמֶח, *lance*, מַטְקֵל, *javelin*, תַּעֲרָה, *sheath*, תְּקוּיָה and שוֹפָר, *trumpet*. This last word is once in B, and four times in Ezekiel.

¹ See also עֲנָבוֹן in Ezekiel's list.

One more class remains among the words expressing human relations, viz. religious terms. I reserve the names of God to be considered afterwards. We find in B the following: כָּרַס, סָנַר, and שָׁחָה, to bow down, קָטַר, to burn incense (Ezekiel in the sense to close), סָלַח, to pardon, אָמַן, חָסַח, and קָנַח, to trust (these are Isaian words, found in both parts), תַּחֲנִיחַ, prayer, תְּהַלֵּל, praise, תּוֹדָה, thanksgiving, מְלִיץ, intercessor, מָשַׁח, to anoint (Ezekiel has סִיחָה, not a religious term, see Gesenius, s. v.), מְשֻׁחָה, anointed (Ezekiel נְסִיחָה, but only of the "princes of the north"), נָאֵל, to redeem, בִּפְאֵר, and שְׂדֵייתָ, ransom, שְׂדֵיירִים, the ransomed (A¹ B¹), לְמַדִּיר, disciple, שׁוֹבֵב, apostate, סָרָה, apostasy, מִצְוָה, commandment, אָרַר, אָרַר, and חָרַר, to be glorious, חֲבָה, enchantment, קְשָׁפִים, sorceries, אָיִן, עֲצָב, צִיר, idol.

Ezekiel has a word corresponding to these last which merits more than a passing mention. It is גָּלִיל, literally something rolled up, applied to an idol as a mere block. It occurs forty times in Ezekiel, and only nine times elsewhere, never in A or B. But how admirably it suits B's ground-tone of sarcastic contempt for idolatry, and how morally impossible it is that he should have avoided it, had it become familiar to him through the prophecies of Ezekiel. There are several other religious terms in Ezekiel (not in B except as specified), viz. נְבִיא, prophet, כְּרִיב, cherub (see Stanley, as quoted on page 526), רִיחַ נִירוֹחַ, sweet savor, חַמְצִימִים, sun-images, מְקַסֵּם, divination, חָל, profane, תְּרוּמָה, oblation, מִקְדָּשׁ, sanctuary, כֹּהֵן, priest. The last three words, being very common, occur in B, but the contrast as to their frequency in the respective prophets is very noticeable. תְּרוּמָה, Ezekiel²⁰ B¹ A wanting. (It should be noticed that Ezekiel has also the peculiar form תְּרוּמִיתָ). מִקְדָּשׁ, Ezekiel⁸⁰ A² B². כֹּהֵן, Ezekiel²⁴ A⁴ B². The frequency of these words in Ezekiel is accounted for by their recurrence in his vision of the temple, chaps. xl.-xlviii. We are told now-a-days that this was the plan of a ritual which he sketched for the use of the returning exiles. How then can we explain the fact that B passes it over in all but complete silence? He prophesied of the return of the exiles, and Ezekiel's ritual was thenceforth to be the only method of acceptable worship; but B scarcely alludes to oblation, priest, or sanctuary. If he preceded Ezekiel, all is clear; if not, the puzzles multiply.

The higher criticism has always laid great stress upon the different names for God, as marking different writers or periods. A, B, and Ezekiel make frequent use of the name "Jehovah"; but Eze-

kiel in just half the number of occurrences has the form אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה (A. V. Lord God). This is a very favorite expression with him, occurring two hundred and seventeen times, while in all other parts of the Bible it is found only eighty-eight times. A has it twelve times, B thirteen times. Now if B immediately followed Ezekiel in the prophetic line, it is a very strange circumstance that he should use יְהוִה alone so frequently, and אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה so rarely, in both cases agreeing closely with A, and differing from Ezekiel. For while the latter has יְהוִה alone two hundred and eighteen times, still, in proportion to the length of his prophecy, the name occurs only half as often as in either A or B.

When we examine the other names for God, we find in both parts of Isaiah as contrasted with Ezekiel, a much greater variety, and a higher spiritual tone. "Elohim" occurs but sparingly in all these.¹ Ezekiel never uses it in the construct state, except in the phrase "God of Israel" (seven times); nor with pronominal suffixes, except "your" and "their." But it is characteristic of both parts of Isaiah to speak of God in terms of personal appropriation. A has the following expressions with Elohim: God of Israel, God of Jacob, God of thy salvation, God of judgment, God of David, my God, thy God, his God, our God, your God, their God. B has God of Israel, God of eternity, God of the whole earth, God of Amen, my God, thy God, his God, our God, your God, their God. To regard these coincidences as merely accidental argues a scepticism which borders hard upon credulity; especially as there are many other such facts in this same class. אֲדֹנָי, *Lord*, is in both A and B, but not in Ezekiel. אֲדֹנָי is never used without יְהוִה following, in Ezekiel, but occurs alone in both A and B. אֱלֹהֵי, *Almighty*, is twice in Ezekiel, but not in B, though once in A. The only other word for God used by Ezekiel is the primitive אֱלֹהִים which occurs four times, against twenty-two in the shorter book of Isaiah (A⁷, B¹⁴).²

It is very remarkable that the phrase יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת which recurs so often throughout the prophets should be wanting in Ezekiel. Although the question is still debated as to the original force of the word "hosts" in this connection — whether referring to the stars, the angels, or some other idea — still it is evident that in common use the phrase is often descriptive of God as commanding the *armies* of Israel, leading forth their hosts to victory. "Jehovah Sabaoth"

¹ The singular אֱלֹהִים is once in B, not in A or Ezekiel.

² For the epithet in Ezek. xxxix. 7, see below.

occurs most frequently by far in the prophets. It is a favorite expression with Isaiah and Jeremiah, but we meet it also in Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Yet throughout the eighty-three pages of Ezekiel it never occurs. Is not the reason for this clear, that Israel in exile, her armies defeated and brought under the yoke, did not find it natural to call upon God by this victorious name יהוה צבאות? The conjecture becomes almost a certainty when we compare Ps. xlv. 10. "But thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; וְלֹא-תֵצֵא בְּצַבֹּאוֹתֵינוּ, and thou goest not forth in our hosts." No wonder, then, that Ezekiel, and Daniel employ other names for the God of their fathers, but refrain from the glorious "Jehovah Sabaoth."¹ To return to Isaiah; this name occurs oftenest, as is natural, in the first part, among the prophecies against God's enemies; but it is by no means absent from the second part; see xlv. 6; xlv. 13; xlvii. 4; xlviii. 2; li. 15; liv. 5. A consideration of no mean force is therefore added to the many which have been accumulating, to difference our author from the writers of the Exile.

It has been strangely urged, as an argument for the late date of Isaiah B, that no mention is made of the Messiah as a King; the conception of a suffering victim being supposed to be more consonant to the circumstances of the Captivity. The best answer to this is undoubtedly the fulfilment of both ideals in the person of the Christ. But the thought of *God* as King lay at the foundation of the Jewish body politic, and recurs in narrative, psalm, and prophecy. We trace it through the prophets Hosea, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, to the Captivity, when it suddenly breaks off. With the overthrow of the temple, and the destruction of the regal forms of the theocracy, the instinct of worship makes a natural selection among other titles of God, and we hear no more of מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה or מֶלֶךְ יְהוֹשִׁיָּהּ till Zechariah and Malachi renew the ascription in the second temple (Zech. xiv. 17; Mal. i. 14). Isaiah A had given the precious assurance (xxxiii. 22), "Jehovah is our lawgiver, Jehovah is our King"; Isaiah B designates the Lord as "King of Jacob" (xli. 21), "King of Israel" (xlv. 6), and "your King" (xliii. 15).

Evidence which many will regard as yet stronger comes from the

¹ Whenever the book of Daniel was written, it at least purports to emanate from the time of the captivity. The argument above is much strengthened by the incessant repetition of "Jehovah Sabaoth" in the brief prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, after the return from captivity.

divine title **קדוש יִשְׂרָאֵל**, the Holy One of Israel. This phrase, being almost peculiar to Isaiah, has been rightly urged, ever since the beginning of this controversy, as of great weight in favor of the unity of the book. It occurs fourteen times each in A and B.¹ It so happens that none of these references belong to disputed parts of A's prophecies. Outside of Isaiah, the phrase is found only six times; viz. 2 Kings xix. 22, where *Isaiah himself is the speaker*, (the passage being identical with Isa. xxxvii. 23); Jer. l. 29; li. 5, chapters which seem to be founded on Isaiah's predictions against Babylon; Ps. lxxi. 22; lxxviii. 41; lxxxix. 19. These psalms are usually regarded as later than the time of Isaiah, who may therefore have originated the phrase in question. The nearest approach to it in Ezekiel is in chap. xxxix. 7, "Jehovah, Holy in Israel," **קדוש בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**. Another parallel appears in the rare word for God, **אֲבִיר**; rendered "mighty one," "strong one." It is used only of God, while with the pointing **אֲבִיר** it is confined to men and animals. **אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל** occurs in Isa. i. 24 only; **אֲבִיר הַקֶּבֶב** in Isa. xlix. 26 and lx. 16, also in Gen. xlix. 24, Ps. cxxxii. 2, 5; **אֲבִיר** is found nowhere else. Thus the only prophets who use this name for God are A and B, and the evidence is constantly accumulating that A = B. One more link in the chain is the description of God as Maker, **יוֹצֵר**. We find this in xxvii. 11, **יוֹצֵר**, A.V. "he that formed them." Again, in xxix. 16, A.V. "him that framed it." The same form occurs twice in xlv. 9. A careful comparison of xxix. 16 with xlv. 9 in the Hebrew makes it highly probable that there is no quotation of one from the other, but that both have the same author, whose originality is seen in varying the expressions while the thought remains the same. **יוֹצֵר** recurs in xlv. 11, **יוֹצֵר** in xliii. 1; xlv. 2, 24, and **יוֹצֵר** in xlix. 5. The kindred word **בֹּרֵא**, Creator, is almost peculiar to Isaiah B. It appears in xl. 28; xlii. 5; xliii. 1, 15; xlv. 7, 7, 18; lvii. 19; lxxv. 17, 18, 18. Elsewhere only in the sublime passage Amos iv. 13, and in Eccl. xii. 1, where we are bidden to remember our Creator. **מוֹשִׁיעַ**, Saviour, as applied to God, is in xliii. 3, 11; xlv. 15, 21; xlix. 26; lx. 16; lxxiii. 8. Elsewhere in the prophets only in Hosea xiii. 4; Jer. xiv. 8. **גֹּאֲל**, Redeemer, is fourteen times in Isaiah B; nowhere else in the prophets except in

¹ In one of these passages (xxix. 23), "Jacob" is substituted for "Israel," as the phrase "God of Israel," follows in the same verse. **קדוש יִשְׂרָאֵל** without **יִשְׂרָאֵל** also occurs five times each in A and B; in four of the former instances, and three of the latter, it is an epithet of God.

the Isaian passage Jer. i. 34. One sacred name for God remains to be mentioned; the name the Christian child first learns, "Our Father," אֱלֹהֵינוּ, which first appears in Isaiah B (lxiii. 16, 16; lxiv. 7), and elsewhere only in 1 Chron. xxix. 10; which with the following verse seems to have suggested the beginning of the Lord's Prayer, and the doxology at its close. Jeremiah has "My Father" (chap. iii. 4, 19).

I have now substantiated my statement that both parts of Isaiah, as contrasted with Ezekiel, manifest in the several names for God, "a much greater variety and a higher spiritual tone." Another point of resemblance and contrast which should not be overlooked pertains to the grouping of these names. Both A and B join together several divine titles, while Ezekiel stops with "Jehovah" or "Adonai Jehovah," repeating these hundreds of times, as we have seen, with scarcely a variation in the epithets. This is characteristic of the later period of prophecy when the divine name Jehovah was used so specifically as almost to exclude the variety of epithets which prevailed in the earlier and freer times. As Ezekiel is all but constant in his interchange of "Jehovah" and "Adonai Jehovah," so is it with Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi in their use of "Jehovah" and "Jehovah Sabaoth." The only longer combinations are "Jehovah Sabaoth their God" (Hag. i. 14; Zech. xii. 5), "the King, Jehovah Sabaoth" (Zech. xiv. 17), and "Jehovah, God of Israel" (Mal. ii. 16). Going back towards the time of Isaiah we find only three such instances among the many repetitions of the divine name in Joel, Nahum, Obadiah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, viz. "Jehovah, my God, my Holy One" (Hab. i. 12), "Jehovah Sabaoth, God of Israel" (Zeph. ii. 9), and "the King of Israel, Jehovah" (Zeph. iii. 15). Even in Jeremiah, by far the longest of all the prophetic books (ninety-five pages, against eighty-three in Ezekiel, and seventy-five in Isaiah), there are very few variations. Whatever date we assign to B, all agree that A exerted a great influence over Jeremiah. The latter has borrowed a few of Isaiah's names of God, but uses them with far less spontaneousness than we shall find to be characteristic of A and B. The name "Jehovah" must occur in Jeremiah more than six hundred, perhaps seven hundred times. "Jehovah, God of Israel," which occurs five times in A, and "Jehovah Sabaoth, God of Israel," twice in A, are repeated with very great frequency in Jeremiah, especially in the latter half of the book. The only other combinations exceeding two words are

“Jehovah, God of all flesh” (xxxii. 27 only), “Jehovah, God of Sabaoth, God of Israel” (xxxviii. 17; xliv. 7), “Adonai Jehovah Sabaoth” (xlv. 10, 10; l. 31), “the living God, Jehovah Sabaoth, our God” (xxiii. 36), and “the great El, the Mighty, Jehovah Sabaoth” (xxxii. 18). Contrast with this the freedom in the use of these names which is manifest in the brief prophecy of Amos (nine pages), who ministered just before Isaiah. We find the following variations: “Jehovah, God of Sabaoth” (v. 14, 15; vi. 14), “Adonai Jehovah Sabaoth” (ix. 5), “Adonai Jehovah, God of Sabaoth” (iii. 13), “Jehovah, God of Sabaoth, Adonai” (v. 16), “(saith) Jehovah, God of Sabaoth his name” (v. 27), “Adonai Jehovah hath sworn by his soul, saith Jehovah, God of Sabaoth” (vi. 8), and especially the wonderful array of titles in iv. 13, “Former of the mountains, and Creator of the spirit, and Revealer to man what his thought is, who maketh the morning darkness, and walketh upon the high places of the earth, Jehovah, God of Sabaoth his name.”¹

I would not be understood to assert that *all* the older prophets employ such a diversity in the names of God; but as we find it in *none* of the later prophets, and as this fact corresponds with the natural development of the religious instinct, the probability becomes strong that B belongs with the earlier prophets. The very fact that A differs in this regard from his contemporary Micah creates a probability that, among the earlier prophets, B belongs with A; while the further fact that A and B agree in the most intricate blending of these divine names, without any such servile correspondence as to favor the theory of imitation, raises this probability to a very high degree. This last assertion I will now justify in detail.² Isaiah A has the phrase “the Lord (יהוה) Jehovah Sabaoth” four times, viz. iii. 1; x. 16, 33; xix. 4. “Adonai Jehovah Sabaoth” six times, x. 23, 24; xxii. 5, 12, 15; xxviii. 22. “The King Jehovah Sabaoth” once, vi. 5. “Jah Jehovah” twice, xii. 2; xxvi. 4. “Jah Jah” recurs in xxxviii. 11, but this peculiar name יה is nowhere else in the whole

¹ The occurrence of both forms “Jehovah Sabaoth,” and “God of Sabaoth,” in the early prophet Amos, and again in the late prophet Jeremiah, would seem to refute Mr. Cheyne’s theory that “Sabaoth” became a proper name, not to be translated. יהוה צבאות can only mean “God of hosts,” the first word being in the construct state. By parity of reasoning יהוה צבאות יהוה is “Jehovah of hosts.”

² The list which follows does not include the phrases already mentioned, containing only two words in the Hebrew, e.g. “The Lord of Hosts,” “The Lord thy God,” etc.

prophetic literature. The reader should bear in mind that the last two passages cited belong to the antilegomena, and hence help on our theory of the unity of Isaiah. "Jehovah, God of Israel," four times, xvii. 6; xxi. 17; xxiv. 15; xxxvii. 21 (the last remark applies to xxiv. 15 here). "Jehovah, God of David," once, xxxviii. 5. "Jehovah, the Mighty One of Israel" once, xxx. 29. "Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel" once, x. 20. "Jehovah Sabaoth, God of Israel" twice, xxi. 10; xxxvii. 16. "Jehovah, our God," followed by "Lord," as an implied epithet, once, xxvi. 13. "The Lord Jehovah Sabaoth, the Mighty One of Israel," once, i. 24. Most of the passages in Isaiah B occur once only. "God of Israel, the Saviour," xlv. 15. "Thy Lord Jehovah, and thy God," li. 22. "God of Israel, Jehovah Sabaoth," xlvi. 2. "El Jehovah, the Creator," xlii. 5. "God of Eternity, Jehovah the Creator," xl. 28. "Jehovah, thy Redeemer and thy Maker," xlv. 24. "Jehovah, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One," xlix. 7. "Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker," xlv. 11. "Jehovah, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel," xliii. 14. "Jehovah, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel," xli. 14; xlvi. 17. "Jehovah, our Father, our Redeemer," lxiii. 16. "Our Redeemer, Jehovah Sabaoth, the Holy One of Israel," xlvii. 4. "Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour," xliii. 3. "Jehovah, King of Israel and his Redeemer, Jehovah Sabaoth," xlv. 6. "Jehovah, your Holy One, Creator of Israel, your King," xliii. 15. "Jehovah, thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob," xlix. 26; lx. 16. "Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, God of the whole earth," liv. 5. It will be seen that Isaiah B has taken expressions peculiar to himself, "Creator," "Redeemer," "Saviour," etc., and combined these, in almost every variety of permutation, with the phrases already used by Isaiah A. The vividness, richness, and independence of these names are a strong testimony to the common authorship of the two sections.

The ministry of Isaiah covered a period probably exceeding fifty years. If we imagine him to have received, in his old age, a new revelation of God, as promising to deliver his people from the exile which both Isaiah and Micah had foretold; if we remember that each new name of God expressed a new conception of his character — we shall then see how naturally the aged prophet would blend יְהוָה, מְשִׁיחַ, etc., with his previous thoughts of God; and we shall be persuaded that this theory embraces far more readily than any other, all the facts of the case now before us.

Thus far, in this investigation, we have been comparing the language of Ezekiel, the only undisputed writer of the Exile, with that of the prophet B. We have noted a marked contrast between their incidental allusions, extending through every department of thought, from inorganic nature through the vegetable and animal world, and through the various branches of human activity, to the names and appellations of the Divine Being. I trust it is now made evident that Isaiah B does *not* belong to the time of the Exile. But the recent view which would dissect our author into ten or more different fragments has also been incidentally refuted, for the testimony has come from all parts of these disputed chapters. I doubt if half a dozen consecutive verses can be found which have not contributed their quota of evidence to the preceding pages. Mr. Cheyne holds that chaps. xl.-lii. 12 constitute the only positively Babylonian section. But it is just here that we find the very indications which point most positively away from Babylon; e.g. five out of the six occurrences of "Jehovah Sabaoth," and all the cases where the title "King" is ascribed to God.

Subjected to the microscope, and viewed in every possible light, these chapters bear consistent witness to their unity, whoever their author may have been. Our investigation has also thrown much light on this last point. A hundred minute rays have converged to a single focus; one place, one period, one author, alone satisfy the conditions of our problem. That place is Judea; the period, that of Hezekiah; the author, Isaiah himself. If those who are accustomed to lay stress upon the matter of local color are convinced that this conclusion is at least probable, the probability will become a practical certainty if they will candidly weigh certain philological indications of a more delicate nature. The writer published in this Quarterly, in April 1881, an Article ("Two Isaiahs or One?") in which the attempt was made to establish the unity of the book by tracing the coincidences in point of vocabulary between A and B, and the decided contrast between B and the later writers. Some of the facts which were grouped in general terms there, deserve to be examined singly and attentively.

I must first call attention to the patient and thorough work in this same department which has been accomplished by Nägelsbach, author of the Commentary on Isaiah in the Lange series. That Mr. Cheyne should speak so appreciatively of Nägelsbach's "invaluable list," and so depreciatively of Urwick's similar labors aroused

my curiosity at once; and upon examining the book, as I should have done sooner, I found at its close, a full table of words in Isaiah B, with references to all their occurrences in both parts of the prophecy; bearing a strong family likeness to my "Index" in two previous numbers of this Quarterly. I must concede the priority to Dr. Nägelsbach, who will see, however, that my work is as independent of his results, as his of mine. The two in fact supplement each other; for while he omitted to classify occurrences outside of Isaiah, I omitted to classify the words of most frequent use. The diligent student of the Isaian vocabulary will be glad to have both lists before him.

Let us now look at this matter of vocabulary as a whole and in detail. Exclusive of proper names, the entire number of words used by B is 1313.¹ In preparing my Index, I omitted three hundred and sixty-eight of these words, regarding them as so common at all periods of the language that they would prove nothing to my purpose. It was a matter of convenience to be spared the great labor of classifying words of such frequent occurrence; but no word was left out of the Index unless it occurred in all five of the classes into which I had distributed the books of the Hebrew Bible. Now it is an important fact that A and B agree so closely in their use of common words that among these three hundred and sixty-eight words, all but six occur in A. Those six are (of those common words) most seldom used; viz. *קָרָא*, *רָצָה*, *רָצוּן*, *רָצוּן*, *רָצוּן*, *רָצוּן*. If B belongs to the time of the Captivity, whatever might be true of his peculiar words, we should expect to find his common words nearly identical with those of Ezekiel. Even though we should allow that he had consciously or unconsciously borrowed many of Isaiah's *characteristic* expressions, yet we could not allow (for it would be a psychological impossibility) that in the vocabulary of daily life he could agree with Isaiah as closely as the above enumeration shows, unless he agreed as closely in this respect with the writers of his own period. Let the reader have the case clearly in mind. Here are two prophets, A and B, separated by an interval of from one hundred and fifty to two hundred years, and writing

¹ In Bib. Sac., Oct. 1881, p. 659, it was given as 1310; add the two words in the note p. 686, also *קָרָא*, which was inadvertently omitted from the table, p. 663, and the number becomes 1313, as above. Deduct *ו* and *ו*, which are not in the Vade Mecum, and the remainder 1311 tallies with the count independently obtained from that Concordance, as stated in the Bib. Sac., April 1881, p. 236.

amid surroundings as diverse as those of Jerusalem and Babylon. We take out from B's vocabulary three hundred and sixty-eight words, not those peculiar to himself, but the commonest words, used at all periods of the language, and opening the forty-four pages of A's prophecy we find all but six of these words there. If this fact seems surprising, we conclude, at first thought, that the Hebrew writers may be wonderfully uniform in their employment of common words. When therefore we turn to Ezekiel, who on this theory preceded B by so short an interval that their lives probably overlapped, and who lived in this same Babylon, we hardly expect to find six of these commonest words missing, especially as we have nearly twice as many pages in this case to draw from. But the fact is that twenty-five words are wanting, viz. אַרְוֹן, אָמֵן, בָּיִן, בְּיָר, חָסֵד, הָיָר, נְעֵר, נִים, סָדִיחַ, סַדִּיחַ, לִיל, לְחֵם, לִיָּן, מָחַ, רָשׁ, צְרַר, צֵיִר, צָבֵא, מֶן, עָם, נָעַר, נִים, סָדִיחַ, סַדִּיחַ, לִיל, לְחֵם, לִיָּן, מָחַ, רָשׁ, קַטָּן. אֶתְנַחֵם, רִעַע, רִיב, רִיץ, קָרָא, וּ, קֶטֶן.

It will be perceived that many of these are very common words; hence we must reject the notion that there is any special uniformity among Hebrew writers in the use of such words. The facts before us are just what we should expect if A and B are the same individual, and just what we should not expect on the Babylonian hypothesis.

An independent argument may be also drawn from the *less* common words which compose the Index referred to above. There are nine hundred and forty-five of these words, of which four hundred and eighty-six occur in Isaiah A. (On p. 132 of this volume, the number given is four hundred and eighty-five. The additional word is מְוֹר, which as printed on p. 672 of the previous volume, should have the sign of equality).

Of Ezekiel's words, only three hundred and seventy-three are found in the Index. To compare the two, we must not forget that Ezekiel contains eighty-three pages, A only forty-four. Hence A's vocabulary has fifty-one per cent of the words in the Index, while an equal number of pages in Ezekiel has only twenty-one per cent. Not only is this general result obtained, that A's language coincides with B's two and one-half times as often as Ezekiel's does, but when each division of the Index according to the letters of the alphabet is taken separately (as in the Summary, p. 132 of this volume, where the whole class *ε* was compared), the majority is always on the side of A, except in the case of the letter כ.

Facts like these must be interpreted in some way. They show

the carelessness of Mr. Cheyne's assertion that "the peculiarities of phraseology can obviously be explained by the profound influence which so great a prophet as Isaiah must have exercised, and demonstrably did exercise, on his successors." This attempted explanation is not so "obvious" as it would be if the coincidences in diction related only to certain favorite or striking words in Isaiah A. When we have proved that the *common* words of B are found with very few exceptions in A, while the exceptions in the case of the only undisputed writer of the Exile are four times as numerous; and also that a majority of all B's other words occur in A, but only a fifth of them throughout an equal space in Ezekiel, we have proved our point.

It is the beauty of a scientific proof that it admits of test and verification by different methods; I therefore proceed in the last place to call the reader's attention to some special words.

In the Bibliotheca Sacra for April 1881, pp. 241, 242, will be found a list of fifty words, which occur in B and just once elsewhere. Among these II. שׂוּר, *to go about*, was given, on the authority of the Vade Mecum, as occurring once in B and once in Ezekiel. The best lexicons, however, make it a noun in Ezekiel, meaning *caravans*, and bring its occurrence in B under I. שׂוּר (to go about, hence, to behold). This leaves forty-nine words in the list, seven of which are in A, and only one in Ezekiel. That is to say, one seventh of all the rarest words in B, leaving out ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, are also met with in A, and only one-seventh of that number in Ezekiel. The single parallel with Ezekiel is בְּרִבְוֵי, the name of an uncertain gem, probably the ruby. The seven in A are גִּילּוֹחַ, *joy*, חוּר, *a hole*, הֶבֶל, *a stream*, נֶצְצוֹץ, *a thorn*, עֲנָג, *delight*, שָׂרָב, *heat*, and תַּעֲזִבוֹתַי, *vexation*.

Little need be said of גִּילּוֹחַ and שָׂרָב, for they occur in chap. xxxv., which is generally allowed to have been written by B. But if there be any doubt in the matter, it ought to be dispelled by an examination of the above parallels with their context. The subject in each case is the same, while the language varies enough to rule out the hypothesis of borrowing. Compare xxxv. 2, 10 with lxxv. 18, 19; xxxv. 7, 8 with xlix. 10, 11. When we come to חוּר, *a hole*, we find a parallel of the greatest interest. The word is found in Isa. xlii. 22, where Israel is said to be snared in *holes*, בְּחוּרֵי; also in xi. 8, where it is defectively written; the sucking child shall play upon the *hole* of the asp, עַל-חוּר. The best commentators and lexicographers agree with the A. V. in regard to

same, including Nägelsbach, though he has accidentally omitted the word from his list above-mentioned.¹ The value of the parallel rests on the following circumstance. There are four words spelled exactly alike in Hebrew, except as distinguished into pairs by the punctuation. One pair (חֹזֵר and חֹזֵר) come from תָּהַר, *to become white*, and mean *white linen*. The other pair (חֹזֵר and חֹזֵר again), come from חָזַר, *to hollow out*, and mean *a hole*. These roots are entirely distinct. Isaiah A uses חֹזֵר for white linen, and חֹזֵר for a hole; the later writers (Ezekiel, Zechariah, Canticles) use on the contrary חֹזֵר for a hole, and (this last in Esther only) חֹזֵר for white linen. Isaiah B has occasion for only one of these words, but renders himself unintelligible (if he belongs with the later writers) by writing חֹזֵר, *a hole*, the word occurring once in A, once in B, and nowhere else.

רָקַל, *a stream*, and נִצְצוֹן, *a thorn*, have been spoken of in the early part of this Article. As to לֵצַב, *delight*, there are fifteen other words in Hebrew for expressing the same idea. We should have expected חֲמִידָה, חֲמִידָה, or חֲמִידָה, if a writer of the Captivity had wished to use a rare word for delight. Unless B = A, it is very singular that he should employ among this multitude of words, one found elsewhere only once, and that in A. It should be added, that at the time assigned to B (the close of the Exile), the ritual feeling was strong among the Jews. A prophet who had the following idea to express, "and call the Sabbath a delight," would hardly have used at that time a word so light, almost mirthful, as לֵצַב. Compare חֲמִידָה from the same root.

תְּצַלְלִים is a difficult word, meaning *vexations* in lxvi. 4, and *boys* in iii. 4. It occurs nowhere else. The root *to be petulant*, accounts for both senses; a fearful warning for boys! When we compare this word in iii. 4 with the corresponding תְּצַלְלִים in iii. 12, we see that the radical idea of *vexing* is retained in both; q.d. "vexations shall rule over them," "vexations oppress them, women rule over them;" i.e. their rulers are like teasing boys and petulant women. As the author of chap. lxvi. is not quoting from this passage, his use of this strange word is an indication of his identity with the author of chap. iii.

If Zephaniah quotes from B, the question of the unity of Isaiah is

¹ A careful comparison of this list with the one published in the Bib. Sac., brings out the great superiority of the Vade Mecum, in point of accuracy, over other Concordances. Cf. my Article in *The Independent*. May 25. 1882.

practically settled. But it is almost certain that this is the case; see remarks on **אַפְסֵי עוֹר** in Bib. Sac., April 1881, pp. 243, 244. Another instance in point is **גְּדִיחָה**, *reproach*, found only in Isa. xliii. 28; li. 7, and Zeph. ii. 8. In all three passages taken in their context, the thought is the same; also (in Isa. li. 7 and Zeph. ii. 8), the common word for reproach, **תָּרִישָׁה**, precedes the rare **גְּדִיחָה**. One of the two writers is evidently quoting from the other; and that this one is Zephaniah appears not only from his well-known habit of taking spoil from his predecessors, but also from the fact that in the time of the Captivity the word in question was written with a final **ה**, see Ezek. v. 15. A writer of that period who wished a rare word for reproach would have used **גְּדִיחָה** or **גְּדִיחָה**, which last forms a perfect contrast with **גְּדִיחָה**, being found twice in Nehemiah, and once in Ezekiel, while the latter is twice in B and once in Zephaniah. Another clear instance of quotation by Zephaniah from B, and the only other case, among these rarest words, in which the two agree, is **צֶהַר**, *to shout*, Isa. xlii. 13 and Zeph. i. 14. In this case several models seem to have been before Zephaniah, e.g. Joel ii. 1, 11; Isa. xxii. 5; but also B (l.c.), since Jehovah is introduced as **צֶהַר צִוְוִה**. Compare the word **מִשְׁעָר** in Zeph. i. 13 and Isa. xlii. 22, 24.

I take up next the parallel between Isa. xlv. 12 and Jer. x. 3, **מַעְצָד**, *an axe*, occurring in these two texts only. Here, as in the case of Zephaniah, the sole question is, which is the original? That one must have suggested the other is plain from the fact that the subject is the same, and also the three words **וַיִּבְרָא קִבּוֹר**, **תָּרִישָׁה**, and **מַעְצָד**. Now the passage in B has a coherence and majesty which stamp it as the product of original genius; while in Jeremiah the whole context (x. 3-16) is a compend of many thoughts from Isaiah and elsewhere. The parallel is obscured in the A. V., but much plainer in the original.

The same is true of the other passage from Jeremiah in this list, **הִשָּׂר**, *to change*, Isa. lxi. 6 and Jer. ii. 11 only. It is difficult at first to see any resemblance here, but there are three words common to both, **גּוֹי**, **קִבּוֹר**, and **הִשָּׂר**. Jeremiah cannot be the source of both, but Isaiah may be. He had said that faithful Israel should eat the riches of the "nations," and in their "glory" they should "change," i.e. come into their place (Gesenius). Jeremiah says that no "nation" had "changed" their gods, though they were no gods; but Israel (as if reversing Isaiah's prophecy) had changed (almost the same word) their "glory" to that which did not profit. The

reader should not fail to note that if Jeremiah makes reference to B, the latter could not have lived at the close of the Exile.

נָרַח, to *put away*, is found only in Isa. lxvi. 5 and Amos vi. 3. There are several cognate verbs with about the same meaning; נָרַח, נָרַח, נָרַח, נָרַח, which last is allied to הָרַח, and its numerous family. It is quite singular that נָרַח occurring only twice, as above, neither writer quoting from the other, should be found in Piel part. plural both times. It looks as though this expression was in use *at a certain period*, when both Isaiah and Amos lived. בָּרַח, to *burn*, occurs in Isa. xlv. 2 and Prov. vi. 28 only. (בָּרַח, with the same meaning, is in Ezekiel only). The connection between the passages in Proverbs and Isaiah seems too close to be purely accidental. In the latter: "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned." In the former: "Can one walk upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned?" Compare בָּרַח with אֶם-יִרְחַק; לֹא תִבְרַח with לֹא תִבְרַח. Apparently Proverbs is the original here; but the date of this book is so uncertain that it cannot help us much. More important is הִרְצִילָה, *reeling*, Isa. li. 17, 22 and Ps. lx. 5 only. B mentions the *cup* of reeling; the Psalmist the *wine* of reeling; both are speaking of the same thing, viz. God's judgments. The only other word for reeling is רָצַל, which also occurs twice; once in Zechariah (xii. 2), in this same sense of reeling from intoxication, and again in Isa. A (iii. 19) in the entirely different sense of *a veil*. Hence B agrees with an early writer (Ps. lx.), while A and B agree to disagree with a late writer (Zechariah). (רָצַל and *reel* have probably no etymological connection.)

A still stronger case is presented by מוֹרָח, a *wine-press*, Isa. lxiii. 3 and Hag. ii. 16, only. A wine-press consisted of an upper receptacle, in which grapes were trodden, and a lower one, in which the juice was received. מוֹרָח, as the connection shows, must mean the former in Isaiah, the latter in Haggai. In each case a parallel word is given; מָר in Isaiah, הֶקֶב in Haggai. These three are the only words in the Old Testament for wine-press or vat. Dr. Bevan in Smith's Bible Dictionary seems to be right, against Gesenius, in claiming that הֶקֶב refers to the whole arrangement, not simply to the lower part; but seems also to be somewhat confused with regard to the three words. A careful study of their occurrences shows that Gesenius's distinction between מָר as the upper vat, and הֶקֶב as the lower, is pretty closely adhered to in *later* Hebrew; but in earlier, this is sometimes reversed. Whenever the whole arrangement is

mentioned, the word is **רָקַב**. **רָקַב**, from its etymology, to *bruise*, must have first meant the upper press; but in Haggai it clearly means the lower, in Isaiah as clearly the upper. This indicates that B belongs with the earlier writers. A curious confirmation of the difference between earlier and later Hebrew as to these words is shown by **רָקַבִּים** in Jer. xlviii. 33 as compared with Isa. xvi. 10. The former verse is taken almost bodily from the latter, both being prophecies against Moab. But Isaiah had said: "the treaders shall tread out no wine in their presses" (**רָקַבִּים**). Jeremiah, being later, instinctively feels that this word is more appropriate to the *lower* vat, and so alters the expression to "I have caused wine to *fail* from the **רָקַבִּים**."

Leaving now the forty-nine rarest words to which reference has been made, a few remarks seem called for upon some of the words found *twice* outside of B. A list of these can be easily made out from Tables II. and III. of my Article in the Bib. Sac., for April 1881.

אֲשִׁיר, a *prisoner*, occurs only in Isa. x. 4; xxiv. 22; xlii. 7, — the first being a passage of undisputed genuineness, the other two disputed. The same word with a different pointing, **אֲשִׁיר**, is found fifteen times, and in all of the seven classes of writers. Several of these last passages give as a variant **אֲשִׁיר**, which also occurs without variation in Isa. xlix. 9; lxi. 1; Eccl. iv. 14; Ps. cxlvi. 7. In view of these facts, the occurrence of **אֲשִׁיר** solely in three passages of Isaiah is a singular phenomenon, unless they are *really* in Isaiah. The chains of this "prisoner" serve to bind together what man had put asunder. A corroborative fact is that the rare word **אֲשִׁיר** appears in two of these verses (xxiv. 22; xlii. 7) with the meaning *prison*, while in the time of the Captivity (Jeremiah and 2 Kings) it meant *smith*. These are not two different words; the root, "to shut up," accounts for both. As fashions sometimes change, we find the old meaning "prison" in still later Hebrew, Ps. cxlii. 8.

אֲבָר, a *wing*, Isa. xl. 31; Ps. lv. 7; Ezek. xvii. 3 only. In Isaiah — "they shall raise wing as the eagles." In Psalms — "who will give me wing as the dove? let me fly and let me rest." In Ezekiel — "the great eagle, great in the wings (**רַחְבֵּי**), long in the pinions (**רֵאשִׁי**, lit. the pinion), full of feathers (**רַחְבֵּי**, lit. the feather)." Here the superficial resemblance between B and Ezekiel must not mislead us. Each speaks of an eagle with an **אֲבָר**, it is true; but B and Psalms use **אֲבָר** in the same sense as **קָנָה**, from which Ezekiel expressly distinguishes it. The distinction would seem then to be later than Isaiah's time.

זָרַק, *forsaken, ceasing*. Isa. liii. 3; Ps. xxxix. 5; Ezek. iii. 27 only. There is an important difference here. In B and Psalms the word is passive, in Ezekiel active. B says, "he was despised and *forsaken* of men"; the Psalmist, "I shall know how *frail* I am"; Ezekiel, "he who *forbeareth* shall *forbear*." Here again B agrees with an early writer, and differs from a late one. (The distinction however seems doubtful; cf. Näglesbach's critical note.)

אָפֶפֶת, *a viper*, Isa. xxx. 6; lix. 5; Job xx. 16 only. There is no connection between the Isaian passages, which strengthens the evidence for unity drawn from incidental agreement. B has in this same passage another word for viper, זָקָנוֹן, found nowhere else fully written except in A. Note also זָרַק, *to press out*, Isa. i. 6; lix. 5; Job xxxix. 15; Judg. vi. 38 only. Hence B uses in this verse three of A's rare words, but without quoting from him.

בָּרִיחַ, *a fugitive*, Isa. xxvii. 1; xliii. 14; Job xxvi. 13 only. So the Vade Mecum; but Gesenius, while quoting בָּרִיחִי, Isa. xv. 5, under the word בָּרַח, *a bar*, prefers to derive it from the above word for fugitive. Davies's Lexicon makes a separate form, בָּרִיחַ, *a fugitive*; but this is not necessary, as Gesenius has shown. The word in Isa. xv. 5 is a perfect parallel to xliii. 14, being a substantive in the plural, while in the other two cases, it is an adjective in the singular. Ezekiel has a different word for fugitive, coming from the same root, טָקַח. Had B lived at Babylon in the time of the Exile, he would probably have used that word.

I add a list of miscellaneous words, which illustrates still further the difference between the vocabularies of B and Ezekiel. Those marked as found in B do not occur in Ezekiel, or at least, not with the meaning given; the converse is also true. It is not necessary to indicate the agreements between A and B, as these may be found in the Index previously published.

WORDS.	B HAS	EZEK. HAS	WORDS.	B HAS	EZEK. HAS
Abhorrence	הִרְאֹן	נָהוּ	Break forth, to	פָּצַח	זָרַח
Affliction	עָנִי	צָר		פָּחַץ	
	צָרַח			קָצַח	
Agitated, to be	גִּישׁ	רָעַם	Bring, to	אָצַח	קָרַב
	סָעַר			יָבַל	שָׁטַח
Angry, to be	רָעַם	חָרַר		קָעַג	
	קָצַח		Cast out, to	קָחַח	חָחַח
August	חֹנֶן	חֹרַח			חָחַח
Besides	בְּלִבְךָ	לְאִמְרוֹ			בְּלִבְךָ

WORDS.	B HAS	EZEK. HAS	WORDS.	B HAS	EZEK. HAS
Comely, to be	נָאָה	הִשָּׂה	Rebuke, to	נָעַר	נָכַח
Crush, to	הִכָּא	כָּרַס	Reproach, to	הִדָּה	נִדָּה
Defile, to	גָּאֵל	טָמֵא	Rich	עָשִׂיר	שָׂדֵעַ
Depart, to	מִישׁ	אָזַל	Set, to	הִסֵּד	נִיחַ
	סִיג			רָבַע	עָמַד
Despise, to	נִאָץ	קָלַל			שָׁמַת
		שָׁמַת	Shake, to	זָלַל	בָּחַל
Destruction	תְּהִי־סוּחַ	אִיר		מִישׁ	קָלַל
	מִתְהַחַח	הִמָּח		נָעַר	רָעַשׁ
	מִשְׁחָח	פָּלַח	Shame	בָּשָׂה	בִּישָׂחַ
		מִשְׁחָחַח	Shout of joy	רָנַח	רִיד
		מִשְׁחָחַח	Shut up, to	עָצַר	סָתַם
		סָץ		צָרַר	עָמַם
Empty,	רִיק	רִדַּף		קָפַץ	קָטַר
	רִיקָם	אָלִיל	Sigh	אָתַחַח	רִי
Form	תַּאֲרֵךְ	זִוְרַח	Slumber, to	נָוַם	רָשָׁן
		צִוְרַח	Spoil, to	שָׁסַח	בָּצַע
Fear, to	הִאָּג	שָׁסַר			גָּוַל
	נָהַר				שָׁרַד
Fear	סִגְוָחַח	הִאָּגַח	Stay, to	אָדַר	שָׁבַן
		פָּלַצַח	Stone, to	סָבַל	רָגַם
		קָפַרַח	Terror	עָזַלַח	בָּלַחַח
Gathering, a	קָבוּץ	קָבַצַח			הִלְחַלַח
Gird, to	אָזַר	תָּנַר			חִרְדַח
Grieve, to	יָבַח	נָאָב			חִמַּיַח
	עָצַב	נָאָח	Thrust down, to	הִדָּחַח	תָּרַח
Hide, to	חָבַא	סָבַח			נָבַח
		עָמַם			נָחַח
		צָפַן			תָּסַע
Hold up, to	תָּסַד	כִּוֵּל	Tread, to	הִדָּח	רָשַׁח
Love	אָהַבַח	עָנְבַיִם	Tumult	שָׁאוֹן	רָמַן
Multiply, to	רָבַב	צָחַר			רָמַלַח
		שָׁרַץ			מִחַמַּח
Pain	חָבַל	חִלְחַלַח			רָעַשׁ
	פָּאָב				תְּהִי־עָת
	מִכְאוֹב		Turned back, to be	סִיג	קָרַח
	מִעֲצָבַח		Vanish, to	מָלַח	מָעַט
Perish, to	פָּרַח	נָזַר	Vanity	תָּבַל	אָלִיל
	סִיף				

I would not be understood to rest the chief weight of the argument on this list; it simply adds one more to a series of independent inferences. The present Article endeavors to prove that the scenery and allusions of Ezekiel, as also his vocabulary, are germane to the place and time assigned him in the Canon, and that the same is true of Isaiah B, as evinced by the contrast with the former prophet, and the agreement with Isaiah A, which he presents at every point of comparison. This appears in inorganic nature (pp. 526-529); in the vegetable and animal kingdoms (pp. 530-533); in the sphere of human activities, domestic, social, military, and religious (pp. 534-537); being strikingly manifest in the names for God (pp. 538-543). The same result is confirmed by the very grouping of the vocabularies in question. Both in respect to common and uncommon words (pp. 544-546), the agreement is close between A and B, while the disparity is wide between B and Ezekiel. Independent evidence results from the careful study of about twenty among the rarest words in B's vocabulary (pp. 547-552), and the nail is clinched by a list of seventy miscellaneous words found in B, but wanting in Ezekiel, who expresses the same ideas by eighty-three other words, foreign to B's vocabulary. Thus it will be seen that the evidence for the integrity of Isaiah is not a chain which must fall if any link be broken; it consists rather of a multitude of pillars, each and all supporting the conclusion that the second part of Isaiah is rightfully placed with the first.

In view of all this, it may not be presumptuous to express the hope that when Professor Kuenen revises his "Religion of Israel," he will not begin by asserting (p. 15 English translation), "we know for certain that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are the productions of a later prophet, who flourished in the second half of the sixth century B.C." Be it so that this is a result "of the entire intellectual work of Europe during the last century" (p. 7), still the present century has something to say on that topic. Mr. Cheyne, for example, so far from knowing for certain any such facts, professes to know but in part.¹

¹ As these closing pages go to the press, I find that a new edition of Mr. Cheyne's Commentary on Isaiah has just appeared. I regret that I have had access only to Vol. i., in which I find nothing which would lead me to modify the views above expressed.

ARTICLE VI.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

No. X. — THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES COGNATE WITH HEBREW.

AMONG the encouraging signs of religious vitality in our churches, not the least important are those which indicate that the true relation between careful labor in the study and the amount and quality of work done outside of it is more and more appreciated, and that proportionally larger demands are made upon ministers for a wide scholarship. It is also significant that so large a portion of a pastor's study-hours — in accordance not merely with his own scholarly and devout instincts, but also with the expectations of his people — is claimed by those branches of theological training which are directly concerned with the Scriptures themselves. But there is still, in the community at large, and even among those who are preparing for the ministry, — and are all active ministers to be excluded from this statement? — an imperfect notion of what is involved in a thorough familiarity with the Scriptures, and of the way in which such a familiarity is to be gained. In particular, since there are yet some who look with a degree of suspicion on scholarly attainments, and call for more study of the simple word of God as the one fundamental requisite for a preacher and pastor, it may be questioned whether such persons are at all aware what a superficial, inadequate, and in some directions dangerous, knowledge of the Bible that is which those teachers of the people would possess who did not base their teaching on very long and hard and conscientious study of many things whose spiritual advantages are not at once patent. Even those, however, who have a fair theoretical grasp of this truth are quite likely to underestimate the importance of studies which are remote from their own mental interests. So it comes about that excellent and intelligent persons, with a sincere desire for the the most thoroughly educated ministry, are often perfectly unmoved by the consideration that there exists a group of half a dozen or more closely related languages, to which the Hebrew — whose name at least they know — might serve the theological student as an introduction. These persons will generally agree that no one should in these days undertake the responsibilities of biblical exposition who is not able to read in the original the Old Testament, as well as the New. Nothing need be said as to the importance of Hebrew in theological training, and yet a hearty protest is certainly in order against the neglect of their Hebrew grammar

and lexicon — and this involves in most cases the hopeless neglect of the Hebrew Bible — which characterizes so many ministers almost from the time they leave the seminary. It is certainly nothing less than a duty for every minister, who is not prevented by unmistakably providential hinderances, to make and keep himself as familiar as the means at his disposal allow with the language in which more than three fourths of the divine revelation recorded by God's servants of old is handed down to us. It ought not to be regarded, as it so often is, in the light of a matter wholly within one's own liberty of choosing or refusing, whether the original tongue is to speak directly to us, or only through an interpreter. There is not likely to be any dispute as to the fact of such neglect. Is not this a point where the ministerial conscience needs to be quickened? And yet it must be said, in all fairness, that the individual ministers are not wholly to blame. This suggests at once the first reason to be urged for wider Shemitic studies in a theological course :

(1) For the appropriateness of the foregoing remarks in this Article will be evident, when we remember that one chief reason of the ministerial distaste for Hebrew, and of its discontinuance after student years, lies in the fact that in multitudes of cases it has never found its rightful place among the mental stores. Looked at from the first as something new and strange, and of only accidental interest, acquired, as far as it is acquired at all, by the efforts of bare memory, it has never made natural connections with other departments of knowledge ; it has never struck root deep into the mind, and interwoven itself into that growth of scholarly thought, of which perhaps no graduate of our theological seminaries is wholly destitute. The difficulties in knowing Hebrew are greatest at the outset. It is foreign in habit and in its fundamental linguistic conceptions ; possible attempts to strike acquaintance do not meet with instant success ; it seems to defraud other studies of the rewarding fruits of toil ; like the Chinaman on the Pacific coast, it is barely tolerated because the law so requires ; it is quickly disposed of when protecting authority is removed. Now, as far as ministerial neglect of Hebrew is due to this cause, — and it is largely due to it, — the study of the cognate languages will be of considerable service in diminishing the likelihood of that neglect. Hebrew will be relieved of its isolation. It will be seen that we have to do not with a mere solitary and lifeless monument, but with members of a family of languages, possessed of a long and varied history, interacting upon each other, influenced by currents from without. A human interest in these languages, and in the peoples who spoke and speak them, will give vividness and color to facts that before were dull or vague. Suggestive phenomena will be constantly met. Historical, archaeological, religious connections will be all the while made between the Shemitic and the Occidental civilizations ; not only will the Shemitic field appear, as it so emphatically is, one intrinsically worth a thorough cultivation ; but

it will be seen to open on all hands into those regions where earlier studies have made the mind at home, and the soil of both will yield all the richer fruit. In answer, then, to one who cries out that Hebrew is burden enough, without a new load of Arabic and Assyrian and the rest, it is enough to utter the paradox, that the more knowledge of Shemitic languages one carries, the less will it be regarded as a burden.

(2) In the second place, and as an additional argument for wider Shemitic studies, it must be clearly borne in mind that without at least one of the languages cognate with the Hebrew a part of the Old Testament remains sealed even to the Hebrew scholar. It may be a small part, — a few chapters in Ezra and Daniel, a verse in Jeremiah, a word or two in Genesis, — but the smallness of the amount ought to make very much less difference in our thought than it actually does. If we had to decide whether we would be able to read Hebrew or Chaldee, we should of course choose that knowledge which would open to us the larger part of the Old Testament; but the question is, whether we shall not have both. If it is worth anything to have access to most of the Old Testament in the original, then it is worth something to have access to it all. It is not necessary to enlarge on the argument which the relation of the preacher and pastor to the word of God supplies in favor of acquiring the biblical Aramaic. Here, again, making all due allowances for providential hinderances, it ought to be matter of shame to a minister or student for the ministry that the opportunity was within his reach to become able to read the entire Old Testament in the language in which it has come down to us, and he merely let it slip.

(3) But another consideration is this. No one can lay claim to a thorough knowledge even of Hebrew, without acquaintance with its sister languages. The system of Hebrew forms is comparatively simple; but this can be understood only as one is able to compare it with the more elaborate systems which meet one, e.g. in the Arabic. Moreover, it is coming to be widely admitted that the simplicity of the Hebrew form-system is the result of a long development. For the earlier stages, for the richness and variety of forms, for the generation of form by form, as well as for the explanation of countless details, we must get back to Assyrian, to Arabic, to Ethiopic. In the same way, investigations in Hebrew lexicography drive us if not always to the elder, certainly to the other branches of the family. The amount of Hebrew literature in our possession is comparatively small. That of the Arabic, Assyrian, and Syriac is enormous. It is therefore not to be wondered at that we are obliged constantly to resort to these other languages for the explanation of a Hebrew word. This applies especially to the Assyrian, which has not only preserved many old Shemitic roots, but has also enriched the Shemitic vocabulary by copious borrowing from the non-Shemitic Akkadian, and has passed over numbers of such words to the Hebrew. It is hardly necessary to add that the

characteristics of Hebrew syntax, both when they are common to the Shemitic family and when they are peculiar to the Hebrew, require for their full comprehension, an acquaintance with the family at large. There is not room even to sketch what has been done in these lines of study. Much yet remains to do, and some particulars will be mentioned farther on. But whether for appreciating the results of the past, or for advancing toward the fuller knowledge of the future, it is a *sine qua non* of Hebrew attainment to have taken long strides outside of strict Hebrew limits.

(4) Worthy of a separate place, while we are concerned with the purely philological aspects of the subject, is the relation of a knowledge of Aramaic, as well as Hebrew, to an understanding of New Testament Greek; but this is probably too familiar to need more than the briefest mention. It ought, however, not to be forgotten that Shemitic influence in the New Testament is not evident merely in borrowed words, in the change of meanings and of usage, in the transference of idioms, but also in the more general characteristics of style, and in the mode of dealing with the new ideas introduced by Christ. But this last point grazes closely on another to be noted hereafter.

(5) To return to the Old Testament. The languages cognate with Hebrew provide us with invaluable aids in interpreting the contents of the Hebrew Scriptures. Nothing else can be named, under this head, that is comparable with the knowledge gained from Babylonian and Assyrian sources. The storehouse of Shemitic mythology opened up in the cuneiform records; the archaeological, geographical, historical details which are multiplying every day; the supplementing and explaining of Scripture passages which had seemed incomplete or obscure, — expressions like these sum up in brief a mass of information which has not begun to be fully known or exhaustively applied. And if it be asked here, — as it may be and is asked at other points, — Can we not then take the results of specialists and use them, without ourselves becoming specialists in these things? the answer is: We must, of course, largely do this; but the man of intelligence, who at the same time feels his responsibility as a teacher of the people, will take as little as possible on trust, in a field where such magical results are proclaimed by the decipherer, without at least understanding the grounds of the decipherer's certainty. Nothing, it may be added, will so surely convince an inquirer of the essential soundness of the scientific methods applied to Assyriology, as some practice, even if it be but little, in doing decipherers' work. And besides this, it may be always rejoined to questions of the sort supposed: The life which personal investigation gives to the knowledge a student gains, the depth of the impression it will make on him, and the enduring presence of such knowledge with him cannot be produced or replaced by anything else.

(6) We all know that the old Shemitic versions of the Bible have a part to play in the critical study of both Testaments, and yet the number

of scholars among us who are sufficiently at home with any one of these to make their knowledge available is astonishingly small. The Samaritan version, the Syriac versions, — how few there are of our American ministers who are clearly informed as to the bearing of even these ancient translations on great problems, let us say, of textual criticism. And when a pastor is asked for his opinion in this or that question, where at least as much knowledge as this is presupposed, what are the chances of his being able to express himself with intelligence and judgment?

(7) The literature of the Aramaic, late Hebrew, and Rabbinic dialects turns our thought to another branch of Shemitic study. It introduces us to the history of Jewish theology. The Targums, deficient as they are in critical value for biblical exegesis, give us important knowledge as to the conceptions held by the Jews from Christ's time on, in regard both to the sacred record itself, and to the facts and doctrines which it contains. It would not be right to say that no one can be a good biblical scholar without being thoroughly familiar with all this literature: but no one can understand the Jewish mind, no one can form a clear picture of the growth of the later theological system of the Jews, without some acquaintance with the works in which Jewish thought has left its record. The fruits of such study will find application more than once within the Bible itself.

The advantages which have thus been briefly outlined do not form an exhaustive list. Some others, it was thought, could be presented more forcibly in the paragraphs which are to follow. But it seems of some consequence that the matter should not be treated as a mere abstraction. If there really are many undeniable advantages to be derived from wide Shemitic studies, it is quite evident that there are corresponding duties to be discharged by the institutions which were founded to train ministers.

(a) There is the first and most obvious duty to the ministry, and to the churches through the ministry. It is of great importance to the members of churches — to the fulness and exactness of their knowledge of truth, to the intelligence and breadth of their faith, to the rounded growth of their spiritual natures — that the ministers should know more than ministers for the most part now do of Shemitic language and literature. But, speaking generally, they never will, unless the seminaries teach them. Here and there an individual will interest himself in these studies, and make some advance; but the ministry as a whole is practically dependent on the seminaries for Shemitic knowledge. Other things — natural science, philosophy, history — they may pursue through impulses derived from other sources; but the Shemitic department will, for reasons mentioned earlier in this Article, be almost certainly neglected, unless an understanding of its worth has been implanted and fostered during the time of preparatory study. Our ministers have a right to say to the

seminaries that have sent them out, "You have not done for us all that you could and ought," if this has not been put within the reach of every student who was physically and mentally fitted for it. What is more, — the churches have a right to complain. Although the seminaries are agencies employed by the church, still the responsibility of the seminaries cannot be shifted. They are expected and are bound to lead the thought of the church in matters which concern ministerial training. If the seminaries will earnestly put before the churches the need of provision for teaching the branches with which we are here concerned, and will submit any practical scheme, it will not take long for the demand to be heard and weighed and responded to with the liberality of thought and of purse which true Christianity engenders.

An objection may, however, be raised, which has often been thought to have much force. All the advantages named, it will be said, are perhaps real and great, but certainly it cannot be expected that the average minister, amid all the pressure of sermon writing and parish work, will become a specialist in language. Will not the result of such attempts at a wider instruction as are here proposed be to raise up superficial men, of large, vague self-confidence, who will think themselves qualified to judge grammarian and lexicographer and commentator, and will succeed only in exposing their own ignorance?

There are several things to be said in reply. In the first place, it will of course be impossible to prevent some men's being forever superficial, and superficial men are always liable to fall into shallow judgments. But it would be quite safe to set over against this, as more than counterbalancing it, that dogmatic prepossession — more helpless than shallowness, because it is blind — by which one whose philological habit is defective adopts the view of this or that expositor, according as it fits best into his theological scheme, or seems more in accordance with some theory of the universe. If there is evil in superficial philology, there is evil also in a *priori* exegesis. The dangers of imperfect knowledge we cannot wholly avoid; but there are worse dangers in ignorance, when one is placed in a position that demands knowledge. The tendency of the training recommended will surely be to fit men, if not for writing commentaries, at least for judging the views of commentators; to give them some reasonable confidence in their power to decide, or the ability — rarer still, and most rare when the philological education has been incomplete — to refrain from a decision where the materials for reaching one are insufficient.

It may be replied, in the second place, that a great deal more independent work is possible for students and for ministers in the Shemitic department than is often supposed. No one man in the practical work of the ministry, or in the confining studies which precede his entrance thereon, can, indeed, cover the entire field. Neither can any one man who makes Shemitic investigation his life-work. But far more can be

done than actually is done — enough to secure to a large proportion of ministers the general advantages which result from such a wide range, and to secure for the church unexpected contributions to its knowledge from this side and that. The truth of this will manifest itself wherever there are proper facilities for the study, and wherever, at the same time, there is encouragement held out to the investigating spirit.

But even if precise results were meagre, there would still remain, in the third place, this great advantage, that by means of prolonged and varied studies in this department one approaches a knowledge of the Oriental spirit and coloring of the Bible which does not consist in any technical acquaintance with archaeology or verbal criticism, but in an atmosphere. Perhaps no one who has not actually come into personal contact with Eastern peoples can perceive this by that just instinct which is a second nature; such, at least, is the testimony of those qualified to speak; but in language we have the best substitute for personal intercourse, because language is a product of life. A familiarity with Shemitic speech may take the place, in some important respects, of a familiarity with Shemitic peoples in their Oriental homes.

But, it may be freely repeated, while the duty of the seminaries to the ministry and churches at large, in equipping their students for average practical work by a training in Shemitic languages, is thus clear, most ministers will not be able to make themselves specialists — absolutely thorough masters — in this, any more than in other departments of study. Cases will occur, but they will be exceptional. This, however, far from weakening the argument, suggests the second great obligation which rests upon the seminaries in the matter of Shemitic learning.

(b) An obligation to the cause of biblical scholarship. There will always be some members of every fair-sized seminary class whose abilities and tastes enable them to make large attainments in philology, and the interests of the churches and of Christianity in the largest sense demand that they should have the opportunity to fit themselves for the special work which they can do. It is a most wise economy of force to make these young men ready for the opportunities and emergencies where such scholarship is sure to come in play.

The first consideration under this head that will occur to many is the necessity of having men thoroughly trained in philology, to cope with opponents of revealed religion who are specialists in language as well as in criticism. Unbelief is no longer ignorant. Shallow attacks on faith are indeed not wanting; but many leaders of scientific knowledge of the facts of the Bible — philological facts and others — are men to whom the Bible, however full of historical interest, is not sacred. It is scholarship of a deep and vigorous sort that we have to match, and the seminary is the place where the churches have the right to expect that the corresponding knowledge will be imparted. How the conflicts are now

raging about the Old Testament, how every kind of learning is called into play, and what a large part linguistics and philology take, and must always take, in such discussions, need not be dwelt on here.

But we hold a very low view of a biblical scholar's training, if we regard it simply as equipping him for defence. It ought to be expected that such a man will make progress in the acquisition of truth. It ought to be regarded as unnatural, if a considerable number among the graduates of our theological institutions do not become active producers in the fields of exegetical, as of dogmatic, historical, and practical theology. It would be easy to make out a long list of undertakings which bear directly or indirectly on our understanding of the Old Testament, not a single one of which can seem of little importance to those who prize the whole Bible as a revelation from God, and not a single one of which can be carried through without a wide and thorough Shemitic scholarship. Such an absolutely fundamental work as the establishment of a Hebrew text of the Old Testament that can lay claim to critical accuracy, is yet to be done; and this vast labor divides itself up into many parts, which call loudly for special students, — the examination of manuscripts both of the original and of translations, the study of Jewish literary history, and, in particular, systematic investigation of the Masoretic vowel-points. On another side, we have the relation of Babylonian mythologies to the early Hebrew records, and this bears on many profound questions. The history of Shemitic wanderings is largely buried in obscurity, and language is one of the most promising avenues toward clear knowledge on this point. The subject has not a little to do with the history of Old Testament revelation. Early Shemitic influence on other peoples, as illustrated by the Phenicians, is another topic. Southern Arabia and the Ge'ez tribes offer still many questions. There are great regions of grammatical and historical study beside, which can by no means be neglected. New opportunities for research are coming to light all the while. And if here in America there are, as experience shows, men who present themselves to receive intellectual training for the Lord's work, whom God has endowed with gifts fit for these tasks, then the American churches are bound to develop just those gifts, and educate biblical scholars. Theological seminaries must furnish the needed preparation. They cannot, of course, become universities; but neither can they wait for the universities, or leave to them a monopoly of such work when they undertake it. It may in fact be a fair question, whether for the present and for a long time to come, the seminaries do not owe it to the community at large to give access on easy terms to all those who desire instruction in such special departments, whether with the ministry in view or not. It will be a long while before many other institutions will be able to offer such advantages in Shemitic studies as our leading seminaries are bound to provide, if the argument of this Article is valid;

and it is by no means clear that every one desiring an acquaintance with matters whose bearing on religion is so certain should not in the meantime be allowed and invited, under proper conditions, to share these advantages. At all events, it is obvious that the churches cannot yield to any other institutions than those responsible to them the training of men who are to defend and promote the cause of religious truth.

Nor must it be forgotten how much the perpetuation of the seminaries themselves depends upon this. Their faculties ought, in the nature of things, to be made up of men who have been trained in them. And whatever may be thought of the needs of the ministry, no man can ask that the chair of Hebrew shall be filled by one who knows little or nothing of any Shemitic language besides Hebrew. And the larger the choice which a seminary has among its own graduates the better. It is impossible to insist too strongly on the responsibility of the seminaries in this regard, and yet the matter is so plain that it ought not to need any insistence.

(c) It is something different from mere fancy or sentiment which would add, in the third place, an obligation to the Shemitic peoples themselves. Without entering into a fruitless discussion of the comparative endowments of the Shemitic and the Indo-Germanic mind, it is simple matter-of-fact that the West has received from the East its most priceless spiritual treasures; that the sons of Japheth are now prospered in spiritual things above the sons of Shem; that if the former are to have great and lasting influence upon the latter, a common ground of familiarity with their literature and history and habits of thought is indispensable. It is not fair, it is not high-minded, to think simply of the gifts that have come to us, and never of how we may repay, to children either of Isaac or of Ishmael, the value which the life of their ancestors has added to our life. If the seminaries can help our ministers to bridge the gulf of separation between the Jews who are among us, or the Arabic-speaking peoples to whom we try to send the gospel, and the Christian church, then there is a responsibility here. Now when the existence of these obligations is allowed, then comes the practical question, What must be done? Granting that the seminaries ought to be bestirring themselves, and that Christian people ought to respond to that which the seminaries may propose, it is still not to be denied that serious difficulties lie in the way of a decided forward movement in the direction indicated. The following remarks are simply in the way of suggestion, looking toward a removal of such obstacles.

L. The Shemitic department of each seminary needs *at least* two professorships, if the work is to be done with any approach to thoroughness. It is absolutely impossible, with the demands of Old Testament exegesis and criticism and theology, growing all the while, for one man to do more than meet these demands. He cannot form special Shemitic classes; he cannot pursue Shemitic investigations. He can neither keep himself fitted for the work, nor do it, if he were fitted. Still less can he sustain

his own enthusiasm by original discovery and production. Any curriculum which required such double or treble labor of the Hebrew professor would insure poor work in some or in every branch, or else kill the man. It could never accomplish its end. In the larger seminaries, — especially in view of an extension of the course, to be suggested further on, — more than two men may be needed in this department. Less than two cannot perform the needed labor. Indeed those who have the wealth of the churches in their keeping ought to know that before long advancing scholarship will be clamoring for a larger teaching force in more than one department of seminary instruction. And, considering the interests involved, there ought not to be the delay of an hour for lack of means.

II. The costliness of many of the text and reference books is an obstacle in the way of such studies for theological students. It is therefore imperative that seminary libraries be fully equipped in Shemitic philology, and that at least of some of the books needed for class-work a sufficient number of copies should be always on hand to be freely lent to the students who desire to pursue the studies. Those who in the end make this department a specialty will of course, by degrees, acquire a working-library of their own. Some will gradually drop this line of work, and retain only the general advantages of having pursued it; but the libraries must make it possible for all who seem qualified to begin the work, and the fittest will survive.

III. As one of the languages of Scripture, the so-called Chaldee, or biblical Aramaic, might perhaps be reasonably required of every student in a seminary; the other Shemitic languages can probably be best pursued as optional studies. Even with one hour a week, much can be done in a seminary year. Two hours a week, or one hour a week for two years, will be desirable where it can be had; in the case of a language like the Assyrian, this is almost indispensable.

IV. The student might be encouraged, early in his special studies, to choose some one Shemitic language which he will make his special province. He will then by no means neglect the others — quite the contrary; but he will be constantly studying them with reference to his chosen one. He will thus not only make more progress in that one, but he will be sure to gain a more scientific knowledge of the field as a whole than if he pursued them with the vague intention of going equally far in all. It would lie within the province of the instructor to present the opportunities and needs of each branch of Shemitic study so as to stimulate the student's mind and direct his choice.

But it will be said, and with reason, Our seminary courses are crowded already. Students have too many lectures even now. They have not enough time to think, to assimilate what they learn, to form opinions, and mature themselves for active work. Over against this, it will be remembered that only the more capable scholar will, on the optional plan,

if it is rightly managed, be taxed by these special studies; but still the objection retains force. The remedy for the evil will perhaps be found in the two following suggestions, to which the experience of other departments of theological culture might add weight.

V. To gain time and strength for work of the kind proposed, seminary professors and students ought to be relieved of the necessity of beginning Shemitic studies in the seminary. It is a very poor economy that requires the seminaries to teach the Hebrew alphabet. When the day comes that a thorough knowledge at least of Hebrew declensions and conjugations shall be insisted upon as a condition of entrance, then several months' time will be saved in the theological course.

VI. But still further advantages to Shemitic studies would result from the general addition of a fourth year to the seminary course. Whether it will be found better in the end to make this fourth year obligatory may be a matter for discussion. But it would probably be wise to provide for a large option as to the particular branches to be pursued during this year, with especial reference to a student's tastes and capacities, and a special insistence on independent and thorough work. This adds great force to the remark made above as to the need of more instructors, in all the departments. But, confining ourselves to the topic in hand, while the special Shemitic student should be required not to give up all interest in other departments of theological study during this fourth year, he should have full opportunity of entering upon some long and exacting and promising line of investigation, from which scientific scholarship and the church might expect to gather good fruit.

But whether the foregoing suggestions shall be found of real value or not, the arrangement of details will be a matter of comparative ease, as soon as the church is awake to the need of such scholarly zeal in Shemitic and other special studies as it is the earnest desire of the writer to arouse and to justify. In forming a scheme for actual practice, the institutions of other peoples will of course deserve consideration, but none of them can be adopted without modification to suit the needs of our own case. Only let us all — directors, professors, ministers, church members — ask ourselves seriously whether the cause of Christ does not demand a larger equipment of theological schools for precisely the objects here brought forward. No one ought to ask, Will it do great harm if these branches are left to other institutions to teach? It will do great harm; but the right question is different from that: Is not this a way in which God's truth can be better understood, God's kingdom advanced, the cause of learning receive the stamp of heaven, and civilization with its progress in knowledge be once more, as so often in the past, laid under deep obligation to the church of Christ? To that question there can be but one answer; and a privilege such as this ought to stir us more than any danger, which can only scourge and drive.

In conclusion, a single word. At the opening of this Article the attention to theological scholarship which marks our day was called a sign of religious vitality. It is possible that this may be denied, not for the first time. The old objection may once more be raised, that the ministry is growing away from the people, and that learning is threatening to choke spirituality. All honor is due to the appreciation of simple piety from which this thought springs. When learning or anything else begins to chill the soul of a minister there is ground enough for anxious searchings of heart. To be living in communion with Christ is the one indispensable condition of usefulness in his kingdom. But the church has never been satisfied with an ignorant fervor. In each age it has felt the double demand of religious warmth and scholarly zeal, and has responded to it, as to a demand in which both counts were of imperative force. It must be so still. As new fields of learning open up before the eyes of students, Christian men must be among the foremost occupants, and when the new field promises a rich crop of blessing to the church itself its representatives can least of all hesitate for an instant. Pious ignorance may be easier than religious learning, but that fact should be only a spur. If the needs of theological scholarship are brought clearly before the church, and the church through the institutions which exist for the very purpose will not supply them, a decline of religion will already have begun. Christianity may still make some converts, but it will have abandoned all power of reaching and holding those who study and those who think. And that is nothing less than to renounce its birthright. F. B.