

operation in the natural workings of the mind? This, in truth, is the most subtle form of an anti-supernaturalistic theory of revelation at present in the field. Our modern rationalists (*e.g.*, Pfeleiderer) do not for a moment deny "revelation"—far be such a thing from them—but that which on the Divine side is viewed as revelation is from the human side simply the natural development of man's moral and religious consciousness. We do not for a moment impute this theory to Mr. Smith, but we must say that no small part of his language seems adapted to imply it, the description of the first chapter of Isaiah, *e.g.*, as "just the parable of the awful compulsion to think which men call conscience," the frequent parallels with those other "prophets," Mazzini, Carlyle, Hugo ("the cases of the Hebrew and Italian prophets are wonderfully alike," p. 86), the growth and changes of his prophetic convictions, &c. There is a loud call for writers who indulge in plausible speech of this kind to come down from vagueness and tell us exactly in what sense they do speak of "inspiration," and how it is understood to differ—if it differs at all—from ordinary religious genius. If the latter is all that is meant, we will require to recast our ideas about the authority of the prophets, and to ask ourselves seriously what place remains for him who is greater than the prophets, the Son of Man Himself.

These questions have a direct bearing on the remaining topic of

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK

of Isaiah. But this is a subject too large to raise in the conclusion of an article. We agree with Mr. Smith that the question of the authorship of the disputed chapters is "one which can be looked at calmly. It touches no dogma of the Christian faith." Further we agree with him that "'facts' of style will be regarded with suspicion by any one who knows how they are employed by both sides in such a question as this" (p. 402). He himself (following Cheyne) accepts as Isaianic an oracle (chap. xxi. 1-10), which the majority of