

triennial, £72 6s. 4d.—a reduction of 7·73 per cent. The concession therefore amounts to a remission of £2 7s. 9d. on the £10 2s. 5d. penalty as proposed. To that extent the douceur to the landlords is to be diminished. That is the utmost concession.

Who has called for the substitution of the triennial for the septennial period? Not the titheowners. If anybody, the landowners, or some of them; though, as above asserted, they will very soon repudiate it. But who is to suffer this loss of 10 or 8 per cent.—of £330,000 or £245,000? Not the landowners, who, if anybody, have asked for it; but the titheowners, who have not. In spite of the fact that one-half of the tithe property has been handed over to the landowners; in spite of the fact that land-rent has not on the whole fallen, nearly, down to the level of the tithe rent-charge, a further spoliation, and together with it a further ground of grievance, is to be given as a sop to Cerberus.

The clergy appeal, with good reason, to Sir Robert Peel's declaration on the second reading of the Tithe Commutation Bill: "Considering our peculiar situation as landlords, and also considering that the parties interested are the clergy, who have no direct representation amongst us, it is required, no less by a due sense of our own interests than by a proper regard to the rights and privileges of the clergy, that we should not appear to sanction any principle which we are not satisfied is consistent with JUSTICE."

Titheowners ask no more than this. They submit that they are entitled to no less.

C. A. STEVENS.



ART. II.—HOW MANY ISAIASHS ARE THERE?

Isaiah: his Life and Times, and the Writings which bear his Name.
By Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Nisbet.

THIS is one of a series called "Men of the Bible;" and we can well imagine the satisfaction with which the general editor must have put the work into the hands of Dr. Driver. The successor of Dr. Pusey in the Hebrew Chair of Oxford had already made his fame before entering upon this high position. He has been a careful Hebrew student from his youth up; in fact, it is currently reported that when he was a schoolboy he wrote purer Hebrew than is to be found in the Book of Genesis, though which of the various compilers thereof he took as his model has not been generally made known.

Much instruction may be gained from the volume before us. Dr. Driver writes reverently, modestly, and cautiously; he spares no pains to establish his position and to make his argument clear to the English student. The writings of Isaiah are arranged in chronological order, and Dr. Driver enters into the spirit of each part, exhibiting as far as he can the foreground, immediate occasion, and historic colouring of the prophecy, and not ignoring the predictive element. If he is somewhat fond of quoting Robertson Smith and certain German writers of the advanced school, he also makes frequent mention of Sir E. Strachey's interesting work on Jewish politics in Isaiah's times—a book which we think deserves to be better known than it is.

Here we would gladly lay down our pen; but there are reasons which make it desirable to go more fully into an examination not only of Dr. Driver's compact little volume, but also of that magnificent collection of inspired utterances which goes under the name of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah.

In studying any such book, the first thing is to ascertain, so far as practicable, the chronology and history of the period in which it was professedly written; the second thing is to consider what parts of the book are properly assigned to the writer, and how they may best be divided; the third thing is to investigate the claims of certain parts of the book which are supposed by some critics to belong to a later period, or at least to be the work of a hand other than that of the writer whose name they bear.

I. Dr. Driver prefixes a chronological table to his book; but it gives little more than a meagre outline of the Assyrian dynasties, and has omitted several dates which are of real importance, because of their bearing on the Babylonian history of the period. Thus he might have given 721 as the date of Merodach Baladan's ascendancy in Babylon, 720 for the overthrow of Hamath, 712 as the probable date of Merodach Baladan's embassy, 710 for the alliance between Merodach Baladan and the King of Elam, 681 for the conflict with Merodach Baladan's son, 668 for a further Assyrian conflict with Elam and Babylon, and 648 for Assarbanipal's great victory over Elam and Babylon.¹ The mere mention of these things reminds us that Babylon was occupying as conspicuous a position in Assyrian politics in and after the time of Isaiah as Ireland is occupying in English politics now. Nor will Isaiah be ever understood until we realize how the

¹ For particulars with respect to these events see Mr. Budge's useful little work on Babylon, published by the R. T. S.

prophet continually sees the rise and fall of Babylon behind the Sargons or Sennacheribs of his day. It must not be forgotten that whilst we have comparatively few Babylonian documents of the period, we cannot expect the Assyrian tablets to do full justice to the position of their ancient rivals and dangerous neighbours on the Euphrates. We know enough, however, to feel sure that Babylon and Elam, when in alliance, were able to exercise a most disturbing influence on Nineveh; and we cannot wonder, when we remember the position and ancient glories of Babylon, that the Assyrian King Esarhaddon should take up his abode there, and should carry Manasseh captive to the city which was still "the glory of the Chaldees;" nor can we be surprised to learn that when Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, was sent thither by his Assyrian master to quell a disturbance, he elected to remain there and revolt from his sovereign. Besides, Babylon is Babel, and is always so spelt in the Hebrew Bible; and its primæval arrogance was not forgotten in Isaiah's time. Its rise and fall symbolized the rise and fall of pride and worldliness from the beginning of the Bible to the end.

All this is passed over by Dr. Driver. Of course he might fairly excuse himself by saying that he was writing a life of Isaiah; but things will be touched on a little further which seem to call for a fuller discussion of the state of things in Babylon than we have got. It is very probable that the mounds on the Euphrates will yet bear still further testimony to the position of Babylon in or after Isaiah's time, and will supply a foreground for certain prophecies which some writers wish to bring down to the days of Jeremiah.

Before passing to our second subject, it may be well to point out that Dr. Driver is inclined to believe that the first Assyrian king mentioned in sacred history, viz., Pul, is the same as Tiglath-Pileser, who is "mentioned elsewhere." But he does not point out that the "elsewhere" is not in some distant part of the Bible, but on the same page, one being mentioned in 2 Kings xv. 19, and the other only ten verses further down. It is not likely that the Hebrew compiler of Kings would have given the "shortened form" of the name first and the full title so soon afterwards; moreover, the Assyrian documents incline us to another supposition. Again, while assenting to the view that errors have crept into the Hebrew documents, especially with respect to figures, it must not be supposed that the Assyrian tablets are immaculate. Dr. Driver holds that these clay documents "fix" chronology, whilst the compiler of the Book of Kings arrived at part of his system through computation. Neither of these statements must be lightly received. The late Mr. George Smith, to

whom we owe the excellent edition of the Assyrian Canon published by Messrs. Bagster, points out, with some diffidence and with a candid acknowledgment that his chronological system was entirely open to revision, that the earliest known copy of the Canon¹ is 150 years later than the events with which it begins (æt. Benhadad), and that Sargon's cylinder differs by two years from the annals on the walls of his palace as to the date of his expedition to Palestine; and that there are errors as to names and other matters in the tribute-lists of Assarbanipal. Then, as for the chronology of the Kings, the only matter which the compiler "computed" was the adjustment of the dates of accession of the Kings of Judah with those of Israel, and *vice versa*. The *real* difficulty in arranging the Kings lies in the fact that we do not always know how long sons were associated with their fathers on the throne. If instead of giving us the comparative chronology of Judah and Israel according to Ussher, Wellhausen, and the rest (p. 13), Dr. Driver had arranged the Kings of Israel and Judah under the guidance of the Hebrew documents, having special regard to the conjoint reigns which are indicated, somewhat obscurely indeed, in these documents, we believe that he would have found the main outlines of the Hebrew chronology to be in distinct accordance with the Assyrian Canon. His treatment of Hezekiah's reign is obscured by the lack of a clear statement of the facts of the case, though the materials for drawing it out are not far to seek. But, as he rightly says, these points form no impediment to the study of Isaiah's life.

II. We now proceed to the second part of our inquiry. Dr. Driver allows Isaiah to be the writer of the first twelve chapters, of chapters xv. to xxiii., and of chapters xxviii. to xxxiii., so that he altogether allots to Isaiah twenty-seven chapters out of the sixty-six which go by his name. We have learnt to be thankful for small mercies. Considering that half a century ago such learned men as Gesenius, Rosenmüller, and Hitzig threw doubt on the 7th, 11th, 12th, 15th, 16th, and part of the 19th and 23rd chapters, all of which Dr. Driver accepts, we welcome his judgment to this extent.

Dr. Driver is inclined to follow in the steps of most students of Isaiah in putting the 6th chapter as the first chronologically, the preceding five, which he locates in the time of Jotham and Ahaz, having been prefixed by the compiler as forming an introduction to the book. In dealing with the 7th chapter, in spite of some obscurity, there is nothing in

¹ See also Smith's "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 293, and "Records of the Past," iii. 116.

Dr. Driver's exposition which would be likely to give offence. "The figure of Immanuel," he says (p. 42), "is an ideal one projected by him on the shifting future. . . . It is the Messianic King whose portrait is here for the first time in the Old Testament sketched distinctly."

If it had been possible, we would have gladly made extracts to show the spirit and style of Dr. Driver's treatment of special subjects, such as the destruction of Sennacherib's army, but our readers will expect to know something of the author or authors of the thirty-nine chapters of "Isaiah" which this "man of the Bible" is supposed by Dr. Driver not to have written.

III. We will begin with the historical chapters. These Dr. Driver dismisses with the following words (p. 86): "The compiler excerpted chapters xxxvi. to xxxix. from the Book of Kings, the composition of which evidently cannot be earlier than the close of the monarchy." There is a sweet simplicity about this statement; but it raises the question, From what source did the compiler of the Book of Kings "excerpt" them? The natural answer is, Either from Isaiah, or from some other contemporary writer whose works Isaiah uses. Dr. Driver must have written the notes just referred to off-hand, without full consideration. The fact is that the historical books bear the marks all the way through of being composed from ancient materials; and the section now under consideration is specially interesting. Let us look at it.

Let the reader "excerpt" from an old Bible the portion from 2 Kings xviii. 13—xix. 37, and put alongside of it Isa. xxxvi. 1—xxxvii. 38. He will find, whether he reads in English or in Hebrew, that he has the same document before him. There are some very slight additions in the way of supplementary words in Kings, and one important sub-section (2 Kings xviii. 14-16) which ought to be thrown into a parenthesis as a separate historical event, chronologically distinct from what follows. Let the reader then take 2 Kings xx. 1-19 and put it by the side of Isa. xxxviii. 1—xxxix. 8; he will be confronted again with the same document, except that Isaiah retains the hymn of Hezekiah, which the compiler of the Kings has not given us. Thus we have the defiant messages of Rabshakeh, the prayers of Hezekiah, the promise made by Isaiah, with the sequel; also the sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, and the mission of the Babylonian ambassadors, told in the same words in both these books. Who wrote them? Dr. Driver says it is doubtful (p. 75), and we have seen the unfortunate slip by which he considers that Isaiah's compiler cannot have fallen in with them till the time of the Captivity. But long before Dr. Driver came into

the world a book was written which is called the Book of Chronicles. Usually this book gives very full accounts of the ups and downs of Judean history, but for this period it gives the most slender abstract, and adds for the benefit of all posterity (2 Chron. xxxii. 32): "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold they are written in the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, and in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel." The Revised Version follows the Hebrew more exactly, but the general conclusion is the same. The chronicler does not think it necessary to give a full account of the most remarkable events in Hezekiah's reign because they are already extant in two books, the Vision of Isaiah and the Book of Kings. Now, Isaiah was a well-known historian as well as a distinguished prophet. He had composed a life of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22), and the natural conclusion is that he also put down the most notable events connected with Hezekiah's life, nor can we see anything either in the substance or language of these chapters to remove them from their position as part of the writings of the prophet Isaiah.

We now have a harder task before us, and must beseech our readers' attention a little longer, whilst we try to exhibit the case concerning the other chapters which Dr. Driver will not assign to Isaiah. The theory which he holds, in common with many others, is that the remaining chapters or sections are anonymous documents which fell into the hands of some compiler or compilers who grouped them with Isaiah's writings as being in some respects of the same class, though of widely different dates. It is perfectly allowable, indeed necessary, to hold that an historical book, such as Kings or Ezra, may be a compilation, or that a volume of sacred poetry, such as the Psalms, may take its name from the most notable of its contributors, or that a chapter may be appended to such a book as Deuteronomy or Jeremiah without affecting our judgment as to the authorship of the book as a whole; but when it is proposed to cut off more than half of Isaiah and distribute it among several later anonymous writers, we may be excused if we demand very convincing proofs. Here is a Jewish book accepted as the work of one author by our Lord and His Apostles, referred to as Isaiah's by the Apocryphal writers considerably earlier (see especially Ecclus. xlvi. 24), and apparently quoted by prophets who lived within a century of the supposed author (see, for example, Isa. xlvii. 8, compared with Zeph. ii. 15, and Isa. lii. 7 compared with Nahum i. 15). On what grounds is such a book to be disintegrated?

This, fortunately, is not a case, like that of some of the earlier books, where verses are subdivided between Elohist, Jehovist

and later editors. We are dealing with considerable sections, not with fragments of verses. Putting the matter shortly, the whole case is made to rest on two main arguments—one of which is theoretical, and the other linguistic. Dr. Driver holds a theory which is excellent, and which the celebrated writer Davison expounded in his lectures on Prophecy with convincing power years and years ago—viz., that prophecy has a foreground and a background. This may be called a general proposition, but Dr. Driver makes it a universal proposition, and argues thus: Every prophecy has a foreground; there was no suitable foreground for certain prophecies contained in "the Book of Isaiah;" therefore these prophecies were not written by him or in his time. "Whatever the prophets announce, it is *always* brought into some relation with the age in which they live" (p. 3; see also pp. 117, 126, 186). But a universal rule can only be based on an examination of instances, and it looks like a *petitio principii* to make a general rule into an absolute one, and then cut off all passages and prophecies which do not fall in with it. Dr. Driver argues as if Isaiah must have seen everything from one point of view, and must have constructed all his prophetic addresses or poems on the same lines. In pressing this view we believe that Dr. Driver has undervalued Isaiah's natural powers, the changing spirit of the long period through which he prophesied, and the creative force of God's Holy Spirit by whom this wonderful man was inspired. We candidly state our conviction that the man who could write such chapters as Dr. Driver assigns to Isaiah could write anything. There is a wealth of language, a force of style, a power of imagination about Isaiah which makes one feel unable to deny him anything—except tameness.

Besides, if Assyria is usually in the foreground in this book and in Isaiah's age, Babylon is in the middle distance, sometimes more in the front, sometimes towards the horizon. Dr. Driver must frequently have been struck with the words of Micah, Isaiah's contemporary and co-worker, who says to the daughter of Zion (iv. 10): "Thou shalt go forth out of the city; thou shalt go even to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered." What was Micah's foreground when he uttered these words? We happen to know the date of this prophecy of Micah's, for it is referred to in a later book as having been in the time of Hezekiah (compare Micah iii. 12 with Jer. vi. 18). It seems difficult in the face of this fact to accept Dr. Driver's theoretical argument.

Take the doubtful sections in their order. Chapters xxiv. to xxvii. were written (according to Dr. Driver) on the eve of the Babylonian Captivity, and the hymns which they include are

“penetrated by a deeper and more delicate vein of feeling than the one in chapter xii.” (p. 125). This is a matter which anyone may judge for himself. To our mind, the connecting links in thought and the use made of earlier formulæ in each case tend all to show that these chapters are Isaiah’s. We see no reason to bring them later.

The Babylonian chapters (xiii. 1—xiv. 23) are supposed by our author to have been written during the exile (p. 127); and in order to make the theory work, the 24th and three following verses of the 14th chapter, being Assyrian, are cut off, and assigned to Isaiah himself. But take the whole as Isaiah’s, and you have Assyria in the foreground and Babylon in the background. Dr. Driver calls the little Assyrian section an “artistically finished prophecy” (p. 75). It may be artistically finished, but it can hardly be said to be artistically begun; for it opens thus: “The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying,” etc. But this is by no means the ordinary way in which prophetic artists do their work.

We next come to the chapters on Edom (xxxiv., xxxv.). Dr. Driver is not quite certain what to do with them, but—“Isaiah addresses Edom in a very different strain” (p. 131). The passage referred to is in chapter xxi. 11, which contains “the burden of Dumah.” But is Dumah Edom? Our author thinks that Dumah is an anagram for Edom. This seems a slender argument: Dumah stands for Edom, and is dismissed in half a verse in Isa. xxi., therefore Isaiah did not write chapters xxxiv. and xxxv. The logic is hardly convincing. We invite our readers to study the two chapters for themselves and draw their own conclusions.

So far Dr. Driver can hardly be said to have succeeded in shaking the integrity of the book. But we now come to the remaining section (chapters xl. to lxvi.), which is certainly unique. We may regard it as a vast prophetic drama which is still in course of being fulfilled; and in coming to this conclusion we are entirely guided by the use made of it in the New Testament. The foreground is the experience of God’s faithfulness to His word and purposes in the past, from creation onward; the background is the inspired conviction that His plans, still future in Isaiah’s time, would all be fulfilled. We believe that the work is Isaiah’s; we see the same grandeur of conception, the same fondness for reiteration and alliteration, the same brief disconnected sentences, the same sudden changes of person and number, the same use of the singular for the plural, the same remarkable affinity with the Book of Job, the same power of illustration from horticulture and agriculture, the same fervid appeals to God, and, in a word, the same style and spirit.

Still, we acknowledge that the whole is marvellous—like Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Saul's conversion, the Apocalypse, and a thousand other things in the Bible. Jerusalem is addressed as in a state of desolation, its temple needing to be rebuilt, its sanctuary is trodden down by adversaries, it is suffering violence at the hands of Babylon and the Chaldees, and no man is going through its streets. It is a captivity period. And yet intermingled with these things are indications that the violence, oppression, and idolatry of the time of Manasseh are in full swing, and alongside of it, oblations, incense, fasts, and Sabbaths of the old covenant are apparently being kept up. The Messiah takes the form of a servant in these chapters, and while the final triumph of God's people and the incorporation of the Gentiles is in the background, Cyrus, who lived above 150 years after Isaiah, is described as if shortly to be engaged in the work of restoration.

Dr. Driver gives up these chapters, and assigns them to the close of the Captivity period, not only because of the absence of any relationship between them and Isaiah's time, but also on linguistic considerations. He considers that chapters xl. to lxvi. (which for convenience we will call B) differ from the Isaiah proper (whom we will call A), inasmuch as they possess new ideas, new ways of putting things, and fresh terminology. We assent to these three statements at once, but not to the inference which Dr. Driver draws from them. The chapters in question have nothing personal in them; they have hardly any contemporary "foreground," or local colouring. It seems a question even to Dr. Driver whether they were written by a captive in Babylon or whether by one of the remnant who went down with Jeremiah into Egypt.

Certainly the writer has projected himself to an unheard-of degree into the exilic period; and yet there are in these chapters occasional hints that the land and the people were in very much the same condition as when the 1st, 5th, and 11th chapters were written. In fact, the state of things described in the last three chapters is singularly like that which existed in the time of the first three. The real key of the position probably lies in the early part of Manasseh's reign, when he undid Hezekiah's work, was invaded by Esarhaddon, and carried captive to Babylon. The city probably suffered greatly at the time; hence the subsequent repairs (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14-16). We sometimes wonder what Dr. Driver, and others, would accept as sufficient proof that these chapters are Isaiah's. If we show points of resemblance, we are told that they prove nothing; they may have been quoted, as Jeremiah quoted his predecessors. If we show that the same word is frequently used for the same thing, we are told that

this is to be expected in the prophetic Scriptures; and we cannot deny it. Tradition and repute count as nothing. Some critics have no difficulty in supposing that these magnificent chapters should have been written by a nameless personage during the exile, and appended to writings which were a hundred and fifty years older, and passed under his name. In vain we point out that parts of A have certain germs of thought which are fully developed and portrayed in B. In vain we remind the critics that there is nothing more extraordinary in Cyrus¹ or his dynasty² being named by Isaiah than there is in Josiah being named by the man of God who went to Bethel. The matter finally becomes a sort of "word-game." Lists upon lists have been made of words and expressions which are in A and not in B, or which are in B and not in A; and the gist of Dr. Driver's argument is, that there are a great many words in B which are not in A, and that therefore the writer of A did not write B. In dealing with such an argument, we need much care and skill lest we should prove too much. Had Isaiah got to the end of his vocabulary when he had written A? The case may fairly be put thus. Here are certain passages in B which have a general resemblance to passages in A; we should therefore expect the same set of words to be used in each; but we do not always find them; in fact, the differences are so marked that, taken in connection with the lack of Assyrian foreground, the presence of the names of Cyrus, etc., we come to the conclusion that we have a distinct document, and that written at a much later time. To put it in Dr. Driver's words, "The accustomed marks of Isaiah's hand cease, and new conceptions and new phraseology make their appearance . . . the difference is one of mental habit—in other words, of personality" (pp. 208, 209).

One would not like rashly to oppose any conclusion which has been arrived at by so patient and candid a student as Dr. Driver; but it seems curious that he illustrates his position from St. John and St. Paul, of whom he says that they preserve each, in all that they wrote, the same individualities of conception and expression (p. 209). We should have thought that, having in view the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles and the Apocalypse, the conclusion would have been otherwise.

¹ Dr. Driver follows Mr. Sayce in believing that Cyrus was a polytheist because he repaired heathen temples. We hope he will abstain from drawing a similar conclusion from the former policy of our Government in India.

² Cyrus' grandfather was named Cyrus. He may have had a predecessor of the same name in the time of Isaiah.

Dr. Driver's views of the linguistic differences between A and B do not satisfy us. To our mind he has unconsciously undervalued not only the linguistic but also the structural relationship between A and B, and, above all, he has underestimated the wealth of language and thought with which such a man as Isaiah was endued, and which he could pour out when under the special elevating influence of the Holy Spirit. This point was well worked out by Professor Stanley Leathes some years ago.

If, indeed, it could be shown that the Hebrew of B was considerably later than that of A, the case would have been different. Dr. Driver says that "the language of B is relatively free from the marks of a later style, but not so free as the language of A." We have not enough of contemporary literature to speak decidedly as to the dates of expressions. Even aramaisms do not always prove a late date; they may be provincialisms. Curiously enough, Dr. Driver only gives us one sample of an aramaic word in B, viz., the word כֶּחָד (*Ke-echad*), in Isa. lxx. 25. But this is a good Hebrew word; the aramaic form is to be found in Daniel, and is spelled differently. What Dr. Driver meant to say is probably that the word given above does not happen to be found in the extant writings of any author earlier than this book, unless indeed the Book of Ecclesiastes may be so reckoned. It is found, however, with a slightly different punctuation and sense, as far back as Gen. iii. 22; and in its adverbial sense it is only a condensation of a common expression which may be seen in Numb. xiv. 15.

But we must draw to a conclusion. It is possible that Dr. Driver is right, and that the writings of some later prophets have been incorporated with those of Isaiah. But it is not probable. It is far more likely that such writings, if discovered at about the time of the return from captivity, would be connected with other works of the same date. There would be absolutely no reason for appending them to Isaiah rather than to one of the later prophets; in fact, the probabilities would be all against it. Certainly it would not be easy to find any lines of argument more likely to influence the general reader than those given in Dr. Driver's book; but after all the student may venture at least to keep his mind in solution, and to wait. Some people think that Shakespeare's works are not his. Possibly three hundred years hence they will be ascribed to Mr. Gladstone. If works of so late a date are thought by some to be of uncertain authorship, we must not be surprised that the integrity of Isaiah should be doubted; but at the same time it would be folly to throw overboard the traditional view of a book which has travelled down intact

through more than 2,000 years, except on the strength of facts and arguments (linguistic or otherwise) which carry absolute conviction with them.

Even Canon Driver's book may be discovered hereafter to be the work of two authors, one a D.D. (as on the title-page), the other an M.A. (as on the cover of the book); one giving positive expositions of the text, the other criticising the authorship; one under the influence of Assyrian inscriptions, the other inspired by a Hebrew concordance. It has been said of some heretics that they are right in their affirmations and wrong in their negatives; and it is true of some critics also. We trust that Dr. Driver will throw the weight of his name and fame into the scale of positive truth, and not allow himself to be tempted further into the paths of destructive criticism.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.



ART. III.—NEW EVIDENCE AS TO THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF ἘΠΙΘΥΣΙΟΣ IN THE LORD'S PRAYER.

AFTER the exhaustive treatise upon ἐπιθύσιος by the present Bishop of Durham in the Appendix to his work, "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," published in 1871, it would be mere presumption to enter the arena of the controversy respecting this important word without having fresh evidence to adduce as to its origin or meaning. In that treatise Dr. Lightfoot did break fresh ground and did adduce fresh evidence, but the importance of this fresh evidence does not seem to have been duly appreciated, consisting as it does of a single, isolated, interjectional expression in a Greek comic author. I hope that the new evidence which I have been enabled to discover, and am about to adduce, will place the conclusions at which he has properly arrived upon an absolutely certain and impregnable basis.

But it will be desirable first to give a slight sketch of the present condition of the controversy, as, probably, it is not every reader of the *CHURCHMAN* that has made a special study of it, with all the stores of learning that have been lavished, and indeed thrown away upon it, simply for want of *evidence*, which has been all the while close at hand, but has been most unaccountably overlooked.

As to its origin, ἐπιθύσιος has been derived (1) from ἐπίτιναι, either through its participle ἐπιτών, or through the feminine of that participle, ἡ ἐπιτιύσσα, which had become practically a substantive; (2) from εἶναι, through the preposition ἐπι and the substantive οὐσία. This latter derivation admits of any