

THE Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII DECEMBER, 1906—JANUARY, 1907 No. 2

GEORGE BUCHANAN, THE SCOTTISH HUMANIST.

BY PROFESSOR STALKER, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Last year the quater-centenary of John Knox was celebrated amidst demonstrations of interest which not only extended to the remotest parishes of Scotland, but found answering echoes in every corner of the globe. This year is the quater-centenary of another famous Scot—George Buchanan; and the University of St. Andrews, of which he was an alumnus in his youth, and in which he held the distinguished office of Principal of St. Leonard's College in his maturity, issued to the country and the learned world in the beginning of the year an invitation to celebrate the event there in the month of July. The occasion was an interesting one, and speeches were delivered by men of eminence, well able to do justice to the subject; but the echoes from other countries, and even in this country, have been few and faint in comparison with those which replied to the summons to commemorate John Knox.

This contrast is not only an illustration of how in the course of centuries reputations may wax or wane, but is also a sign of the times. Once the name of Buchanan stood at least as high as that of Knox in the land of their birth, and was far better known in foreign parts. Indeed, for two centuries after the deaths of both, Buchanan was the more outstanding figure, Dr. Johnson declaring him to be the only man of European reputation whom Scotland had ever produced. But Buchanan's name may be said to have steadily waned from the time when the Latin language ceased to be the medium through which academic instruction was communicated, while John Knox, on the contrary, has, since about the same date, continued to rise

THE UNITY OF ISAIAH.*

BY REV. PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D. D.

The importance of this book for our times is indicated by its title. This, however, is only suggestive. Its authorship is indicative of its value in a far more satisfactory way. Many defences of the Bible are undertaken by well-meaning but incompetent authors, and are often worse than valueless. Very few ministers or even professors of theology could undertake to answer the criticisms of Driver or Cheyne, for instance, for the reason that very few are specialists on the subjects with which they deal. In Professor Margoliouth, a colleague in the same great University of Oxford, we have a specialist of specialists, who not only knows all the materials with which these and other higher critics have constructed their theories, but who goes beyond them as a specialist in one particular line of great importance in the decision of the questions under discussion. One who knows nothing about Arabic would be guilty of great presumption if he were to undertake to decide as to who was the greatest Arabic scholar in the world; yet, the most unlearned of us might feel pretty sure that a man who was very far below that point of attainment would not be likely to occupy the chair of Laudian Professor of Arabic in Oxford University.

In his preface, Professor Margoliouth tells us: "For much of the matter contained in the following pages, I am indebted to Arabic and Hebrew texts." He adds, that it is "now possible to treat the Old Testament as a part of Arabic literature, just as it has long been possible to treat Hebrew as a dialect of Arabic."

It would be impossible to give, in the space allowed for a book notice, the reasons given in this book for believing in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the Davidic authorship of the great bulk of the Psalms, the genuineness of Daniel and other books of the Old Testament; but a slight sketch of the argument for the unity of Isaiah may be allowed. The two chief grounds relied on by higher critics for the division of Isaiah, and the assigning of Chapters xl—lxvi to a deutero-Isaiah of post-exilian

*The Unity of Isaiah, from Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation. BY D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *Laudian Professor of Arabic, Oxford University*. Third Edition. Hodder and Stoughton.

times, are the occurrence of Aramaean words in this portion of the book and the calling of Cyrus by name.

As to the first, Professor Margoliouth holds that it would have been entirely possible, and indeed quite natural, for a writer of the time of Hezekiah, and even earlier, to use Aramaean words. He shows us that "in Deborah's song, which is assuredly a very early specimen of Hebrew, there occurs an Aramaism, 'Yethannu,' 'we shall celebrate,'" (Judges v. 11.) The fact is then referred to that Hezekiah's officers requested the Rabshakeh of Sennacherib not to speak to them in the Jew's language, lest the men on the walls of Jerusalem should hear and understand their colloquy, saying: "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it." On this the remark is made: "Hence, if Isaiah's oracles were full of Aramaic loan-words, we should have no occasion for surprise. The only Aramaic loan-words that prove anything are words that we can date; and when loan-words known to have been introduced into Aramaic later than 700 B. C. are found in any part of Isaiah, it will be time to pay them due respect."

The opinion of the higher critics that Isaiah could not have foretold the fall of Babylon, and could not have known the name of the king who was to take it, more than a century and a half before the occurrence of the event, would be very reasonable on the supposition that he was not divinely inspired. But, as Professor Margoliouth remarks: "In the case of prophecy we have to deal with a class of literature unrepresented anywhere but in Israel;" and to deny Isaiah's ability to predict these events, is to deny that he was really a prophet, and to imply that the account of his call in the sixth chapter, when he saw our Lord's glory and spoke of him, was not true. It is indeed true that the calling of the name of Cyrus is a mark of particularity and definiteness unusual in prophetic predictions; but it should be remembered that special attention is called to the reason of this in the prophecy itself. The reason is this: "That thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which *call thee by thy name*, am the God of Israel. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even *called thee by thy name*: I have *surnamed thee* though thou hast not known me." (Isaiah xlv. 3, 4.) In this great crisis of Israel's history this miracle of foreknowledge and divine power over the greatest of kings is brought out again and again.

Has not this something to do with the fact that this people, always inclined to idolatry before, regarded it with abhorrence ever after that? This amazing fact in their history is no slight indication that this is a real prophecy by the real Isaiah, and only Isaiah. No post-exilian forgery could have produced such a stupendous change. Again and again, the great contrast is drawn between the false gods and Jehovah who had thus foretold the deliverance from Babylon: "They have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, that pray unto a god that cannot save." "Who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? *Have not I, the Lord? and there is no God else besides me; the first God and a Saviour; there is none beside me.*"—(Isaiah xlv. 20, 21.)

Having seen that there is no good reason for the partitioning of the prophecy on this or any other of the schemes suggested by critics, and for assigning the last twenty-seven chapters to a deutero-Isaiah, or to a number of post-exilic authors, let us turn to Professor Margoliouth's reasons for believing in the unity of Isaiah. For all who believe in the plenary inspiration of the New Testament its testimony is sufficient. But, unfortunately, many modern scholars are unwilling to accept this testimony as final. So this treatise goes out to meet the critics on their own ground and presents not only the unbroken tradition of all ages of the unity of the prophecy and the authorship of the Isaiah who prophesied in the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, but presents the proofs of the unity of the book from the book itself. Little but a succinct summary can be given. The summary is this:

1. External evidence.
2. The division at the end of chapter thirty-nine leads on to many other divisions.
3. The geographical references of Isaiah compared with those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.
4. The idolatrous practices referred to in the latter as in the earlier portion, not in accordance with post-exilian conditions.
5. The crimes condemned in the last portion the same as those condemned in the first, and could not have belonged to the post-exilian period.
6. Personal details.
7. The second portion has words peculiar to the first, in the peculiar meaning in the first.

8. The second has the same scientific and technical vocabulary as the first.

It would be impossible, of course, in a brief review, to present the evidence arranged under all these heads. To give a hint of what is contained under two or three of them, along with more general reasons for belief in the unity of the prophecy, is all that can be done. The sins of the people referred to and rebuked by the prophet in the latter part of the book, appear to be the same sins as are reprov'd in the earlier part, and in the very first chapter. The ungodly living, which made the worship of the people unacceptable to God, as shown in the first chapter, seems to be of the same character as that rebuked in the fifty-ninth, for instance. It would hardly have been said of them in their humbled and chastened condition at the end of the exile, "Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood." (lix. 7). Their "transgressing and lying against (denying, A. R. V.) the Lord, and departing away from our God," (lix. 13,) can hardly belong so well to the time when idolatry had been entirely given up, as to the time when no influence was sufficient to wean them from it. The charge of drunkenness in lvi. 10-12, recalls the same made in v. 22. Our author remarks: "That the same impeachment could be made with justice at such different periods as the time of the first Isaiah and the close of the exile, or commencement of the return, seems unthinkable." But stranger still would it be to hear the prophet inveighing against mysterious heathenish idolatries among the people at the close of the exile, as we find him doing in lvii. 5 f. "Ye inflame yourselves among the oaks, under every green tree"—and of infanticide in this worship—"that slay the children in the valleys, under the clefts of the rocks."—(A. R. V.)

The use of the word translated "oaks" in the A. R. V., and "idols" in A. V., suggests other bonds, which unite the two parts of the prophecy. The use of the familiar word "*elim*" here, in a sense so peculiar as to defy intelligent translation, is in reference to the same thing referred to in i. 29: "For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which they have desired." The word *gan-noth*, gardens, occurs in the same connection, and in both parts of the book. Another word, *Nashath*, is used in a peculiar sense in both parts of the book, (Isa. xix. 5, and xlii. 17.) Professor Margoliouth remarks: "Both parts of Isaiah are acquainted

with a verb *nashath* or *nasath*, meaning "to be dry," and, in all probability, identical with a very familiar Arabic word meaning the same." The fact that Jeremiah, at the beginning of the exile uses the same word, (Jer. xviii. 14), but in a different sense, leads to the conclusion that its earlier meaning had by that time been forgotten, but it is used in the earlier sense in both parts of Isaiah.

Another of these words is *Shachar*, in Arabic, "black art." This word is used in both parts of Isaiah, (Isa. viii. 20, and xlvi. 11.) The use of this familiar Arabic word, unused elsewhere in the Scriptures, "seems to me to be a striking mark of identity of period." "Moreover, if the second Isaiah had borrowed the phrase from the first, we could scarcely imagine him handling it so freely as to make a denominative verb from it." The force of this last remark will be felt, I think, by any one who will examine the Hebrew. The use of the peculiar word *noses* (Isa. x. 18, and lix. xix.) is another link. Here our author remarks: "No one save Isaiah appears to know anything of the worship connected with *yannoth* and *elim*, or to know the meaning of the words *nashath*, *shachar* or *noses*." The author of chapters xl.-lxvi., he remarks, claims to be the writer of the earlier part of the prophecy, "and when questioned on these five matters, turns out to know all about them. Whence, it would appear that his claim is just." (p. 131.)

There are some more general reasons which lead Professor Margoliouth to disbelieve in the existence of a second Isaiah. "That two authors of stupendous merit might accidentally get bound up together, and so the works of the second be attributed to the first, is exceedingly unlikely, but not so unlikely as to be impossible. In the case of Isaiah, however, not only is the example of the minor prophets decidedly against it, but that of Ezra and Nehemiah still more so. Owing to the similarity of the subjects of which they treat, they appear in several canons under the single head of Ezra; but the Jews, though they probably often bound them up together, never confused them." "The first dissection," he also remarks, "leads to innumerable others." We know that this has been the rather ludicrous result of sawing Isaiah asunder. A division into some forty parts is needed to satisfy the rapacity of some critics.

How unreasonable is the theory of such a division of a book

which has, until a comparatively recent date, been recognized by all the world, Jews and Gentiles, as the prophecy of Isaiah, is set forth in the following sarcastic strain. Referring to this age-long acceptance of the book by the whole world, Professor Margoliouth says:

“But that was a childish mistake. What it really had was a patchwork of scraps produced by a number of obscure individuals, so insignificant that posterity thought their names unworthy of record, or so dishonest that they dared not avow them. It is a cento of scraps of that sort that humiliated the literature of Greece and Rome and won Europe for Christ.”

This imperfect sketch of a notable book cannot properly be concluded without drawing attention to the author's view of the enormity of the crime of a second Isaiah, if such there could have been: “It must be perceived that the author of chapters xl-lxvi is either a prophet or a great rogue and impostor. The mention by him of the name of Cyrus (xlv) is declared to be a tremendous miracle wrought in order that the whole world, from East to West, might know that Jehovah was the mighty God.” This is repeated and insisted on again and again, as the reader of Isaiah sees, and the crime of a forger, who should do this after the event he pretended to have foretold long before, would be one to make an ordinary criminal stand aghast at its heaven-daring enormity. We cannot believe the words “as Esaias saith” could be used in the New Testament in reference to the words of such a reprobate as a post-exilic second Isaiah would assuredly have been. After laying in the balances all that his great colleagues and the other higher critics claim for the division of the prophecy of Isaiah, Professor Margoliouth finds it utterly wanting. It should encourage us who may not be able to fully understand, and much less to answer in detail their learned arguments to hear one who can so ably do both, saying: “Is there, then, nothing in the splitting theories? To my mind, nothing at all.”

BETHESDA, MD.