Two Isaiahs, Or One?

Rev. William Henry Cobb

The subject of the unity of the Book of Isaiah may be discussed as a purely philological question. One of the advantages of this method is that it brings the controversy to an arena common to all parties. There exists at present, as is well known, a radical disagreement among biblical scholars as to the authorship of chapters 40–65. (to say nothing of certain portions in chapters 1–39.); and it cannot be doubted that much ammunition has been wasted on either side by the failure of the parties to come to a decisive action in this common arena. When, for example, a Christian believer takes the ground that inasmuch as the New Testament ascribes to Isaiah passages from the disputed chapters, he will defend the integrity of the book at all hazards, it is plain that the "mere critic" can never dislodge him from that position. He has intrenched himself behind a rampart which (from the stand-point of philology simply) would be called a theological bias. When, on the other hand, an unbeliever asserts *a priori* that it is impossible for a writer who died one hundred and fifty years before the Babylonian captivity to have made that period his present,

and sustained the assumed part with entire verisimilitude, through twenty-seven chapters of prophecy, this unbeliever is perfectly secure behind his anti-theological bias. Philology may present evidence, in the case before us, favoring either the unity or diversity of authorship; but philology deals with probabilities, and her weapons are not strong enough to carry either of the opposing fortresses. Each army stands on impregnable ground, and so neither can conquer the other. The present Article does not propose to compare the respective strength of these intrenchments, but (after the manner of the so-called later Isaiah) to invite all parties to the open field for a trial of arms. Whether the two main portions of what we now call the Book of Isaiah so resemble each other in language and style as to indicate" that they came from the same hand, or so differ as to point to the contrary conclusion, is a matter to be discussed with as little solicitude for consequences as though it were a question in Sanscrit or Norse literature. When, however, we speak of an investigation in point of language and style, we are coupling a simple subject with a very complex one. Men of excellent judgment and undoubted candor differ so radically on questions of style that as soon as a comparison on this basis between the first and second Isaiah is suggested we find them fortifying again. All agree, it is true, that there are great differences of style between the last twenty-seven chapters and the residue of the book; but while one party considers these too great to be consistent with the theory of Isaian authorship, the other party accounts for them by supposing the prophet to have written the last section in his old age, not intending it for oral delivery, and by pointing out similar differences in style between the chapters acknowledged to be genuine. Occasionally a writer will appear unconsciously on both sides of this dispute; as Ewald, who maintains a diversity of style between the two sections, and consequently of authorship, but who makes the chief distinctive characteristic of "the great Unnamed" identical with that which he had previously assigned to Isaiah. It is obvious that if the subject before us

be debated on grounds of style alone, it is not likely to be settled soon. A question of style is largely a question of taste and sentiment; to accuse one's adversary of an utter lack of critical feeling, an inability to appreciate either resemblances or differences, is easy; much easier than to invent a *stylometer* for determining how far an author may differ from himself without loss of personal identity. Not to rest in the familiar dictum, *de gustibus non est disputandum,* it is worth while to inquire whether the dispute be not

more likely to reach a satisfactory conclusion if confined to the *language* of the documents in question. We grant at once that the enumeration of an author's vocabulary no more gives us the full expression of his thought than the accumulation of bones and muscles gives us a living man. But something must be granted on the other side. All will agree that language is far from being a constant quantity. In every literature the vocabulary of one age differs both from that which precedes and from that which follows it. Words being the current coin of the realm, some pieces become so worn as to be handled only by antiquaries, others are from time to time struck newly from the mint. Moreover, at one and the same period different writers vary widely in the extent of their vocabulary, just as some citizens are richer than others. The language of an author thus becomes to some degree characteristic of him. In the Isaian controversy much use has been made of this fact on both sides; lists of words and phrases peculiar to each section are massed upon the negative, and offset by parallelisms; the process reminding us of the famous Hebraist and Purist controversy respecting the Greek of the New Testament. A writer in the American edition of Smith's Bible Dictionary mentions the "formidable proportions "to which the array of linguistic evidence in proof of a diversity of authorship has grown within a century, and takes refuge, like the Darwinians, in the imperfection of the record; the meagreness of extant Hebrew literature. But is not this a somewhat weak appeal to our ignorance? Would it hot serve the cause of truth

better to welcome all such patient investigations, and to inquire whether there may not be sufficient evidence on the other side, despite the imperfect record, to establish the unity of Isaiah on linguistic grounds? Such an inquiry, so far as appears, has never been thoroughly prosecuted.

About two years ago, the present writer made a verbal examination of Isa. 40:1–11, noting agreements and disagreements with the earlier chapters. Becoming interested in the work, he went on to prepare from the Concordance a Hebrew index of chapters 40, in which not only were references given by chapter and verse to both parts of Isaiah, but all the authorities for each word were indicated by classes, on a plan to be presently mentioned. Exception was made of proper names, and also of words so common at all periods as to be valueless for the purpose designed. No attempt was made to summarize results till the index was finished; the writer being ready to follow the light wherever it might lead. The more important of these results, as thus ascertained, are given herewith.

The next step was to go through the Concordance (Vade Mecum) page by page, and gather the eight following items: the whole number of words in the language (exclusive only of proper names); number occurring in the first part of Isaiah; number in the second part; number common to both; whole number used by the prophets; number in the earlier prophets; number in the later; number in no prophet except the second part of Isaiah. The number -of words on each page was verified, by counting twice in opposite directions, and the addition of all the tabulated columns was proved in like manner. A solid basis was thus gained, it is hoped, for a scientific comparison between the two vocabularies in question.

But several objections at once present themselves against the value of such results. It will be claimed, for example, that this method assumes the unity and genuineness of Isaiah 1–39: throughout, while large portions of these chapters are suspected.

Reply: modern critics suspect less than a fifth part of the thirty-nine chapters; hence these portions cannot much affect our results, unless we draw our parallels from them in too great proportion; which it will be found is not the case. Besides, if we should put them in the same category with chapters 40–66., the theory of Isaian unity would gain as much as it would lose; for we should then be obliged to note the resemblances between these suspected portions and those admitted to be genuine. We do not put them in the same category with the latter chapters, because there is no such manifest unity in these fragments as in that section, and because far less has been said, and fewer critics united, in support of the view that the

detached portions are spurious, than in support of a later Isaiah for the last twenty-seven chapters. If it proves that the historical Isaiah was *not* the author of chapters 40–66., these earlier portions may deserve a separate examination; if he *was* the author of the above section, no one will deny that he wrote the fragments also.

It may be objected again, that, in the Vade Mecum, Chaldee words are mingled with the Hebrew, and thus an undue prominence is given to the vocabulary of the later writers.

Reply: while these words ought to be given in any full presentation of the Old Testament vocabulary, they are quite indecisive of the question before us. Their absence from chapters 60–66 would prove nothing as to the author's identity with Isaiah, for the language of Ezekiel, who wrote at Babylon during the Captivity, is free from them, while that of Jeremiah, who remained at Jerusalem, contains them by the dozen.

One more objection may as well be met now. It is that we know really very little about the age of any Old Testament documents in the form we now have them. The latest critics claim that all the historical books were revised and their phraseology altered as late at least as the time of Ezra.

Reply: not even the foremost adherents of the school of Graf would claim that his views are so generally adopted as

to have become established science. One incidental result of this Article, it is believed, will be to confirm the justice of the classification by periods which was adopted provisionally at the outset of the writer's investigations. Accuracy is not claimed for this grouping of the Old Testament writers into classes, but it may serve some good purpose in paving the way for a better division.

Let us then designate the first four books of the Bible as class *a.* We say nothing about their author (or authors) nor about their date; all we claim is that these books so resemble each other in language that they may form a class by themselves. Omitting Deuteronomy for the present, we find a new section possessing marked resemblances, extending from Joshua to 2 Samuel, inclusive; with this we group the two first books of Psalms, and call the whole, class *b.* The third class, *c,* comprises most of the prophets, viz. Isaiah (1 –39.), Jeremiah, Hosea to Zephaniah; also the two books of Kings, Proverbs, Lamentations, and the third book of Psalms. Another class embraces the books commonly allowed to be latest in composition (I name them in the order of the English Bible):1 Chronicles to Esther, Psalms (fifth book), Song of Solomon, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai to Malachi. This leaves a few books to form a class by themselves, viz. Deuteronomy, Job, Psalms (fourth book), Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah 40–66. As a rule, those critics who would assign an early origin to one of these would say the same of all; others would give them all a late date. Hence this may be called the doubtful class; and since the letter *d* stands for *doubtful,* and also for *Deuteronomy,* while *e* stands for *Ezekiel, Ezra,* and *Esther,* it will help the memory to call the class before us class *d,* and the previous one, class *e.* This classification may go for what it is worth; it has at least the merit of convenience when one wishes to group roughly by periods a large number of occurrences of any word. The number of times the word appears in each class is placed above the letter in small figures; thus, אדֹנָי *a*[18], *b*[7], c[16], *d*[2], *e*[1]: The reader will

carefully discriminate between this theoretical division and the facts about to be stated.

The problem before us is to see whether the latter section of Isaiah can be taken out of class *d,* and assigned, according to the evidence, to either *c* or *e,* these being the only two classes embracing prophetical books; or whether the balance be so evenly poised that we must leave the work as we found it. For the sake of brevity we will henceforth designate the author of Isaiah 1–39. by the term A; and the author of Isaiah 40–66. by the term B. Does B belong to class *c* or *e;* and if to class c, is he identical with A? We find the vocabulary of A to be an uncommonly rich one; out of 6226 words (exclusive of proper names) in

the Hebrew Bible, he employs 1828. Many of these are peculiar to himself; but most of them occur in other writers of all periods. Now even if A and B are the same, we should by no means expect their vocabularies to be the same; for no writer uses the same words on different occasions. If, for example, we were to take the thirty-nine chapters of A, and divide them in two, we should find a decided difference in the words of the two halves (the third chapter alone containing numerous ἅπαξ λεγόμενα); we should find, however, enough marked resemblances in words to justify us in assigning both parts to the same author. By parity of reasoning, if A and B are one, we ought to find their vocabularies different, and yet more nearly alike than the *average* agreement between A and other writers. Can we ascertain that average? Apparently it is an easy task. The figures just given show us that, to speak in round numbers, out of every *ten* words in the language, A uses three. If we open the Concordance at random, and count ten words, about three of them on an average will be found in the first Isaiah. The writer B employs in all 1311 words. If he has no connection with A, we should expect to find about three tenths of these words in A's vocabulary.

But we can gain a closer approximation than this, for B, whoever he is, *does* have some connection with A. He is

at least a prophet. Now the vocabulary of the prophets undoubtedly differs from that of the narrative portions, and from that the poems; we ought therefore to compare B's words not with the entire language but with that portion of it used by the prophets, and this would permit our nameless B to use a greater fraction of A's words without the suspicion of any intercourse between them. The difference is not so great as many would suppose between the words found in the prophets and the whole number; the former comprise 4176 words; or two thirds of the whole. We have then the following proportion: 4176 : 1311 :: 1828 : 574.

The fourth term expresses the *average* number of A's words which would be found by selecting 1311 words at random from the prophets. Bearing in mind now that the prophets Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi belong to class e, we should expect, if B is to be classed with them, that his vocabulary would contain *fewer* of A's words than the average; if however he belongs in class c, he would use *more* than the average. Let us now differentiate this problem more precisely.

From the 4176 words used by the-prophets we must first deduct 194 which are found (among the prophets) only in B; this leaves 3982 words used by other prophets. 2868 of these, by count, occur in the prophets before the Captivity. Deduct this last number from the one preceding, and we have 1114 words in the later prophets and not in the earlier. The *whole* number in the later prophets, by count is 2491; from this take the previous number, and we have a remainder of 1377, which is the number of words common to both classes. It thus appears that about 54 per cent of the words found in the later prophets are also found in the earlier. If B is to be added to class e, that is, if the author of Isaiah 40.-66. wrote at Babylon near the time of Cyrus, we ought to find about half of his words among the earlier prophets. Or, stating again by the rule of three: 2491 : 1311 :: 1374 : 724. That is, as the whole number of words in the later prophets is to the whole number in the assumed additional

one, B, so is that part of the first term found in the earlier prophets to that part of the second term which should be found in the earlier prophets. Once more; what portion of these 724 words, scattered through the earlier prophets, would be found in the single book we have termed A? It ought to be somewhat in the proportion which As vocabulary bears to that of all the earlier prophets. Hence, 2868 : 1828 :: 724 : 474. This result agrees with our expectations before stated; the average of coincident words is reduced by 100 when we confine our attention to the *later* prophets. If then there is any virtue in averages, we may presume that in case B belongs to class e, from 400 to 550 of his words will be found in A, (the average being 474); if the number common to both much exceeds our former average of 574 it will be an indication that he

belongs in class c.

Now it is not a little curious that of the 1311 words in B's vocabulary, there are, by actual count, just 474 which are *not* found in A; the remainder, 837, being common to both. This latter figure is largely in excess of what would be necessary to establish an improbability that our nameless author flourished in the time of the Captivity; the improbability, so far as this line of argument goes, becomes overwhelming. By taking the above supposition, we have been led to a conclusion which is numerically contradicted by the facts. We lay no stress, however, upon the *exactitude* of this result. It is, of course, only a coincidence, though a very singular one. The main point is in the decided reversal of the proportions expected; our hypothesis comes out in a *reductio ad absurdum.* How is it, now, with the other hypothesis? Suppose B belongs to the earlier period of prophetic literature; how many of his words should we look for in A's vocabulary? Since A himself belongs to the same period we can answer this by means of a single proportion. As the whole number of words in the early prophets is to the whole number in B, so is that portion of the first term found in A to that portion of the second term which should be found in A. 2868 : 1311 :: 1828 : 839, the number of words we ought to find

common to both parts of our Isaiah. Here is a second coincidence, entirely independent of the first, and pointing to the same conclusion. While almost equally remarkable in itself, it becomes really startling when compared with that before ascertained. When the writer obtained these results, he could scarcely convince himself that there was not some reciprocal relation between the two processes — something like the expressions x and $a—x,$ one of which is necessarily the complement of the other. Not only can no such connection be traced, but it cannot exist, for the two sets of results are not quite interchangeable. The first method gives 474 words common to A and B, and 837 peculiar to B; which is precisely the reverse of the truth, and therefore indicates the falsity of one hypothesis and the correctness of its opposite. The second method gives 839 common and 472 peculiar, which is correct within two units, and therefore indicates again the truth of this opposite hypothesis. The double coincidence has ten-fold the force which would belong to either of the single coincidences; it is like the fixing of a geographical point by the intersection of its latitude with its longitude. As to both resemblances and diversities between A and B, we find just what we should expect if the latter lived before the Captivity, and just what we should not expect if he lived during or after that period.

Let us not forget, however, that philology deals only with probabilities. Those who hold that the writer B was contemporary with Cyrus have three possible replies.

First he may have consciously imitated the language of A. This has often been said in the progress of the controversy; but in view of the fact now discovered that he would have been obliged to imitate that language just enough, and vary from it just enough, to correspond with the average not of his own class but of class c, this position can hardly be maintained with sincerity by any candid mind. It must take its place with the exploded theory that Mark wrote an abridgment of Matthew. 'The second reply is more plausible. B may have been so familiar with the prophecies of A, so fed

his soul upon them, that his very vocabulary became unconsciously saturated with them to such a degree that the great majority of his words are identical with A's, while a considerable fraction are not. But the prophet B was too original a writer for this hypothesis of saturation. This is not a weapon taken from the forbidden arsenal of "style"; the prosaic method of counting has shown us that out of his 1311 words, 194 are found in no other prophet. Add to these the 837 found in Isaiah (A), and there remains only about a fifth part which he could either have borrowed from the other prophets who preceded him, and the two or three who were his contemporaries (if we call him a prophet of the exile), or transmitted to the two or three who followed him. We shall presently find that he must have become saturated not only with the words of a

single prophet, but with the entire literature of period c, so that his language is minutely characteristic, not only of A, but of the *ten* prophets from Hosea to Jeremiah, while it distinctly fails to be characteristic of his own era. From the stand-point of philology simply, it is easier to believe that a writer has taken his subject a hundred and fifty years into the future, keeping his vocabulary in the present, than that he has treated a subject of present interest with a vocabulary a hundred and fifty years old. It is a light thing if the substance (the thought) go down ten degrees; it is a miracle if the shadow (the word) return backward ten degrees. We need not spend time upon the third reply, which would account for the verbal resemblances between A and B by a similarity in their subjects, modes of thought, points of view, etc., for the apparent *dissimilarity* in these respects is precisely what has started modern scholars upon the quest of a later Isaiah. At least, philology need allege no other motive.

It will now be needful (and perhaps more agreeable to the reader) to abandon the mere grouping of numbers, and occupy ourselves with the words themselves. Obviously, the fewer times a word is used by different writers, the more important is it for our purpose. The commonest words in a lan-

guage, being used in all ages, give no clue as to the date of any writing; but if some forgotten English poet were exhumed to-day, he might be easily assigned, by his use of rare words, to the age of Milton, of Pope, or of Cowper. In such discussions as the present it should ever be remembered that a man is known by the company he keeps. If a word is found *only* in the prophet B, we have no test to apply to it; but the most valuable words for this examination are those occurring in B, and just once elsewhere. There are fifty such words, as given in the following table.

TABLE 1: "Words found only once, except in Isaiah B.

אֶגְרוֹף	(1)	Isa. 58:4	Ex. 21:18
אַפְסִי	(2)	47:8, 10	Zeph. 2:15
אָצִיל	(3)	41:9	Ex. 24:11
גָּדוּף	(4)	43:28; 51:7	Zeph. 2:8
גִילָה	(5)	65:18	Isa. 35:2
דֳמִי	(6)	62:6-7,	Ps. 83:2
זדל	(7)	46:6	Lam. 1:8
רוע	(8)	61:11	Lev. 11:37
חֲצַן	(9)	42:22	Isa. 11:8
חֶמְלָה	(10)	63:9	Gen. 19:16
חֹצֶן	(11)	49:22	Neh. 5:13
חַרְצֻב	(12)	58:6	Ps. 73:4

טָלֶן	(13) 65:25	1 Sam. 7:9
טָפַּה	(14) 48:13	Lam. 2:12
יָבָל	(15) 44:4	Isa. 30:25
יָמַד	(16) 61:6	Jer. 2:11
כַּדְכֹד	(17) 54:12	Ezek. 27:16
כָּוה	(18) 43:2	Prov. 6:28
לוא	(19) 48:18; 63:19	1 Sam. 14:30
מִמְסָךְ	(20) 65:11	Prov. 23:30
מְנוּסָה	(21) 12	Lev. 26:36
מַעֲצָד	(22) 44:12	Jer. 10:3
מַקֶּבֶת	(23) 1	Judges 4:21
נָדָה	(24) 66:5	Amos 6:3
נָהַר	(25) 60:5	Ps. 34:6
נַעֲצוּח	(26) 55:13	Isa. 7:19

נָשַׁף	(27) Isa. 40:24	Ex. 15:10
סָבַן	(28) 40:20	Ec150:50:9
עזוז	(29) 43:17	Ps. 24:8
עַכָּבִישׁ	(30) 59:5	Job 8:14
עָנָג	(31) 58:13	Isa. 13:22
עָצְמָה	(32) 40:29; 47:9	Nah. 3:9
פוּרָה	(33) 63:3	Hag. 2:16
פֶּתָס	(34) 44:12; 54:16	Prov. 26:21

פִּיפִיּוֹת	(35) 41:15	Ps. 149:6
פּט	(36) 66:19	Num. 21:29
פֶּס	(37) 40:12	Prov. 16:11
צִיר	(38) 45:16	Ps. 49:15
צָלָה	(39) 44:16, 19	1 Sam. 2:15
צָרַח	(40) 42:13	Zeph. 1:14
קְרָבָה	(41) 58:2	Ps. 73:28
קשַׁח	(42) 63:17	Job 39:16
רָקַב	(43) 40:20	Prov. 10:7
שׁד	(44) 16; 66:11	Job 24:9
שׁוּר	(45) 57:9	Ezek. 27:25
שְׁבוֹל	(46) 47:8-9,	Ps. 35:12
שַׁחַ	(47) 65:11	Ps. 9:18
שָׁרָב	(48) 49:10	Isa. 35:7
תַּעֲלוּלִיס	(49) 66:4	Isa. 3:4
תַּרְלָה	(50) 51. 17, 22	Ps. 9:5

Arranging this last column in the order of the English Bible, and following, as fairness requires, the common division of the Psalter into five books, we group the fifty words as follows:

Genesis [1], Exodus [3], Leviticus [2], Numbers 1, Judges 1, I Samuel [3], Nehemiah [1], Job [3], Psalms 1:[4], Psalms n. [2], Psalms 1:[3], Psalms II: [2], Proverbs [5], Ecclesiastes ,[1] Isaiah (A) [7], Jeremiah [2], Lamentations [2], Ezekiel [2], Amos 1, Nahum [1], Zephaniah [3], Haggai [1].

Or, distributing by classes, as already explained: a [7], b [10], c [24], d [4], e [5].

It thus appears that about half of these rarest words occur in class c, and only a tenth part in class *e*. These two classes are of nearly equal extent. My Hebrew Bible con-

tains 1383 pages. Class *a* occupies 286 pages, *b* 248, *c* 352, *d* 158, and *e* 339. The point to be noticed now is that every writer must use language intelligible to the people of his own time. The rarest words of any one age soon become obsolete as time moves on; not even reverence for sacred books can keep them current. An impassioned preacher of our day would not use, unless in formal quotation, such phrases as "earing-

time," or "all to-brake his scull," or "I know nothing by myself" (i.e. against himself). The more thoroughly he was saturated with the Bible, the more careful he would be to be comprehended by his audience. Is it likely, then, that of these fifty rarest words in our unknown B, 48 per cent should be found in class c, and only 10 per cent in class e, if the writer belonged to the latter class? Of course it is *possible,* but philology deals with probabilities, and has already raised a high probability that B is to be classed under *c.* Can we identify him with any of the prophets known to belong to this class? Of these Jeremiah uses two of the words in our table (besides two more in the Lamentations), Zephaniah three, Amos and Nahum one each, Isaiah (A) *seven.* The three correspondences in Zephaniah become important, in view of the shortness of that prophecy; but Zephaniah is famous for reproducing the ideas and language of his predecessors. He borrows especially from Isaiah, as a glance at the margin of our English Bible will show; — the resemblance is much closer in the Hebrew. Now it is certainly remarkable that in each of these three correspondences not only is a single word the same, but similar thoughts are expressed. One of the two must be quoting from the other. Where did Zephaniah find the word אֶפֶס ? אַפְסִי is common, but it occurs with י paragogic only in the texts cited. B says, "Hear now this, thou that art given to pleasures, that dwellest carelessly, that sayest in thine heart, I am, and there is none beside me;….desolation shall come upon thee suddenly." Zephaniah says: "*This is* the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me; how is she

become a desolation." Is it not plain which of these is taken from the other? One can almost see the quotation marks. Evident, also, in the Hebrew, is the parallelism between Isa. 42:13 and Zeph. 1:14; notice, too, the coupling of a common with the rare word of the same meaning and in the same order, in Isa. 51:7 and Zeph. 2:8. The case, then, stands thus: in the book we now call Isaiah, seven words occur once each in parts A and B, and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. These are not found in quotations, but independently. Three more words occur in part B, once each in Zephaniah, and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. As found in Zephaniah they are apparently reminiscences of B; moreover, Zephaniah who lived before the exile quotes largely from A. Hence the writers A and B must have been (to say the least) very intimately connected. The two correspondences in Jeremiah are quite obscured in the Authorized Version, but interesting in the original; let the careful student determine if Jeremiah also has not quoted these ideas from our nameless B.

It will now be said, perhaps, that the language of the writer B may after all belong to the time of the Captivity; it may be found that a majority of his rare words occur in that period, though they do not happen to be met with once only. If this hypothesis is true we should expect to find a greater number of B's rare words in class *e* alone than in class *c* alone. We therefore subject our author to this new test. It is needless, probably, to take space to give chapter and verse for the parallels, which can easily be ascertained from the Concordance.

Table II.

Words (not in Table I.) found in only one class out of Isaiah B, with the number of their occurrences.

אָרַר (1) Isa. 42:21 and *a*^{2}

אַסִּיר (2) 42:7 and A^2

בָּעָה (3) 64:4 and c^4 (of which A^3)

גַּלמוד (4) 49:21 and *d*^{3}

(5) 47:5 and c^2 דּוֹמָס

(6) 41:19; 55:13 and e^4 הֲדַס

(7) Isa. 47:11 and c^2 הֹוָח

(8) 40:29; 1:4 and b^2 יְף

(9) 44:5; 45:4 and d^2 בָּנָה

(10) 40:2 and d^2 כֶּפֶל

(11) 47:9, 12 and c^4 כְּשָׁפִיס

(12) 4, 4; 54:13 and c^3 (A^1)   לְמוּד

(13) 54:14 and c^{10} מחִתָּה

(14) 58:4 and e^2 צֵה

(15) 44:12 and c^2 מַקָּבָה

(16) 58:7 and c^2 מָרוּד

(17) 42:22, 24 and c^4 מְשִׁסָּה

(18) 66:2 and 5^2 נָכֶה

(19) 44:15 and c^2 נָשַׂק

(20) 41:17 and c^2 (A^1)   נָשַׁת

(21) 45:14 and c^2 סָתָר

(22) 47:1 and d^2 עָנֹג

(23) 47:1 and d^2 עָקֹב

(24) 41:7 and c^2 פְּטִישׁ

פִּשְׁתָּה (25) 42:3; 43:17 and a^2

צֵב (26) 66:20 and a^2

צְלִי (27) 44:16 and a^2

צַמָּה (28) 47:2 and e^3

צֵעָה (29) 51:14; 63:1 and c^8

צִפְצוֹנִי (30) 59:5 and c^3 (A^1)

קֵהּ (31) 65:10 and c^3 (A^1)

רֹק (32) 1. 6 and d^2

שׁוֹבֵב (33) 57:17 and c^3

תַּאַר (34) 44:13, and b^6

An analysis of this table gives the following result. Of the thirty-four words class *a* has 4, b^3, c^{19}, d^5, e^3. Of the 19 in c, A has 7, a larger number than is found in any whole class except c. The smallest instead of the largest number is in class *e.* If we count the whole number of occurrences, we find 139. Taking out the 43 in B, the remainder are distributed as follows: a^8, b^{10}, c^{58} (A^{10}), d^{11}, e^9. Combining the two tables we find that of the 84 rarest words in B (aside from ἅπαξ λεγόμενα), A has 14, just a sixth, a far greater number than any other writer, while there are only 8 in the whole

class *e.* That is, nearly twice as many of these rarest words are found in the. 44 pages of A, as in the 339 pages of *e.* Class *c* alone embraces more than half of the 84; classes *b* and c, which almost belong together, have two thirds of them. If B wrote in the time of the Captivity, his style must have been remarkably antiquated.

With one more remark, we will leave this list to speak for itself. It is that one of these words, אַסִּיר, is found only in A and B, and would have been given in Table I, but that it occurs *twice* instead of once in A. Of course its probative force is much increased by this repetition; it belongs with the previous list, showing us that there are eight instead of seven words in the Hebrew Bible found in both parts of our present Isaiah, and nowhere else. Four or five such coincidences would have formed no mean link between the parts; every additional one more than doubles the evidence of unity. An eight-fold cord will perhaps resist even the diremptive power of our modern exegetical Sampsons. But the testimony is not all in yet; — 84 is a small minority of the unusual words in B. What if the preponderance among the rest should belong to class e, although many of the same words belong in some other class too, and are hence excluded from the table just given? We address ourselves next to that question.

Table III.

Words found in only two classes out of Isaiah B, with the number of their occurrences.

בֵּר   (1)   Isa. 40:31 and b^1, e^1

אַגְמוֹן   (2)   58:5 and c^2, d^2 (A^2)

עִבָּר   (3)   61:5 and c^5, e^1

אַלְמָנוּת   (4)   54:4 and a^2, b^1

אֶפְעֶה   (5)   59:5 and c^1, d^1 (A^1)

אֲרוכה   (6)   58:8 and c^3, e^2

בַּר   (7)   44:25 and c^3, d^2 (A^1)

בֶּהָלָה   (8)   65:23 and a^1, c^2

בוּל   (9)   44:19 and c^1, d^1

יִצָּה   (10)   59:5, and c^1, d^3 (A^1)

בָּרִיחַ   (11)   Is A. 43:14 and c^1, d^1 (A^1)

גָּאַל   (12)   59:3; 63:3 and c^2, e^7

י   (13)   6; 51:23 and c^3, d^1 (A^1)

גֶּזַע   (14)   40:24 and c^1, d^1 (A^1)

גָּלוּת   (15)   45:13 and c^{11}, e^3 (A^1)

גְּמוּלָה   (16)   59:18 and b^1, c^1

דָּאַג   (17)   57:11 and b^3, c^3

דֹב   (18)   59:11 and b^4, c^7 (A^1)

דֶּבֶק   (19)   41:7 and c^1, e^1

דַּכָּא   (20)   57:15 and b^1, d^1

דַּק (21) 40:15 and a^{11}, c^2 (A^1)

הָדַר (22) 45:2; 63:1 and a ^{3}, c^2

הוֹי (23) 45:9, 10; 55:1 and c^{41}, e^7 (A^{18})

זִיז (24) 66:11 and b^1, c^1

זַל (25) 63:19; 64:12 and c^6, d^1

חָל (26) 53:3 and b^1 ,e^1

תוּג (27) 40:22 and c^1 , d^1

הַלְמִיש (28) 50:7 and d^3, e^1

תַּפְזוֹן (29) 12 and a^1, d^1

חָד (30) 66:2, 5 and b^2, e^2

טוּחַ (31) 44:18 and a^3, e^8

יָגַת (32) 51:23 and c^6, d^1

יָעֵף (33) 40:28, 30, 31; 44:12 and c^4, e^1

יָצֵע (34) 58:5 and c^1, e^2 (A^1)

יָרִיב (35) 49:25 and b^1 ,c^1

כֵּהֶה (36) 42:3; 61:3 and a^6, b^1

כִּיס (37) 46:6 and c^4, d^1

כֶּלֶא (38) 42:7, 22 and c^7, e^1

| (39) 51:6 and a ^{3}, e^1

כסות (40) 50:3 and a^8, d^4

כְּרִיתוּת (41) 50:1 and c^1 ,d^2

בֹּס (42) 61:5 and c^3, e^1

מַבּוּעַ (43) 49:10 and c^1, d^1 (A^1)

מְגוּרָה (44) 66:4 and b^1, e^l

מוֹרַג (45) 41:15 and b^1, e^1

מָחָא (46) 55:12 and d^1, e^1

מַחְמָד (47) 64:10 and c^7, e^5

מַשֶׁךָ (48) 42:16 and c^5, e^l (A^1)

מַטָּע (49) 60:21; 61:3 and c^1, e^3

מַלקוֹחַ (50) 49:24-25, and a^6, b^1

מַסֵּר (51) Isa. 42:7 and c^5, e^1 (A^1)

מַסֵּר (52) 41:7 and c^1, e^2

מִסְתָּר (53) 45:3 and b^4, c^5

מַעְגָּלָה (54) 59:8 and b^2, c^4

מַעֲמַקְּיס (55) 51. 10 and b^2 c^2

נָאָה (56) 52:7 and d^1, e^1

נוּס (57) 56:10 and c^3, e^2 (A^1)

נָזָה (58) 52:15; 63:3 and a^{21}, c^1

נחוּמִיס (59) 57:18 and c^1, e^l

נָטַל (60) 40:15; 63:9 and b^1, e^1

נָכוֹחַ (61) 57:2; 59:8, and b^1, c^5 (A^2)

נָסַג (62) 59:13-14, and c^5, d^2

צֶר (63) 60:21 and c^2, e^1 (A^2)

שַׁב (64) 40:7 and a^3, e^1

סְגְנִיס (65) 41:25 and c^3, e^{15}

סוּף (66) 66:17 and c^6, $e^{\,l}$

סוּפָה (67) 66:15 and c^{11} , d^3 (A^4)

סְעִיף (68) 57:5 and b^2, c^3 (A^3)

סָעַר (69) 54:11 and c^5, e^1

סָרָה (70) 59:13 and c^5, d^2 (A^3)

עֲזוּז (71) 42:25 and c^1, e^1

עַכְבָּר (72) 66:17 and a^1, b^5

עֲלוּמִיס (73) 54:4 and c^1, d^2

עֶלֶף (74) 20 and a^1, c^3

עָסִיס (75) 49:26 and c^3, e^1

עֹצֶב (76) 48:5 and c^1, e^2 (A^1)

עֹצֶר (77) 53:8 and c^1 , e^1

עָקַשׁ (78) 59:8 and c^3 d^1

פָּגוּל (79) 65:4 and a^2, e^1

פְּדוּת (80) 50:2 and a^1, e^2

פוּךְ (81) 54:11 and c^2, e^1

פוּק (82) 58:10 and c^4 , e^2

סָצַח (83) 44:23; 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; 55:12 and c^2, d^1 (A^1)

צֶאֱצָאֹס (84) 42:5; 44:3; 48:19; 61; 65, and c^2, d^4 (A^2)

קָדַח (85) 50:11; 64:1 and c^2, d^1

רָּגַע (86) 51:4, 15 and c^8, d^3 (A^1)

רָוֶה (87) 43:24; 55:10 and b^2, c^{10} (A^8)

רָוֶה (88) 58:11 and c^1, d^1

_____

רָז (89) Isa. 40:23 and b^2, c^3

רָל (90) 53:7 and a^2, e^1

שׂבְעָה (91) 55:2; 56:11 and c^1, e^3 (A^1)

שָׁאוֹן (92) 66:6 and b^3, c^{14} (A^7)

שִׂטָּח (93) 41:19 and a^{26}, d^1

שָׂסָה (94) 42:22 and b^5, c^6 (A^2)

שֹׁעַל (95) 40:12 and c^1, e^2

שָׁקֶּח (96) 66:17 and a^9, e^1

שִׁרְיָן (97) 59:17 and c^1, e^1

תַנְתוּמִיס (98) 66:11 and c^1, d^1

Summary. — a [19], b [25], c [74] (A 29), d [32], e [46], making 196, or twice the number of words, since each word appears in two classes. It should not surprise us that a larger proportion of words than hitherto is found in the class e, for each word in the table must be used in *two* different classes; if, for example, a writer in *c* has employed it, it might be repeated by a writer of the Captivity or of the Return. The significant fact is that so few of B's uncommon words are in any way *characteristic o*f that period. Our previous lists gave us only eight in 84. Now if we should concede the entire class *d* to the time of e, there would yet be only three out of the 98 words in Table 3. which *could* have arisen in that age, viz. numbers 28, 46, and 56. The remaining 95 words are all used in classes a, 6, and *c.* The theory of an Isaiah at Babylon demands that out of these 182 rarest words (ἀπαξλεγόμὲνα apart), only eleven at most, and probably fewer, are *peculiar* to his own

and subsequent times, while 128 of them are entirely absent. Whatever test we apply to this theory, it fails.

It may be asked why we do not examine the ἁπαξλεγόμὲνα. The reply is that it would be a needless task, and one involving great uncertainties. Disputes might arise at every step respecting the significance of parallel words in the cognate languages, and respecting the value of these parallelisms as evidence. Let the objector rather assail us on the ground we have chosen.

Turning to the Isaian theory, we find it strikingly con-

firmed, as usual, by Table 3. Three fourths of all the words are in class c, and forty per cent of that number are in A alone, whose pages comprise only one eighth part of the division *c.* Nor is this all. Some of these rare words are found in A several times each, which shows us that B uses favorite words of the former. See Nos. 23, 67, 92. The first of these (הוֹי is not a little remarkable, and forms another close link between A and B. Were the two Isaiahs twin brothers; or do they coincide in all respects?

We will carry the evidence only one step farther. The remainder of B's words must comprise those used four or more times, and in three or more classes outside of his own prophecy. The epithet *rare* is of course merely relative, including words of greater or less frequency at the option of the compiler. It has seemed best to fix the limit in this case at fifteen words, also to omit the detailed tabular list, owing to its great length, and leave the zealous student to dig in the mine for himself. The following statement, however, may be relied on with perfect confidence.

Summary Of Table IV

Words in Isaiah B (not in previous lists) found from four to fifteen times, inclusive.

Whole number, 175; a^{106}, b^{118}, c^{162}, d^{115}, e^{122}. Number in A, 73.

Class *e* increases still, and includes a larger fraction of the whole, because each of these words must be in at least three classes out of five. Still it is but a little over the average of *a, b,* and. *d.* It has 70 per cent, of the whole, while class *c* has 93 per cent, nearly half of these in that eighth part of *c* which constitutes A. We will not detain the reader at present by an examination of the many interesting points presented by single words in this list. We have given evidence enough to prove, to an unbiased mind, that our assumed prophets A and B are mutually convertible, being both identical with the great prophet Isaiah, whose authorship of the sixty-six chapters which have borne his name for at least two

thousand years can be successfully maintained not only on traditional but also on linguistic grounds. Philology takes the following well-known critical Canon of Hitzig, and merely inserting three words in brackets, turns it against its author. "*That* time, *those* time relations, out of which [the vocabulary of] a prophetic writer is explained are *his* time, *his* time relations; to that time he is to be referred, as the date of his own existence."

Note.— Since the above was in type, the writer has decided (at the suggestion of an eminent Hebrew scholar) to work over the above tables, so as to show what results would follow an arrangement more in accordance with the views of those who reject the unity of Isaiah. For the classification now proposed, however, the writer is alone responsible; it is given to anticipate criticisms from the quarter indicated.

We will, then, divide the books of the Old Testament into *seven* groups, instead of five. Classes *a* and *b* remain as before; *c* is confined to the *prophets* before the Captivity, viz. Isaiah A, Hosea to Zephaniah; *e* comprises only the *prophets* of the Captivity and the Return, viz. Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Jeremiah and Daniel are relegated to the doubtful class, also the books of Proverbs and Lamentations. The two books of Kings with Psalms in., comprise class . There remain for class g-, 1 Chronicles to Esther, Psalms v., and Canticles. The words peculiar to Jeremiah and Daniel having been ascertained from the

Vade Mecum, and deducted from the whole number in the earlier and later prophets, this last number is reduced by 1071. The average of Isaian words to be looked for in classes *c* and *e* (by altering our previous proportion) now rises to 823. Since the book of Jeremiah alone is of greater extent than the new class c, and since both Jeremiah and Daniel contain numerous Chaldee words, while B has none, the above average comes very near to that which actually obtains in B, the excess in the latter being fourteen words. All the more significant, then, is the fact that when we confine our attention to

the four later prophets above-mentioned the average is again reduced by nearly 100, viz. to 732. It is impossible, therefore, upon the ground of diction, to class the writer B with Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, or to refuse to class him with the earlier prophets. Even more to our purpose is the evidence from the rarest words actually used by B, according to the new tables. The summaries are as follows :

Table 2

Words occurring in B, and in only one class elsewhere.

(This includes our former tables i, and ii.). Whole number, 77; *a* [11], *b* [13], *c* [14] (A [9]), *d* [29], *e* [4], *f* [3], g [3].

To estimate this result we must have before us the number of pages in the new divisions, as follows: a, 286; 6, 248; c, 90 (A, 44); *d,* 286 (omitting, of course, Isaiah B); *e,* 109; *f*, 127; *g,* 203. That is, among these rarest words, an average of one word to 26 pages is found in *a;* one to 19 in *b;* one to 6 ½ - in *c;* one to 5 in A; one to 10 in *d;* one to 27 in *e;* one to 42 in *f*; one to 67 in *g*.

The prophet B must belong either to *c* or *e;* but his rarest words, we thus find, occur more than four times as often in *c* as in *e;* and oftenest of all in that half of *c* which constitutes A

Table 3

Words occurring in B, and in only two classes elsewhere.

Whole number, 85; *a* [19],*b*[20], *c* [32] (A [21]),*d* [54] *e* [12], *f*[12], *g*[21]. The averages here are as follows: *a,* one word to 15 pages; *b,* one to 12; c, one to 3; A, one to 2; *d,* one to 5; e, one to 9; *f*, one to 10; *g-,* one to 10.

The probability from this table is as three to one in favor of *c* against *e,* and also as three to one in favor of A against Hosea to Zephaniah. The reason why class *d* comes in each case nearest to *c* in the averages, is that we have placed Jeremiah there; the fact goes to confirm our first classification. The vocabulary of B is seen to affiliate not with Ezekiel, Zechariah, etc., but with Jeremiah, Hosea, etc., and with A best of all.

Table IV.

Words (not in previous lists) occurring in B and elsewhere from four to fifteen times in all. Whole number, 190; *a* [106], *b* [121], c [129] (A[82]), *d* [155], *e* [72], *p*[5],

g.[86].

From this we gather the proportions: a, one word to 2.7 pages; &, one to 2 pages; c, 1.4 to every page (A, 1.9 to every page); *d,* one to 1.8 pages; *e,* one to 1.5 pages; *f*, one to 1.7 pages; *g*, one to 2.4 pages.

The probability here is as 21 to 10 in favor of *c* against *e;* as 63 to 25 in favor of *c* against *d;* and as 19 to 9 in favor of A against Hosea to Zephaniah. Combining these three tables we find that out of the 352 rarest words in Isaiah B, 88, exactly a fourth, are met with among the prophets to whose company modern scholarship wishes to assign this writer; while 175 of these words (one less than a half), occur among the prophets with whom tradition places him; 112 being found in Isaiah A. The later prophets have four of these words on every five pages; the earlier, two on every page; A has five on every two pages. Modern philology seems therefore to harmonize well with ancient tradition.

Let it be remembered that these final results fall far below those which we ourselves claim; they are given, however, from a benevolent motive. We wish to spare our opponents the task of toiling through the Concordance to make these new lists, or the worse alternative of guessing at the outcome of such a process. We wish to show them, too, that even when we take their own ground, we can establish the integrity of Isaiah with a high degree of probability.

The reader who has taken pains to follow this Article through, will please observe that it differs from previous attempts of the same kind as a *quantitative* determination in Chemistry differs from a mere *qualitative* one. In the next number of the Bibliotheca Sacra, the Hebrew index referred to on page 233 will be given, with the two classifications adopted in this Note and in the body of the Article, thus bringing the evidence in full within reach of all who may like to investigate the subject.

current : : uid:3173 (drupal)