

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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

On Integrating the Book of Isaiah.

WILLIAM HENRY COBB.

BOSTON, MASS.

CICERO considered himself to have accomplished nothing in debate unless he had persuaded his opponent. Among the disputants on Isaiah, there are two classes who will never enjoy that felicity: those who rule out the supernatural, and those who lug it in. The first class should bear in mind that no one is likely to succeed, where Hitzig failed, in interpreting Isaiah without entering sympathetically into his religious convictions. Even if the existence of God should be accounted doubtful, it was the most certain of realities to our prophet. The second class should reflect that the spirit of the age pays little heed to arguments depending on such *a priori* assumptions as these: "If there is a God, he has revealed himself to us. If our Bible is his revelation, it is perfect and infallible. If our Lord cites an Old Testament book by its author's name, the question is settled for all real Christians." The last statement is palpably contrary to fact, unless the number of real Christians is fast diminishing.

The true middle ground, on which all can stand together and investigate the difficult questions connected with this great book, lies in a common determination to seek truth first and always. Men who look at the same facts from the same point of view ought not to remain hopelessly apart even in biblical science. We should frankly respect our honest differences of judgment, and examine dispassionately the data as they come to light, with utter fearlessness of results, and with a cheerful confidence that the final view, when gained, will be comprehensive enough to embrace the truth in every partial view. For my own part, I long since gave up expecting to *prove* the unity of Isaiah. The differentiation of the book has been a long and slow process; the integration, if it ever takes place, will embrace many particulars, some of which are now *sub judice*. Twenty years ago, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, I suggested that the process might extend

over a century. As the paragraph is important for my present purpose, I reproduce it for substance (*Bib. Sac.*, Oct., 1881, p. 662):

Modern science ought to become less and less polemical. The way to treat a man who fails to see what you see is not to rail at him, but to pour in the light. That will be a happy day when religious discussions lose out the controversial aspect, and become simply investigations, all parties to which are equally eager to buy the truth. And perhaps, among these investigations, the scattered fragments of the peerless book of Isaiah, which have been tossed about the learned world for a century past, may be gathered up, and fitted together, so that a century hence the evidence of their unity will be manifest.

At present, I should modify this forecast a very little. I venture to anticipate a general belief in the Isaian authorship of most of the book as we have it, minor changes and additions having been made in the course of transmission. All will agree that such evidence for this conclusion as exists ought to be presented and fairly weighed. It is the aim of this article to give the outlines of that evidence, which will be found to be respectable in quantity and cumulative in character. The argument is not a chain, which must fall if a single link be broken; it resembles rather a multitude of pillars, all supporting a common conclusion. The first point to be examined is:

I. THE HISTORICAL SITUATION OF THE DISPUTED CHAPTERS.

Tradition is of two kinds, historical and critical. According to historical tradition, the book of Isaiah is by Isaiah; according to critical tradition, it is mainly later than Isaiah. Now a critical tradition is simply the survival of a critical theory. It has this advantage, that it represents a sifting process which has been applied to historical tradition as well as to all other material; but it has the disadvantage, no matter how venerable it becomes, of furnishing no presumption against any modicum of fresh historical evidence, upon which it acts like emery dust upon a precious stone. Criticism, in short, is a set of methods, yielding secure results only when applied to known facts by sound reasoning.

I respectfully claim the privilege of using these methods. For I believe in all the good new things: in glosses and variants and lacunæ; in rhythmical suggestions and Septuagint readings; in transpositions and editorial additions and critical conjectures. Above all, I believe that the historical situation gives the key to the true interpretation of a prophecy. The theory of an exilian Isaiah originated in what we now perceive to have been a radical, though unavoidable,

misreading of the facts of history. The real facts are known only in part; but I would suggest as a title for one of our burning questions, "the shrinkage of Cyrus."

A few years ago, the student beheld this great conqueror pervading not only all Western Asia, but all Deutero-Isaiah. As two opponents discussing a legal question may go to court on an agreed statement of facts, so, from the standpoint of history, it was a mere question of detail whether the events of Cyrus's time were predicted nearly two centuries back, or were utilized by a prophet of his own day. The facts were these:

Cyrus was a Zoroastrian monotheist. With devout zeal for the one God, he overthrew the idols of Babylon, having effected entrance into the city (after a long siege) by drawing off the Euphrates, and marching under the hundred gates, to the consternation of the revelling inhabitants. At the very beginning of his reign, he showed his regard for Jahwe by sending home Zerubbabel and the Hebrew exiles with their sacred vessels. He built a new temple in Jerusalem at his own charges; and even in the days of Darius, his faithful decree still protected the Jews from their enemies.

Observe next, not in detail, but in outline, how Cyrus made his presence felt throughout Isa. 40-66. In chap. 41, he is the righteous man from the East, and Jahwe makes the Syrian desert a pool of water, so that Zerubbabel can get through. In 43, Jahwe sends Cyrus to Babylon, to rescue the Jewish captives from the Chaldæans. In 44, Cyrus is his Shepherd and rebuilds Jerusalem. In 46, he is the vulture from the East, before whom Bel bows down and Nebo stoops. In 48, he executes his pleasure on Babylon and his arm is on the Chaldæans. In 51, Jahwe's ransomed return (from Babylon, of course), and come with singing to Zion. In 52, the captives depart (from Babylon, of course) in solemn procession, bearing the very vessels enumerated in the first chapter of Ezra. In 54, the new foundations of Jerusalem are laid with sapphires, thanks to Cyrus's munificence. Even in what is now called Trito-Isaiah, the same subject is continued. In 58, the exiles sent forth by Cyrus repair the breach and restore the paths to dwell in. In 60, Cyrus is chief of the strangers who build the walls of Zion, and of the kings who minister to her with gold and frankincense. The message in 62 is "Prepare ye the way of the people, say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh," — in *other* words, the company of Sheshbazzar. And finally in 66, like an echo of chap. 40, the assurance is renewed: "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I

comfort you, and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem,"—that is, when Cyrus sends you there. All this, and very much more of the same sort, was steadfastly believed only a generation ago.

I could wish no stronger proof of my statement that a critical theory, however venerable, is powerless against historical evidence, than the adjustment which began to take place when the inscriptions of Cyrus and Nabuna'id were discovered. I say began, for the process is still going on. Great bodies move slowly; the great body of Old Testament scholars is divided at present, according to various methods of adjusting the new knowledge to the old. The following may turn out to be largely if not wholly true. (For a different view, see McCurdy: *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments.*)

Cyrus, whether or not a Zoroastrian, was by no means a monotheist. He never laid siege to Babylon; there was no need, for the people opened the gates to his general Gobryas and hailed himself as their deliverer. Whereas Nabuna'id had neglected the worship of the gods of Babylon, Cyrus reinstated it with splendor. So far from ascribing his conquests to Jahwe, he ascribes them to Marduk. The captured gods of other peoples he restored to them, but he did nothing whatever for the Jews. The whole account of his decree sending them back to Jerusalem with their sacred vessels we owe to our pious but unscientific friend, the Chronicler. Zerubbabel was not a returned exile, and no return ever took place until Ezra led his company back in the fifth century, or perhaps the fourth century.

But furthermore, there never was an exile in the traditional sense. These children of Israel were a peculiar people; they first occupied the land under Joshua in a very peculiar way, marching *en masse* like a crusading host, while the enemy melted before them; and the men of Judah were carried into captivity in the same wholesale fashion, leaving deserted villages which they reoccupied under Zerubbabel! The one account is as unhistorical as the other. A few thousands of Jews were taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, but a much greater dispersion had been long going on, from various causes. As a result, there were Jews in the four quarters of the earth, and it was the hope of the prophets, as of the modern Zionists, that Israel's scattered families would return to the Holy Land. As a matter of fact, the post-exilic community in Jerusalem grew up there from the survivors of the pre-exilic community, reinforced from all the region round about. They built the temple themselves and carried on their own worship. Neither the kings of Persia nor the Jews in Babylon had much to do with them.

Now, if we could be sure of all this, it would be easy to show that Isaian critics for the last hundred years have been following the wrong trail. At any rate, I have succeeded in hinting at the shrinkage of Cyrus.

But the case against Deutero-Isaiah can be made out very strongly, whatever we think of Cyrus. Let us return to chaps. 40-66 and try to ascertain their natural testimony to the historical situation.

I believe (sparingly) in transpositions; there is a clear case in the narrative chapters, 36-39. Merodach-baladan's embassy, consequently also Hezekiah's sickness, must have preceded Sennacherib's overthrow. This brings chap. 40 into connection with chap. 37.

It is constantly assumed, without a particle of evidence, that Isaiah's prophetic activity closed in or about the year 701; that is to say, just when he had gained the supreme point of vantage for his greatest work; the work whose records, by *prima facie* evidence, lie before us in the very book which has always gone by his name. What is the situation in chap. 37? The great king has retreated, but not without devastating the land. "As for Hezekiah the Judean," says he, "forty-six of his fenced cities, the fortresses, and small towns in their vicinity without number, I besieged, I took. 200,150 persons I brought forth from the midst of them and allotted as spoil."

The words have become familiar, but the picture they draw—have we made it real in our minds? Look at those desolate *cities of Judah*, at the enormous deportation, far greater (allowing for exaggeration) than that effected by Sargon from Samaria, and ask if this is not the time to proclaim, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people"; the time to favor Zion, yea, the set time to "say unto the *cities of Judah*, Behold your God." And Jahwe is coming; who says he is marching at the head of the exiles? Not our author. Across the wilderness, as of old, cometh your God. Prepare for him as you would make ready for a great king. His glory shall be revealed, with good tidings; to Zion; her warfare is ended, she hath received the double, namely, the severe chastisement which Isaiah ha-! so often foretold; to the remnant, behold, Adonai Jahwe cometh, to feed his flock like a Shepherd.¹

¹ The above was written before I had read Löhr (1878-80), who holds that Isaiah is the author of the book as a whole, and that he gives these indications of his own standpoint, but that he looks forward from it to the Babylonian captivity. This last, as I hope to show, is unnecessary. Löhr's three pamphlets, though little known, were mentioned by Delitzsch and Dillmann, and have also found

An explanation has been glanced at already for Isaiah's prophecies of the return of the exiles. The oneness of the twelve tribes and the hope of their reunion was a doctrine kept alive in the interest of religion as well as of patriotism. Even in the days of Tiglath-pileser, multitudes of the North Israelites had been carried into captivity. Sargon renewed the deportation, and Sennacherib shaved the land still closer. We cannot doubt that many thousands of these captives were sold into slavery and thus were dispersed in all directions. (See article, "Dispersion," in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.) The 49th chapter of Isaiah is a typical example of the prophecies to which I refer. Zion, whose children Sennacherib had carried off by scores of thousands, mourns in her bereavement, saying: "Jahwe has forsaken me; Adonai has forgotten me." Isaiah bids her lift up her eyes and behold her children flocking *from every quarter*, till the land is too narrow for them. "Lo, these shall come from far; and lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim," that is, Syene, to adopt Cheyne's excellent emendation. The fact that the standpoint in 49 is Palestinian, not Babylonian, is well worked out in Sellin's *Serubbabel* (1898), more successfully, it seems to me, than the contrary position is maintained by the same writer in his recent work (*Der Knecht Gottes bei Deuterofesaja*, 1901). Babylon is doubtless included, in 49¹², among the lands of the dispersion, but only included. "These shall come from far" may mean Babylon, the far east; then follow the other three cardinal points, ending with Syene, the far south. Already in the 11th chapter, after mentioning Assyria, the foe at hand, Isaiah had boxed the compass in a similar back-handed, unseamanlike fashion. Adonai is to recover the remnant of his people from Egypt, Pathros, Cush, on the south; from Elam, Shinar, on the east; from Hamath, on the north; and from the coastlands of the west. The parallel is complete; and chap. 11 was conceded to Isaiah until long after chap. 49 had been taken from him. But there is a nearer parallel than chap. 11, for in 43⁵ we read: "I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far and my daughters from the end of the earth." It is plain, therefore, that the prophet, in all these passages, has his eye not simply upon the

place in the elaborate and admirable bibliography which Prof. G. A. Smith has appended to his article, "Isaiah," in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Two or three other points in my article have been anticipated by Kennedy (1891) and Douglas (1895).

captives in Babylonia, but upon the Dispersion in all lands. His geographical position was at Jerusalem, and he himself may well have been the Isaiah of Hezekiah's reign. And if he may have been, we ought to hold that he was, until the contrary is shown by conclusive evidence. For the historical tradition comes down to us from men on whom we ought to suppose in every case, until we have good reasons to the contrary, that the sunlight of external evidence was shining, to illuminate things which we see only through a glass darkly. One may fix his attention on almost any period of history, and find striking prefigurements of its development in the prophecies and visions of Scripture. The exegetes of the books of Daniel and Revelation have proved this to perfection. In like manner, when one takes up the third volume of either of those fascinating and powerful works, Stanley's *History of the Jewish Church*, and McCurdy's *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, he must be on his guard lest a historical presentation which appears to fit the facts so admirably be regarded as the only reasonable one. That this is not the case is already apparent, I hope; and this conclusion will be greatly strengthened when we pass from the historical situation in its external aspect, and examine

II. THE RELIGIOUS TEACHING OF THE DISPUTED CHAPTERS.

Beginning with chap. 40, we find, just after the introductory verses already considered, a sustained polemic against idolatry. With characteristic promptness and thoroughness, the Chronicler represents Hezekiah as setting out to overthrow his father's paganism, in the first year, the first month, and the first day of his reign. Shortly after, all Israel that can be mustered keep the passover together, and then immediately have another feast, by going throughout all the cities of Judah to destroy and abolish every remnant of idolatry, with none to molest or make them afraid. Stade, Robertson Smith, and others have properly criticised this representation, claiming that Hezekiah's reforms came late in his reign, that they were far less radical, that they were bitterly opposed, and that the life-work of men like Isaiah and Micah was the chief cause of whatever efficiency they attained. These critics have also perceived the natural, almost inevitable, point of time when everything favored the reformation. Not when the dark shadow of Assyria threatened in the distance, or hung huge over the land; but when the sole deity of Israel's God had been gloriously vindicated in the downfall of the oppressor, —

this was the tide in the affairs of men which was taken at the flood. What doth hinder us to go one step farther? Hezekiah moved on the idols with Isaiah at his right hand. "Under the influence of Isaiah," says Professor Moore (*Enc. Bib.*, article "Idolatry"), "Hezekiah probably made an effort to root out the idols." Why not, then, under the inspiration of the stirring words which are summarized in this very chapter? "Behold," cried the prophet, "your eyes have seen our God bring princes to nothing" (40²⁴). "He only blows upon them and they wither, and the storm-wind chases them away like chaff. To whom then will ye liken God? To the image a workman has made?"

Note just here the parallel with Isaiah's pregnant word, *relating to the overthrow of Sennacherib*, at the close of chap. 17; I like to call it Isaiah's ocean symphony. "Like the surge of many waters the nations are surging; but *He* throttles them; — and they flee far away and are chased like mountain chaff before the wind, and as whirling [dust] before the storm-wind." The rebuke of idolatry is renewed in chap. 41, with the mingled sarcasm and grandeur of which Isaiah is master. We meet it again in every one of the next seven chapters, 42–48, also in 57, 65, and 66. This, too, is the meaning of the figure in 55^{1f}; compare Jeremiah's "broken cisterns" and "fountain of living waters." It was a thorn in the side of the original Cyrus-theory that several of these passages assume the existence of the temple with its ritual. Consequently, Deutero-Isaiah has shrunk greatly, the last eleven or more chapters of the twenty-seven being assigned to Palestine in the days of the second temple; but this explanation cannot apply to 43^{22f}, which is Babylonian if anything is; even Cheyne says so. Here Israel's sin is that of omission; neglect of burnt-offerings, sacrifices, and oblations; how could that be charged in Babylon? I have studied various attempts to evade the plain fact that this is a reproof for neglect of the sacrifices, and I find none of them even plausible. The apparent contradiction to passages like 1^{11f}, which speak slightly of ritual observances, will be no stumbling-block to the Christian pastor, who finds it needful at one time to rebuke his people for making all their religion consist in church-going, at another time for neglecting public worship.

Combined with the denunciation of idolatry in these chapters, we often find a challenge to false gods to foretell the future, or to bring events to pass, both which the God of Israel has done, as the people are well aware. And when were mightier deeds wrought for Israel, against all human probability, or when was the word of the Lord

more boldly staked and more signally fulfilled than at the close of the eighth century before Christ? How fresh and timely sounds the voice of Isaiah, when we connect it thus with his life-work and contrast it with the boastful threats of Rabshakeh. "The former things, behold, they have come to pass; ye are my witnesses, saith Jahwe." "Fear not, thou worm Jacob; thou shalt thresh mountains and beat them small. Behold, they that strive with thee shall be as nothing and shall perish." "Declare the things to come, that we may know that ye are gods; yea, do good or do evil." "Let them bring forth *their* witnesses; or, let them hear, and say, It is truth."

Professor Skinner is careful to remind us that there was idolatry in Israel in the Exile, for which he refers to Ezekiel. Now we are not obliged to answer that Ezekiel wrote in the *former* part of the Exile, and that it would be harder to prove the prevalence of idolatry among the captives fifty years later. It is sufficient to reply that there was idolatry in Israel in the days of Isaiah, that it is the case of Isaiah which is just now before the court, and that the historical tradition has the right of way. If the latter can justify itself, the critical tradition will be politely bowed out of court. This at least is clear, that the prophecies against idolatry contained in thirteen out of our twenty-seven chapters, when looked at in a general way, are appropriate to the period of Hezekiah; and I can only hint at the importance of examining the many details in the description of various idolatrous rites, some of which are of uncertain origin and significance. We need all the light which can be thrown upon them from the customs of every period to which they might be referred. The few allusions to Babylon and to Cyrus in chaps. 40-66 I will take up presently.

After the retreat of Sennacherib and the beginning of recovery from his ravages, it is no marvel if the patriotic spirit in Jerusalem rose to fever heat. The scattered families were to come back to Jahwe's land, and as Assyria had been humbled before them, so they would rule over every nation. The feeling of proud superiority to other peoples, which is often held to be a mark of post-exilic date, is rather the mark of human nature in all ages — witness the dominant politics of the three most Christian nations to-day. Isaiah, as both statesman and prophet, would seek to turn this rising tide of patriotism into nobler channels than those of hatred and exclusiveness. For this purpose he might use the identical motive employed by many patriotic preachers in America to-day. "It is true we are the grandest nation on earth, but only because God has chosen us. And why? That we might carry his salvation to the ends of the world." The

lofty conception of the Servant of Jahwe was thus adapted to the needs of Hezekiah's age, and may have been the fruit of the new religious life promoted by his reforms. True, it rose far beyond the spiritual plane which the mass of the people had then reached, and this is precisely what we are told in Isa. 42, where the actual Israel is contrasted with the ideal. Blind and deaf is the servant of Jahwe; and so Isaiah's inaugural vision receives one more fulfilment. I have endeavored to show elsewhere (in this JOURNAL, 1895, pp. 98-102) that the original Servant of Jahwe is Abraham; and that the conception is extended to Israel, only because, according to the solidarity of Oriental thought, Abraham lives on, and works on, in Israel. But I strangely overlooked, even when developing this conception from Isa. 41⁸, the support given by the preceding and following context. The old exegesis of the opening paragraph of 41 needs only to be strengthened and supplemented. At the close of chap. 40 we read: "They that wait on Jahwe shall renew their strength." Now then, says Jahwe, let the heathen peoples renew their strength. "Let them come near, let us come together to the test, while I put over against them my servant Israel, whom I summoned from the east and called in righteousness. Before him I give up nations. When the five kings were confederate, my servant pursued them and passed over safely. When the armies of Pharaoh came against him, the depths covered them. Yesterday the hosts of Sennacherib vanished like dust and driven stubble. Who hath wrought it, calling the generations of Israel from the beginning? I, Jahwe, the first, and with the last I am He. Tremble, ye ends of the earth; but draw near and renew your strength. Get you a fresh set of idols, the carpenter encouraging the goldsmith. BUT thou, Israel, my servant, seed of Abraham my friend; fear thou not, for with thee am I. . . . Let the judgment go on. Bring forth your strong ones, saith the King of *Jacob*. An abomination is he that chooseth you. I have raised up one from the north and he is come; from the sun-rising my servant Israel that calleth upon my name. Let the great king send again his *sejanim*; my servant will trample them down as the potter treadeth clay."

Then the prophet seizes the new impulse of patriotic life and turns it into the new channel of the divine call. "Behold, my servant Israel; judgment to the nations he shall proclaim; nor fail till he have set righteousness in the earth; far-off coasts are waiting for his Torah."

König, in *The Exiles' Book of Consolation*, 1899, maintains (against

Duhm, Cheyne, Laue, and others) an internal connection between chaps. 41 and 42, thus (p. 9, see more fully at p. 62) : "41²³⁻²⁹ is a parallel to 41¹⁻⁷. After the emphasis laid upon the calling of the hero from the east (41²⁻⁴), Israel might have been perplexed about their own calling ; hence, for the sake of assuring them, 41¹⁻⁷ is followed by vv.^{8 ff.}, a consolatory passage (*vocavi te*). And in like manner 41²⁸⁻²⁹, in which once more the call of the eastern conqueror is emphasized, might well be followed again by a section dealing with Israel (42^{1 ff.})." But the view I have just presented preserves this connection in a much simpler and more natural way. And yet some critic will say, with a touch of scorn : "If Israel instead of Cyrus is the hero from the east in 41², is Israel the vulture from the east in 46¹¹?" No, I reply ; mark the context and parallels of this latter passage ; then the interpretation at once appears. "Saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure. Calling a vulture from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country. Yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass ; I have purposed, I will also do it." Now compare 14²⁴ : "Surely, as I have thought, so shall it come to pass ; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand" ; also 10^{5 ff.} : "Ho, Asshur ! rod of *mine* anger. I send him ; I give him a charge. Shall the axe boast against the hewer?" Sennacherib is the vulture, and all three passages fit him ; even the verbal agreements are surprising. As a mere sample of other readjustments required, look at 43¹⁴ : "I send to Babylon, and bring down all of them as fugitives, even the Chaldæans, in the ships of their rejoicing." Most modern scholars are as sure that this refers to Cyrus as though it read, "I send Cyrus to Babylon." But when did the men of Babylon flee to their ships before him? or when, for fear of Cyrus (46¹) were Bel and Nebo hurried away on beasts that hardly bore them? Nay, it is Sennacherib who furnishes a striking parallel to both these passages. In his account of the campaign of 700, against a man in whose fate Isaiah took a special interest, it stands written : "Merodach-baladan feared the war-cry of my powerful arms and the advance of my strong battle line. The gods who ruled his land, in their shrines on shipboard he brought ; to the midst of the sea he conveyed them ; he escaped like a bird."

A word here on the obvious objection that too much is being hung on a single peg, despite the fate of Eliakim's family. The present writer may be accused of holding the name of Sennacherib so close to his eyes as to shut out everything else. A couple of quotations may serve to repel this charge, or to distribute it among others.

The first is from Budde's *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, p. 155 f.: "The imagination can scarcely measure the depth and strength of the impression made by this marvellous deliverance. Never had the need been greater, the foe never mightier. Yahweh had allowed all human help to exhaust itself, in order to show all the more palpably that He alone could help, and that He was superior to any foe. . . . And it was no chance stroke, for repeatedly and long before he had announced it through his prophet Isaiah. The prophet's reputation must have risen mightily, and the word of the hoary-headed sage must have been listened to with a respect never accorded him in youth or the prime of life." Evidently Budde thinks that Isaiah's activity did *not* culminate in 701. To the same purport speaks Kittel in his *History of the Hebrews* (English translation, vol. ii. p. 371, cf. p. 369). "In any case, the reputation of Yahvé and of Zion would necessarily gain infinitely by the marvellous issue of the struggle. Isaiah had been right when he said that the Hill of Zion was higher than all hills, and that Yahvé would protect his dwelling-place. It is extremely probable that he now enjoyed the triumph of seeing the disappearance of the idols which still remained everywhere in the hands of the common people, and that Hezekiah, by way of honouring Yahvé of Jerusalem, proceeded with greater earnestness than before with the work of suppressing the high places."

It need not concern us to reconcile this judgment with the remark on the previous page: "Of Hezekiah's further proceedings [after Sennacherib's retreat] we can learn nothing. Isaiah, too, vanishes in 701, and we see no more of him." Let it suffice that the suggestions of these two eminent scholars exactly fit the interpretation which I have proposed above. But the overthrow of Sennacherib is not the only historical point of contact for chaps. 40-66 with the times of Isaiah. At present, a very troublesome question for the critics, and a divisive one, in the true sense of that much-abused word, is the problem of interpreting the sharp and stern addresses, alternating with tender expostulations and gracious promises, the best example occurring at 57^{3-13a} followed by 57^{13b-21}. Who are accosted here? Samaritans? heathen? Jews in exile? Jews of the return? The difficulties thicken about every hypothesis. But may there not be a good historical basis underlying the account in 2 Chr. 30 of the divisions in North Israel? If we cannot corroborate the narrative, much less can we contradict what seems so natural an event under all the circumstances. It was eminently fitting that a king of Judah, on whom Jahwe had set his seal by a great deliverance, should act as

the religious head of all Israel and seek to unite the tribes in the ancient ritual of the passover. It was to be expected that some would accept the invitation while others laughed it to scorn. Add to these two elements that of the foreign colonists, with their new and strange idolatries (2 K. 17), and there is not, I verily believe, a passage or a phrase in Isa. 57 with which the situation does not harmonize. Note especially the plain references to apostasy which connect so well with the southern view of the northern religion, e.g. 57¹¹: "Of whom hast thou been afraid and feared? for thou art treacherous, and hast not remembered me nor laid it to thy heart. Is it not so? I was silent, yea, a long time, and thou didst not fear me." Cf. 65¹¹: "As for you that forsake Jahwe, that forget my holy mountain, that spread a table for Gad, and fill up mixed wine to Meni,"—old Syrian deities. The sudden transition from 57^{3-13a} to 57^{13b-21} reminds us of the burden of Hosea.

Now in answer to the objection which will be weighty with many, perhaps most, present-day scholars, namely, that it is impossible to believe in such a religious development in Hezekiah's time as has been postulated above, I have this to say: We are so far from agreement over our sources that we really know precious little about the religious development in Hezekiah's time. A fair objection to current attempts to contrast the theology of earlier with that of later prophets is that many of the data have been drawn from the supposed exilian origin of Isa. 40-66. It behooves us to get our theories from *all* the facts, without forcing theories through any of them. I am far from denying either the applicability to our subject of the fruitful doctrine of evolution, or the fact that there was a religious development throughout the history of Israel. The question "what was that development?" is a question of fact, not to be answered by *a priori* pre-judgments either rationalistic or supernaturalistic. The proper order, I take it, of examining such a question is:

- a. The historical tradition.
- b. The historical situation.
- c. The *prima facie* testimony of the text as to religious teaching.
- d. The subsequent history of the text.

So let us take up

III. MARKS OF LATER INTERPOLATIONS.

I believe (occasionally) in glosses. The very word is attractive. It suggests the smooth, silken fur of a feline, with no hint of any

concealed talons, which might rend the context into fragments. I have caught a number of these glosses and held them long enough to abstract their essential traits; so that our friend who is always with us, *der unbefangene Leser*, might be constrained to say, this is a gloss. Here is the first principle deduced. Let A and B be rival critics; to A, nothing is a gloss which opposes B; anything may be a gloss which favors B. I have advanced a little further in the study; for Duhm who is rich in glosses supplies abundant examples. It is the mark of a genuine gloss that it can be omitted with gain rather than detriment, that it explains an indefinite or difficult original, that it has local or temporal earmarks, that it changes poetry into prose, that it breathes the spirit of a later age. A gloss may exist in the absence of one or more of these signs, but there is one gloss which I am sure of, for it has them all. Observe how the passage reads without the gloss; the metre is as plain in English as in Hebrew (45¹).

Thus saith Jahwé to his anointed	whose right hand I have holden
To bring down nations before him	and the loins of kings will I loose;
To open doors before him	and gates shall not be shut.

The Hebrew goes on in the same rhythm to the middle of ver.³. Let me refer, in passing, to König's masterly investigation of the Hebrew metres in his recent book, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik*.

This passage, 45^{1a}, is an address to the Servant of Jahwe, as appears from the parallels with 42^{1a} and especially 49^{1a}. König remarks (*Exiles' Book of Consolation*, p. 9): "In 45¹ after the mention of Cyrus the Ebed-Jahweh is not forgotten (v.⁴)."⁴ But in truth this ver.⁴, like 49⁶, brings out the mission of Israel to Israel, and 45¹⁻⁴ (minus one word) may be regarded as all of one piece. The doctrine that every man's life is a plan of God is as well illustrated by Israel as by Cyrus.

But now how came the gloss לְקוֹרֵשׁ (to Cyrus) to be thrust in at the beginning of this passage, with the various detriments that have been indicated above? Professor Cheyne, in *Enc. Bib.* (article "Isaiah"), has put the principle involved here into the fewest possible words: "The older prophecies were no doubt accommodated by interpreters to present circumstances." A copyist at the close of the Exile saw a new application for this prophecy of Isaiah. He put לְקוֹרֵשׁ in his margin, whence it worked its way into the text. The previous verse was more roughly handled, on the evidence of our modern

analysts themselves. According to Duhm, everything after the Athnahh has been added, namely, the following: "saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built, and the temple founded." Cheyne agrees with Duhm, and Marti agrees with both. Here we distinguish between a gloss and a variant. The last part of 44²⁸, say these three most recent commentators, was inserted by some one who wished to apply directly to Cyrus the prediction in ver.²⁸ about building the waste places; in all probability, then, say I, he replaced by the name Cyrus something that stood there before; Israel, for example, or even the name of some king, since elsewhere the term Shepherd is applied to a king. As is well known to Isaian students, the name Cyrus occurs in the whole twenty-seven chapters, 40-66, just twice; namely, in the two consecutive verses last examined, and in these, as now appears, it may be a later addition. I think it likely that in a few other cases, Isaiah's prophecies were worked over during the exile and even afterward. Thus 45³⁻⁵ may have received slight additions, in the Deuteronomic style, to adapt the passage still further to the time of Cyrus. But this is not certain, as I have just indicated. Verse³, at any rate, presents no difficulty to the interpretation which I advocate. It is simply a figure of speech equivalent to saying "With God all things are possible." It can have no reference, either before or after the event, to a forcible capture of Babylon by Cyrus, for there was no such event. 48²⁰ agrees well with the hypothesis of a definite adaptation of what was first a less specific call, as at 52¹¹. As we have seen, the normal reference to the Exile in 40-66 concerns itself with the world-wide dispersion of Israel. Something like the following may have stood originally in 48²⁰: "Go ye forth, my people; flee ye from the oppressor"; compare the phrase just after, "the end of the earth," with the same expression in other parts of Isaiah.

In the present article, I am not examining the suspected passages in chaps. 1-39, because I have elsewhere discussed most of them minutely, and given some solid grounds for the belief that even assuming the late origin of 40-66, those passages can be successfully assigned to Isaiah. A single point may be mentioned on the matter now before us, marks of later interpolations. Many critics hold that the word "Babylon" in 14⁴ and again in 14²² did not stand in the original prophecy. I have published my adherence to Duhm's view that the first three and a half verses of that chapter are a post-exilian addition in Zechariah's manner. In any case, the critical principle which has been cited from Cheyne is at hand whenever it is called for. It is plainly impossible for any one who holds to that principle

to prove that the book of Isaiah belongs to several authors instead of to one author and a few editors. For in the main, both historical situation and religious teaching are consonant with the age of Hezekiah, and thus the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah may be attributed to that prophet, except so far as they have been accommodated by interpreters to later circumstances. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that no claim is here made for anything more than probable evidence of the essential unity of the book. The general question must be kept open, that the results of further research may be coördinated with what is already known.

IV. ARGUMENTS FROM STYLE AND DICTION.

Since Ewald's day, scholars have been disposed to take *cum grano salis* the arguments for either unity or diversity of authorship which rest on the style of a composition. That great master of history, grammar, and criticism was so wont to speak *ex cathedra* in matters of this sort, and his sure intuitions have been so often reversed by later investigators that the chief result is a lesson of caution. No man has ever invented a stylometer to indicate with any approach to scientific precision the extent to which an author may deviate from his accustomed forms of expressions without committing literary hari-kari. What the negative critics forget is the Protean character of genius. Other things being equal, the greater the genius, the wider the limits within which his style will disport itself. Felix Mendelssohn, on his first journey to Italy, spent some days at Weimar with Goethe, whom he knew well, and who showed himself in ever-changing moods. "Then I thought," wrote Mendelssohn, "there you have the Goethe, of whom people will one day declare, he was not at all *one* person, but consisted of several little Goethiden" (*Reisebriefe*, Leipzig, 1865, s. 6).

Moreover, when we come to *estimate* a work of genius, one man's meat is another man's poison. Knobel is as ready to give a flat contradiction to some literary pronouncement of Ewald's (*e.g.* on Isa. 12), as Dillmann to Knobel's, or Duhm to Dillmann's, and so on indefinitely. What complicates the matter still more is that the argument from style never has free course. The assertion that there is in the book of Isaiah, speaking broadly, a marked contrast of style between chaps. 1-39 and chaps. 40-66 has been a truism for several generations. Different ways of accounting for the fact have been invented, but the fact itself is indisputable. Now the defenders of

Isaian unity have always met the challenge of their opponents on this matter of style ; but as soon as these defenders have pointed out, with all painstaking, the resemblances to 40-66 contained in 34-35, or in 13-14, or in 24-27, or in 21, or 33, these chapters have been declared to be themselves late, for reasons drawn chiefly from theology and history. If then we succeed in showing, for instance, that 21¹⁻¹⁰ belongs historically, and by every other test, to Isaiah,¹ we can begin at once to turn the tables on the analysts. For, strong as is the argument for the genuineness of the Ode in Isa. 14, considered by itself (see this JOURNAL, 1896), it is much stronger when 21¹⁻¹⁰ can be included in the foundation on which the argument rests. Again, there is, it is true, a clear difference in style, as Cheyne shows, between chaps. 13 and 14 ; but 13 is Isaian by independent evidence (*Bib. Sac.*, July, 1892), and hence we relegate^e the argument from style to its true place of subordination. So too with respect to chaps. 24-27 ; if Dr. Barnes can vindicate their genuineness (see his *Examination*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1891), we shall remember the oft-quoted declaration of Ewald : "Every kind of style, and every variation of exposition, is at Isaiah's command, to meet the requirements of his subject." Step by step, the work of many a year to come presents itself, in the form of a careful examination of every suspected passage, in its historical situation, its religious references, its textual integrity, and its style ; each piece of ground regained will aid in the winning of another. Insistence on the proper order of these investigations gives a sufficient reply to the critical postulate of Driver, Blass, and others, that while marked diversity of style presumptively indicates difference of authorship, strong resemblance of style is a very weak argument for identity of authorship. This maxim may be of service in a case which has to be determined by considerations of style alone ; but against objective evidence it has no more force than the maxim which it so much resembles : "heads I win, tails you lose." No such rough and ready dictum can exempt us from working these problems out in the sweat of our brows. To the casual reader, the list of phraseological peculiarities given in Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 238-240 (cf. Cheyne's *Introduction*, pp. 255-270) is doubtless impressive ; but how its significance shrinks when one considers the wide range and sweep of the subjects covered in those chapters. A glance at the Isaian affinities of the brief Ode in chap. 14 (see this JOURNAL,

¹ So Dr. W. E. Barnes, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1900 ; cf. my article in this JOURNAL, 1898, part i. The two are wholly independent.

1896, pp. 33-35) prepares one to believe that a similar exhibit for all the suspected passages would fill a volume larger than the whole body of the prophets.

The argument from diction (in a restricted sense, namely, the *words* used by an author) is capable of being put upon a more secure and scientific basis than that from style in general. For here we dig under the subjective notions of this or that critic as to stylistic harmony or dissonance, and also as to the significance of historical and religious references, which may accord equally well with events centuries apart. We build on the solid fact that every writer reflects unconsciously the particular vocabulary of his time and place. In the case before us, we examine by all possible tests the diction of every part of Isaiah, comparing the passages minutely with each other and with all other Hebrew writers, to determine their natural affinities in point of verbal expression. This was the "happy thought" (so it seemed at the time), which came to me in 1879. So for two years I worked it patiently out, publishing the results in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April and October, 1881, and for January and July, 1882. Manifestly, the chief value of such an investigation cannot be presented in the mere outlines which the present article deals with; its force lies in its fulness of detail. It is one thing to pick out certain words in chaps. 40-66 to justify an opinion, as many writers had done on either side; it is a different matter to present the vocabulary in full and in its multiform connections, as I did, tracing the delicate threads of coincidence which bind together all parts of the book in a way that the most servile imitator could not copy — not to add that the author of *such* chapters could not have been such an imitator. I really believed that an argument drawn so plainly from unconscious peculiarities would have weight with critics of all schools. But I was met at once with the reply: "Words are of minor consequence; the historical situation is the paramount matter." To which I now make respectful answer that the point is well taken, and that the evidence is this time presented (or rather, outlined) in what seems to be its due and proper order.

During the last twenty-five or thirty years, returns have been coming in also from other investigators. Our friends the radical critics should restrain their impatience at apparently unwarranted presuppositions on the part of their opponents, and should ask only, "What is there in these facts and reasonings that has to be taken up into the whole of things?" Then they would hardly fail to find some grains of sense in the arguments for Isaiah's authorship of some

or all of the antilegomena, as given by Strachey (1874), Kay (1875), Klostermann (1876), Naegelsbach (1877), Urwick (1877), Löhr (1878-80), Rawlinson (1885), Bredenkamp (1887), Orelli (1887, '91), Forbes (1890), Wright (1890, '93), Kennedy (1891), Barnes (1891, 1900), Douglas (1895), Sinker (1897), Vos (1898, '99), Margoliouth (1900), and Osgood (1901).

I would call especial attention to the admirable articles of Dr. Geerhardus Vos in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for July and October, 1898, and January, 1899. No one knows the present status of the Isaian questions who has not thoroughly and conscientiously tried the strength of the positions which he defends. I do not believe, as some of these conservative authors seem to, that radical critics are unwilling to give full and fair consideration to the arguments on the conservative side. For instance, although my own examination of Isa. 12 (in this JOURNAL, 1891, part 2) has not been noticed, as the others have been, by German and English critics, I have always supposed this to be an accidental oversight. In the comical words of Duhm (Preface to *Commentary on Isaiah*): "Vielleicht ist mir ab und an ein brauchbares Altes oder Neues entschlüpft, das Aufnahme verdient hätte; das Commentarschreiben hat eben viel vom pig puzzle."

The above bare reference to recent literature defending the unity of the book of Isaiah leads naturally to

V. THE GENESIS AND COURSE OF THE CRITICAL TRADITION.

One cannot properly understand the position of an opponent until he sees how it came to be what it is. The earlier shapers of the tradition down to Eichhorn were obliged, as he confesses, to oppose a general consensus. It was Gesenius in 1821 who brought the world of scholars to believe in the exilian origin of Isa. 40-66. If we had only his light, I think we should reason as he did. He had to contend against a bald form of supernaturalism, as though it should be taught that some one in the sky whispered to Isaiah the name of Cyrus several generations before the latter's birth. Gesenius did not attack this dogma in front, but he adroitly turned its flank by asserting that the prophet's own position is in the exile, where he is on firm ground, and that when he looks out into the future his vision at once becomes hazy. The positive part of this argument, as I have sought to show above, is by no means "firm ground"; the negative part is as useful as ever; indeed, it has a very present interest, as the following extract will show (*Band 2*, s. 21 f.).

Had it seemed good to Providence to permit even Isaiah to prophesy of Cyrus in a supernatural way, he would have revealed also to this prophet the position of things *after* the exile in accordance with historic truth, not with ecstatic ideals which have never been realized. What a contrast between the condition of the poor colony under Ezra and Nehemiah and the pictures of Isa. 60, 65, 66, according to which a golden age is to enter directly after the return, and is to make the nation the most splendid in the world! Doubtless every one smiles at Kimchi (in the commentary on certain passages, *e.g.* 48²¹) who naively wonders because nothing is related in the book of Ezra about the miracles which, according to our prophet, were to come to the returning Jews, water springing out of the desert rocks and the like. But it is surely no better, it is the height of arbitrariness, when one regards those pictures of the prophet as really fulfilled in the history, only with the saving clause that not everything is to be taken so literally. No sensible expositor, indeed, *will* take it so; but to see an enthusiastic depiction of prosperity, splendor, and a golden age fulfilled in a poor, wretched camp, requires a strong fancy.

The attentive reader will not fail to perceive that this reasoning is auxiliary, rather than contrary, to the view I am presenting. Most of the other arguments of Gesenius relate to matters already discussed in the preceding pages. In regard to two of them, however, a word may be in place. His inference that Jeremiah would have cited against his opponents the latter portion of Isaiah had it existed, cannot be granted. Jeremiah knew too much to expose himself to the ready retort: "Isaiah is *our* royal prophet. It was he who taught us the inviolability of Zion." The argument that Jerusalem is repeatedly described (not foretold) as lying in ruins, deserves attention.

It is curious to see that while Gesenius reasons from the *fact* of Jerusalem's desolation, Cheyne finds it necessary to account for the *notion* of Jerusalem's desolation. Thus in *Enc. Bib.* he writes regarding chaps. 40-55: "We say 'at Babylon,' because certain passages presuppose that Jerusalem was desolate, which, strictly speaking, it was not. Only a writer living at a distance from Judaea can have indulged in such idealism." I believe that this is an exact statement of the truth. To my mind, the two or three allusions to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple (apart from 44²⁸, which Cheyne gives up) are exilic adaptations of Isaiah's original words about the cities of Judah and the desolations of the land. It is important to notice how fully the conclusions of Gesenius were accepted a generation ago. After the example of Vos, Cheyne begins the article "Isaiah" in *Enc. Bib.* by comparing Kuenen's views with those which are up to date. I follow the lead of these professors and quote Kuenen too (*Religion of Israel*, English ed., vol. i. pp. 15, 7).

"We know, for certain, that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are not the productions of Hezekiah's contemporary, but of a later prophet, who flourished in the second half of the sixth century before Christ." Kuenen included this among the results which he called "the natural fruit of the entire intellectual work of Europe during the last century." But to-day there are very few speaking with authority, in Europe or America, who believe this "certainty." For the later critics, Duhm, Hackmann, Kittel, Laue, Marti, and others, have vied with one another in reducing Isaiah to his lowest terms. In 1895 appeared Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, which left to the son of Amoz only about one fifth of the book introduced.

Upon what meat doth this Isaiah feed that he is grown so thin?

Upon critical conjectures. But I must not proceed further in the notice of Cheyne's opinions without recording my profound gratitude for his brilliant pioneer work in every department of biblical studies. It is a continual marvel that he is able to bring forth out of his treasury such abundant spoils both new and old. To appraise the full value of these ever-growing accumulations must perforce be left to later scholars. But already it is plain that his main hypothesis on the book of Isaiah is exerting a constant diremptive force. When I remarked (in this JOURNAL, 1896, p. 32, n. 3), "Those who follow his [Cheyne's] processes will probably disintegrate the book still further," it really required no gift of prophecy to make that observation, but only a rudimentary acquaintance with arithmetic. As thus: "If four fifths of a book are spurious, and any part of the remaining fifth is suspected, the chances against that part are four to one." So it has proved. The English Polychrome, 1898, went further in the same direction; the Hebrew, 1899, further still. One cannot always judge by the coloring, and one must never suppose that the English and Hebrew Polychrome constitute one work. For example, I was amazed and delighted to find chap. 1 almost wholly uncolored in both books. Give me that chapter for a fulcrum and I'll move the world. Moreover, Cheyne had commented thus in the 1898 edition; "Chap. 1, ver.²⁻²⁶. All doubtless Isaiah's work, except perhaps ver.²⁴, which at any rate proceed from Isaiah's school." Doubtless. But in December, 1898, Professor Haupt read an analysis of Isa. 1 before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Haupt's results are summarized and criticized at great length in the Hebrew Polychrome. "Isaiah," says Cheyne there, "may or may not have expressed himself as Haupt supposes that he did. But it seems a hopeless task to recover any of the utterances of the prophet on which the present

text of 1²⁻²⁸ is based. The view expressed in Kittel-Dillmann that chap. 1 has literary unity, and as it now stands (or, one might venture to say, in anything approaching to its present form) came from the pen of Isaiah, seems to the present writer untenable." Analysis goes further still in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, published in 1901. Only the framework of chaps. 28-31 is Isaian. 6¹⁻⁹ in its original form came most probably from a disciple of Isaiah. On some other points, the reader is invited to suspend his judgment until the next volume of *Studia Biblica* appears. To-day, Professor Cheyne would not lay his hand on the Divine Library, and make oath that more than an eighth part of our book of Isaiah was written by the prophet himself. Besides, he foresees the last term of the series 1, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, etc. In this last article, he intimates plainly that Isaiah, like Moses, lives in deeds, not in written words. Was he a poet? Probably not. This is the conclusion on that matter: "Isaiah was too great to be a literary artist." At last the frank confession comes out: "We can hardly expect to find that Isaiah left much in writing, and we must also make allowance for the perils to the ancient literature arising from the collapse of the state." This brings me to my final suggestion.

VI. ISAIAH'S PLACE IN THE WORLD OF THOUGHT.

If their race is not extinct, the masters of general literature will some day be heard from on this question. I do not refer to master's apprentices or literary dilettanti. I mean men of power, like Coleridge and Emerson; men who combine a taste as delicate as Sainte-Beuve's with an insight as keen as Browning's. They recognize a kindred spirit when they meet it; they know that the good God has sent to this planet a few men of towering literary genius, and that Isaiah was one of them. Oh, if Matthew Arnold had suspected that he was to lose both his Isaiah of Jerusalem and his great prophet of the Exile! he would have put in a vigorous veto, he would have raised a tempest about the ears of the analysts. The great masters may ignore historical constructions; they will be indifferent to literary skirmishes on the outposts; but the moment you begin to argue that Isaiah, having written A could not have written B, having soared to this height could not reach that depth, or even the common level between, they will exclaim "Hold! that is our province. Face to the right about and retreat." For no argument that would shatter Shakespeare and dismember Dante will have a feather's weight with such men.

What I believe and feel on this subject I cannot even indicate, except by an illustrative example. I am accustomed to read two authors who have much in common, Isaiah and Dante. "Why compare these?" it will be said. "They are separated by precisely two thousand years, by the gulf between Semite and Aryan, between sunny Italy and rugged Judah, between two mutually persecuting religions. They are opposed in their very cast of thought; the one objective, the other subjective. One is a poet, who poured out love sonnets; the other a prophet, whom we could not conceive in such an occupation."

True, but — a man's a man for a' that. The things wherein these two men agree are more and lie deeper than the things wherein they differ. Each was a patriot statesman, who suffered at the hands of a fickle and ungrateful people. Each has suffered since from a class of commentators, who think to measure the creative intellect by the two-foot rule. As Dante pierced to the reality under the false forms of the multitude around him, so Isaiah wielded the very spear of Ithuriel. The Jerusalem held up to righteous scorn in his chap. 3 is near of kin to the Florence which Dante lashes in *Paradiso* 16. Dismissing environment, we find that these men agree fundamentally. Each is a voice crying in a wilderness of unbelief; it is God's voice. Dante a poet and Isaiah a prophet? Dante was a prophet and Isaiah was a poet. The scholars of our time debate over the rhythm of Isaiah's verses; but every age has felt the charm of his poetic expression; even so, every age since Dante lived has bowed before his prophetic power.

The critics note, as qualities of Dante's genius, comprehensiveness, definiteness, brevity, intensity, simplicity, vision. All these are equally characteristic in Isaiah's prophecies. On the other hand, the leading *ideas* of Isaiah would almost epitomize the Divine Comedy. They are such as these: the majesty of God, the sinfulness of man, Divine judgment, salvation, refuge in God alone. In the Latin treatise, *De vulgari eloquentia*, Dante mentions the subjects treated by different poets, and asserts that his own theme has been righteousness. There is no need to draw the parallel.

I have referred to *vision* as the crown of Dante's qualities of mind. His was the insight that not only penetrates but elevates and exalts; the true centre from which to view his great trilogy comes at the culmination. It is the sight of God that draws its votary on and up to immortal beatitude. Little do they know Dante who stop at the *Inferno*.

Isaiah's central standpoint comes at the beginning. This, too, is the sight of God, giving the call and consecration to his office. The *ter sanctus* first abases and then lifts him up, till the heavenly *vision* becomes the inspiring power of his life, so that Jahwe is to him, more than to any other, the Holy One of Israel.

Dante's Paradise, bathed in the eternal light of God, is gloriously anticipated in either half of the book of Isaiah. "Arise, shine, for thy light is come. The Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and thy God thy glory." Thus the second part; and in the first part we meet that promise which may well have inspired the poet of the Divine Comedy throughout his arduous quest: "Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty; they shall behold a far-stretching land."