

the human soul, we must be conscious of it. 'De non apparentibus ut de non existentibus eadem est ratio.' Regeneration is not the same as election, it is the act and seal of the Divine Will. Consciousness is of the essence of existence, and is not an accident subsequently added. Of course there are degrees of consciousness, but this is beside the present issue. This is how the matter appears to me, and I should be glad to learn wherein my error lies.—T. T. S.

The writer overlooks the very distinction my note pointed out,—between Regeneration and Conversion,—a distinction rooted in Scripture and expounded by our best Reformed theology. He identifies the two in every case. It is true that they are often, perhaps normally, simultaneous in experience. But theology must leave room for instances in which they are not so, e.g. regeneration in infancy or early life, where the *consciousness* of divine grace fully emerges only later on.

J. LAIDLAW.

Edinburgh.

I have read with much interest Professor Hull's note on Acts xxvii. 14 in the July number of *The Expository Times*. Is there not, however, one difficulty which requires explanation before his theory can

be accepted? It will be found in any modern work on meteorology (I have no books at hand, and am, therefore, unable to give a reference) that the rotation of all storms in the Northern Hemisphere is in the contrary direction to that required by Professor Hull's theory; while in the case of an anti-cyclone, although the rotation is in the required direction, the system is essentially a fine weather system. Unless, therefore, some well-authenticated cases can be produced to show that the above laws are not of universal application, as is commonly assumed, it would seem impossible to accept the theory as fully established.—R. D. P.

I do not think there ought to be any difficulty in meeting your correspondent's objection. It is true that in this country an anti-cyclone is generally 'a fair-weather system.' But does he mean to affirm that there are never anti-cyclonic storms either here or in the Mediterranean? Probably your own experience in the East of Scotland will enable you to furnish an answer. The direction and force of the wind depend on the barometric pressure, and this on distribution of temperature; and the operation of the law which your correspondent quotes has its variations.

E. HULL.

London.

The Two Servants of Jehovah, the Conqueror and the Sufferer, in Deutero-Isaiah.

BY THE REV. W. E. BARNES, B.D., FELLOW OF PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

IN the following paper an attempt will be made to state the witness of prophecy to Christ as far as regards 'Deutero-Isaiah,' from the standpoint of one who accepts the current modern re-statement of the nature of prophecy in general. The prophets were not mere predictors of distant events. They did not hold up a mirror on which the reflexion of the things of the far future was caught and then dashed with bewildering effect into the unready eyes of the people of the present. We believe rather that the prophets spoke to their hearers chiefly of the past which they remembered, and of the present which they beheld, and that being inspired they were able to deduce from these familiar events the great principles of God's work in history. A knowledge of these gave the prophets indeed an insight into the future, but we degrade their office if we attribute to them a knowledge of the details of future events, while

ignoring their power to trace the working of God ('the arm of the Lord') in the events of the past and present. The prophets were, above all, interpreters of history.

Old Testament history at the time of the second Isaiah means the history of the great Babylonian empire, stretching from the coast of the Mediterranean on the west to the Persian Gulf in the east. It is the history, for the most part, of highly civilised peoples. Splendid buildings, large libraries, wide-reaching commerce, and a knowledge of science attested the civilisation of the Babylonian empire.

It was civilised, but sinking. In B.C. 550, Nabonidus, the degenerate successor of Nebuchadnezzar, could oppress, but not protect. The empire was full of captives, torn, like the Jews, from one land to be settled in another, that they might forget their own people and become bond-

servants of 'the great king.' Heavy task-work was laid upon them, that they might build palaces and temples. Large and untrustworthy armies upheld for the day a Government which was the mother of discontent.

The discontent at home was matched with danger from abroad. Over Babylon hung the cloud of threatening barbarians from the north. The far-stretching empire was threatened at its heart. For centuries the civilised peoples—Assyrians, Babylonians, Syrians—had been wasting their strength in wars of aggrandisement, and now the barbarians¹ seemed about to take the trade of war out of the hands of its amateur professors, and sweep those civilised nations off the face of the earth.

Babylonia had tasted the bitterness of barbarian invasion at an earlier date, when its gods, to the scandal of their worshippers, had to be carried into the neighbouring land of Elam for safety. Nabonidus was not unaware of the greatness of the danger. If he was found wanting, it was not through want of knowledge. From the borders of Egypt, from the mountains of Armenia, from the farthest limits of his empire, so he tells us, his men came at his command. But when the great host was gathered, his heart failed him, or, as he says himself, 'his God bade him rebuild a ruined temple,' and so he stayed at home, and turned his soldiers into bricklayers.²

But while Nabonidus, 'the great king, the mighty king, the king of the four quarters of the earth, the king of Babylon,' was building on the edge of a precipice, the petty prince of an insignificant kingdom threw himself into the breach to oppose the common danger which threatened all civilised states. This prince was Cyrus, king of Anzan, afterwards to be known to all time as Cyrus, king of Persia. With his small force the little vassal king,³ so Nabonidus himself complacently tells us, overthrew the huge barbarian host, and led away the Scythian king a prisoner.⁴ Western Asia was saved from devastation.

¹ *Scythians*, according to some authorities.

² So I read the strange story told on the Abû-Habba cylinder. Col. i. 16-46 (*KIB.* iii. 2. p. 99).

³ Nabonidus calls Cyrus vassal (or servant) of Merodach (Marduk), the God of Babylon. This title implies a claim on the part of Nabonidus to be Cyrus' suzerain (*KIB.* iii. 2. p. 99).

⁴ After this victory, Cyrus is called king of Persia (Parsu), instead of king of Anzan, in the 'Nabonidus-Cyrus Chronicle' (*KIB.* iii. 2. pp. 129 and 131).

In Babylon a Jewish prophet was watching the course of events. When the barbarian was defeated, and men might breathe again, the prophet knew that the hand of God had been at work. Cyrus was a foreigner, and a patron, if not a professor, of polytheism, but he had set the Eastern world free from a deadly fear, and the younger Isaiah, carried by the Spirit past national and religious prejudices, hailed him in God's name by the highest title he could give to man, *The Lord's Anointed* (xlv. 1), and announced still greater things of him: 'Behold my servant whom I uphold; mine elect in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.'⁵

Cyrus had begun as a deliverer, and the prophet, quickened in his mental and moral vision by the grace of God within him, foresaw that the deliverer would carry the work of God still further.

But first the great world-kingdom of Babylon was to become his, with barely an effort on his part, barely a struggle on his opponents': 'He shall not cry [his war-cry], nor lift up [his battle-shout], nor cause his voice to be heard in the street' (*ib.* ver. 2). So it came to pass. On the approach of Cyrus, Sippar, the great historic city of Northern Babylonia, fell without a battle, and Nabonidus became a fugitive; and next Babylon itself flung its gates wide to receive the deliverer.

The little vassal king of Anzan had become 'king of the four quarters of the world, king of Babylon.'

Who should be king but he who makes us free?

Cyrus, once on the throne, continued his work of deliverance. Not the captives of the Jews only, but the captives of other nations were allowed to return to their own lands. The sacred vessels of the temple at Jerusalem were sent back, and the images of the gods which had been brought to Babylon from other cities were restored to the sanctuaries from which they had been taken.

Weak and oppressed nations met at last with mercy; Cyrus nobly fulfilled the expectation of the prophet: 'A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench' (xlii. 3).

In the rise of Cyrus we have history on the largest scale, with a prophet standing by to interpret it. The younger Isaiah discerned the hand

⁵ Neither Dillmann (*in loco*) nor Duhm (*in loco*) see any reference to Cyrus, but vers. 1-4 apply exactly to him.

of God in the deliverance from the Scythians (the Kurds of the sixth century B.C.), in the peaceful progress of the deliverer to his second great act of deliverance, and lastly, in the person of the deliverer himself, the little vassal king daring where his suzerain shrank back.

We find then already, in the Old Testament, illustrations of *three great divine principles* of working which receive their fullest illustration in the New.

1. The first is that God is a Deliverer from death and from bonds. In the sixth century B.C. He wrought His deliverance by the hand of the heathen king of Anzan. Five hundred years later, He sent as the Deliverer His Son, who 'went about healing [in body and soul] all those that were oppressed of the devil,' and loosing the bonds which the scribes and Pharisees were ever tying more tightly around men.

2. The second principle is that God smooths the first steps of His appointed deliverers. As He made easy the way of Cyrus to Babylon, so by the whole providential course of history he prepared and smoothed the way for the preaching of the gospel.

3. The third great principle which the history of Cyrus illustrates, is that God chooses 'the weak things of the world that He may put to shame the things that are strong' (1 Cor. i. 27). The earlier deliverer is Cyrus the little vassal king, the later is one who 'emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant' (Phil. ii. 7).

There was much, then, in the teaching of the younger Isaiah concerning the career of the king of Anzan to prepare students of his writings to recognise a Divine Deliverer in One who came nearly six centuries later. But the prophet had more to show. His vision could discern the 'arm of the Lord' at work in a career far different from that of the warrior king.

In ch. liii.¹ is sketched a life in its outward events almost the very opposite of that of Cyrus, and the title, 'My servant,' is given to an obscure, patient sufferer (cf. Duhm on xlii. 1, p. 285 of his *Jesaja*).

'He grew up before Him (*i.e.* before the Lord) as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground . . . (ver. 2). He was despised and rejected of

¹ I hold with Duhm (*Jesaja*, p. 284) that xlii. 1-4 and lii. 13-liii. 12 are by the same hand, but I date both in the days of Cyrus.

men . . . (ver. 3). He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself and opened not his mouth . . . (ver. 7). And as for his generation, who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? (ver. 8).'

What a contrast is this to the career of Cyrus! Here we have, it seems, the story of a Jewish exile, known to the all-seeing eye of God as a man holding fast his integrity unhelped by human sympathy, a man rejected by his country and unjustly put to death by the oppressor, while none of his people cared to defend him living, or to weep for him when dead.

Cyrus' career is complete success, this nameless one's is utter failure, yet both receive the title, 'My servant.' What, then, is the prophet's test by which he discerns *the Servant of the Lord*?

The one thing in common between the 'servants of the Lord' is that both are *deliverers*.

One by conquest, the other by suffering comes between the people of God and their oppressor. One breaks the yoke, the other offers himself freely to bear it for others. Both are deliverers from the bitterness of the Babylonian Captivity.

But the prophet is a prophet, and sees other and deeper ills than the social and political. He saw the spiritual deadness of the people who, *because* one was appointed to suffer and not to contend, could not recognise in him the *Servant of the Lord*. The prophet saw a score of moral evils corrupting the hearts of his people, and blinding them from spiritual vision: 'All we like sheep have gone astray.' From these evils no Cyrus could deliver; but the prophet beheld in the silent sufferer the second 'Servant of the Lord,' a moral force which could be brought to act on moral ill; 'with His stripes we are healed.'

The prophet shows us here, it seems, a fourth of the great principles of the divine working which receive their chief supreme illustration in the great work of Christ's redemption.

Let me recapitulate the three first before I add the fourth to them. We found that the career of Cyrus illustrated for us three principles:—

1. That God is by nature a Deliverer. Creation and preservation are His attributes, not destruction.

2. That God *prepares* His deliverances. They are not sudden, but are from eternity. 'The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world' (Rev. xiii. 8).

3. That God chooses the weak, and makes them strong to deliver.

And now from the career of the righteous sufferer we may add a fourth.

4. That the greatest deliverance of all, that from *moral* evil, comes through suffering.

The younger Isaiah was then, in the truest sense, a forerunner of Jesus Christ.

He calls the attention of all who at any time read his book to just those principles of divine working which governed the redeeming work of Christ on earth. As we study his prophecies, we see that the coming of the Lord Jesus was not an

interruption, but an integral part of God's providential government.

In these days of doubt and stress, it is indeed a helpful thought that the revelation contained in the Old and New Testaments, though given at many times and in many parts through many minds of men, speaks from first to last with one unflinching voice of one unchanging, all-ruling providence of God, of one redeeming love manifested through all ages, and of one teaching and comforting Spirit of God, which ever pleads with the spirit of man, calling it out of darkness into His marvellous light.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Among the Periodicals.

The Lord of Hosts (יהוה צבאות).

IN spite of all that has been written upon the above Divine title, Pfarrer BORCHERT (in the current number of *Studien u. Kritiken*) maintains that its meaning is still an open question. At one time the prevailing notion was that the 'hosts' (*Zeba'ôth*) mean the hosts of heaven, *i.e.* either the stars or the angels. Latterly, under the influence of such scholars as Robertson Smith, Reuss, and Kautzsch, this explanation has been giving place to another, which identifies the 'hosts' with the armies of Israel. According to this theory, the title *Jahweh Zeba'ôth* came down from a period when war and battle were the order of the day, although finally, and especially in the hands of some of the prophets, it lost its martial sense. Still another explanation is proposed by Smend, who takes *Zeba'ôth* as equivalent to all 'the forces and elements of the Cosmos.' Unfortunately, the question of the meaning of the expression is complicated by uncertainty as to the date when it came into use. Smend declares the formula to be characteristic of the prophetic literature, and agrees with Wellhausen that it probably originated with Amos, and that its occurrence in the older historical literature, such as the Books of Samuel and Kings, must be set down to the score of interpolation. What appears to be the original and fullest form of the title is found twice in Amos (iii. 13, vi. 14) and once in Hosea (xii. 6). In these passages we have 'Jahweh, the God of hosts' (*Jahweh 'elohê hazzeba'ôth*). According to

Borchert, however, it is plain that the title cannot have been used by Amos or Hosea for the first time, else the expression would be completed by the addition of *shamayim* (heaven) or of *Israel*. This argument is further strengthened by the occurrence of the shorter form *Jahweh 'elohê Zeba'ôth* (Am. iv. 13, v. 14, 15, 16, 27, vi. 8) and even *Jahweh Zeba'ôth* (ix. 5). Moreover the formula occurs in sources older than Amos, and where Borchert sees no ground for suspecting interpolation (2 Sam. v. 10, vi. 2, 18, both from the *Judean* document, *c.* B.C. 950, and 1 Sam. iv. 4, from the *Ephraimitic* document, *c.* 850). And even in some of these passages we have the *shortened* form *Jahweh Zeba'ôth*, which seems to imply that the expression had been long in use. Nothing but personal preference will, according to Borchert, account for the use of the expression by one writer and its avoidance by some of his contemporaries (*e.g.* it occurs in Isaiah, but not in Micah; it is used by Jeremiah no fewer than seventy-nine times, by Ezekiel not once). As to the *meaning* of the title, Smend holds that this must be sought in those passages where we read 'Jahweh (the God) of hosts is His name' (Isa. li. 15; Jer. xxxi. 35; Am. iv. 13, etc.). But Borchert protests that it would be as reasonable to seek for an explanation of the name *Jahweh* itself in Ex. xv. 3 or Jer. xxxiii. 2, where we read 'Jahweh is His name.' He considers that alike linguistic usage and the antiquity which upon any reasonable theory we have to assign to the expression, are fatal to Smend's explanation. Nor can he see his way to accept of the identification of the 'hosts'