

plainest language has either been explained away, or has been enlisted as a proof against its authenticity, or looked upon as containing a mere mythical statement. Let me give the reader one or two examples, to show how the plainest prophetic declarations are treated by the critics of the so-styled *school of higher criticism*. In 1 Kings xiii. 2, we read: "And he cried (*i.e.*, Shemaiah the prophet) against the altar in the word of the Lord and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord; Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee." For the fulfilment of this prophecy, the reader may compare 2 Kings xxiii. 16-19. Now, although this prophecy was literally fulfilled, yet it is declared by De Wette and other critics belonging to the same school, to be merely a "mythical story of prophecy" against the altar of Bethel. (See De Wette's "Critical and Historical Introduction to the Old Testament," Vol. II., p. 233.) The prophet Isaiah, in chapter xlv. 28, mentions "Cyrus," who shall command the rebuilding of Jerusalem with the temple; now, this very naming of Cyrus upwards of a century before he was born, has been eagerly seized upon by our advanced critics as a proof that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah must be of later origin. These writers do not, for a moment, take into consideration that there is no assigning a limit to the prophetic vision, which is the manifestation of the power of God, and that to do so would be to set a limit to the omnipotence of the Almighty.

Before entering upon a review of the interpretations given by Professor Workman of the Messianic passages in his lecture, it may be as well to notice first a few statements made in the beginning of the lecture, which should not be passed over in silence.

On the first page, the Professor remarks:

"A popular view prevails that there is nothing in common between Biblical and non-Biblical prophecy. Though widespread, the opinion is erroneous. The Hebrew Scriptures do not claim a monopoly of religious prophecy, and it is unwise to misrepresent their claims in this respect by misinterpreting historic facts."