

Miss [unclear]

THE

✓
P R I N C E T O N
R E V I E W .

By **Whom**, all things; for **Whom**, all things.

FIFTY-FOURTH YEAR.

JULY—DECEMBER.

NEW YORK

1878.

JULY.

	PAGE
EXPLORATION AS VERIFYING REVELATION,	1
PROF. J. L. PORTER, ASSEMBLY'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.	
GOD'S INDISCRIMINATE PROPOSALS OF MERCY,	33
PRES'T ROBERT L. DABNEY, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY THEOL. SEM'Y.	
CLASSICS AND COLLEGES,	67
PROF. B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.	
THE MATERIALIST REVIVAL,	96
PROF. LIONEL S. BEALE, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.	
THE SON OF MAN,	115
PROF. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT.	
RECENT CHANGES IN JURISPRUDENCE AND APOLOGETICS.	149
FRANCIS WHARTON, LL.D., CAMBRIDGE.	
METHODS OF HOME EVANGELIZATION,	169
PROF. WM. G. BLAIKIE, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.	
KANT AND HIS FORTUNES IN ENGLAND,	204
PROF. J. P. MAHAFFY, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.	
CHRISTIANITY UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE,	239
PROF. ADOLF HARNACK, UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.	
THE PROPHETS AND PROPHECY,	281
PROF. WM. HENRY GREEN, PRINCETON THEOL. SEMINARY.	

SEPTEMBER.

THE PROBLEM OF THE HUMAN WILL,	329
HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.	
ART AS AN INTERPRETER OF HISTORY,	352
PROF. HENRY COPPÉE, LEHIGH UNIVERSITY.	
TAXATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC,	384
JUDGE ROBERT C. PITMAN, MASS.	
SCIENCE AND A FUTURE STATE,	399
BALFOUR STEWART, F.R.S., THE OWENS COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.	
J. S. MILL AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THEISM,	409
PRESIDENT DANIEL S. GREGORY, LAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY.	
THE AIM OF POETRY,	449
PRINCIPAL SHAIRP, UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S.	
THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHANCE,	471
PROF. JOHN VENN, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.	
FAITH,	511
MARK HOPKINS, EX-PRESIDENT OF WILLIAMS COLLEGE.	

	PAGE
THE POLITICAL OUTLOOK IN FRANCE,	541
REV. DR. ROBERT L. STANTON, CINCINNATI.	
THE COST OF A LANDED GENTRY,	578
ARTHUR ARNOLD, LONDON.	
THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT,	612
THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.	

NOVEMBER.

NATIONAL MORALITY,	641
EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D., ENGLAND.	
THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF SCIENCE,	673
PRINCIPAL DAWSON, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.	
PHILOSOPHY AS SCIENTIA SCIENTIARUM,	697
ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.	
THE EUROPEAN EQUILIBRIUM,	717
THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, EX-PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE.	
COPYRIGHTS AND PATENTS,	743
LEONE LEVI, F.S.A., F.S.S., KINGS COLLEGE, LONDON.	
MAN'S PLACE IN NATURE,	776
PROF. JOSEPH LE CONTE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.	
DUTIES OF HIGHER TOWARDS LOWER RACES,	804
CANON GEORGE RAWLINSON, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.	
ECLIPSES OF THE SUN,	848
SIMON NEWCOMB, LL.D., U. S. N. OBSERVATORY, WASHINGTON.	
THE RECENT SOLAR ECLIPSE,	865
PROFESSOR YOUNG, PRINCETON COLLEGE.	
A CRITICISM OF THE CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY, IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR MAHAFFY,	889
PRESIDENT MCCOSH, PRINCETON COLLEGE.	
PHYSIOLOGICAL METAPHYSICS,	916
PRESIDENT PORTER, YALE COLLEGE.	

THE PROPHETS AND PROPHECY IN ISRAEL.

THE recent work by Professor Kuenen, of the University of Leyden, entitled "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel,"¹ is written from the standpoint of the most ultra criticism and of absolute anti-supernaturalism.

According to Dr. Kuenen's view as stated by himself, "prophecy is one of the most important and remarkable phenomena in the history of religion, but just on that account a human phenomenon, proceeding from Israel, directed to Israel." It is from God in no other sense than as "from him are all things." It is "a testimony not as out of heaven to us, but a testimony to men's need, and to Israel's peculiar destination to 'seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him.'" (A destination, by the way, which in the Scriptures is ascribed not to Israel, but to the Gentiles before Christ's coming.) "A preparation for Christianity? Yes; but in another sense than that which tradition means by these words—no prediction of facts in the life of Christ, but a preparation of the soil out of which Christianity was to spring, the prelude to the new religious creation which mankind owe to Jesus of Nazareth" (pp. 4, 5).

Prof. Kuenen proposes to settle the strife between the supernatural and the naturalistic view of prophecy by the single test of their fulfilment. To this we cheerfully assent. It is a test to which the sacred writers themselves appeal (Deut. 18 : 21, 22 ; Isa. 43 : 9-12 ; Jer. 28 : 9) ; it is palpable, obvious, and easily applied. If these predictions have been fulfilled, they are from God ; if not, they cannot be from him.

¹ "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel." An Historical and Critical Enquiry, by Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden. Translated from the Dutch by the Rev. Adam Milroy, M.A., with an Introduction by J. Muir, Esq., D.C.L. London. 1877. 8vo, pp. 593.

He divides (p. 25) the sources of our information respecting the predictions in the Old Testament into three classes, viz. :

“ 1st. Writings of prophets.

“ 2d. Historical accounts regarding what the prophets have done and spoken.

“ 3d. Words of God addressed to historical personages, and incorporated in the narratives concerning them.”

It would divert us too much from our present purpose to undertake here the defence of those books, or parts of books, which Dr. Kuenen sets aside as not genuine. They have been abundantly vindicated by able critical scholars. We simply remark, in passing, that the allegation that these predictions were written after the event is equivalent to a confession of the accuracy of their fulfilment which cannot otherwise be evaded. But the question at issue can be settled by prophecies whose genuineness no one has yet ventured to dispute. After all that has been done in the way of attempted elimination, enough remains to establish unmistakably the divine origin of prophecy. If this can be first settled by what Dr. Kuenen himself confesses to be the genuine productions of the prophets, he will no longer have the same motive to deny the genuineness of the rest, especially when it appears, as is in truth the case, that, even as his own critical hypotheses, these latter still afford evidence of divine prescience; for they contain predictions reaching beyond the date at which he alleges that they were written, and which have been manifestly fulfilled.

Dr. Kuenen groups what he calls the unfulfilled prophecies under three heads, as they severally relate to (1) the destiny of the heathen nations; (2) the judgments pronounced upon Israel; and (3) the expectations of the prophets with regard to Israel's future. It will be convenient to follow him in this arrangement.

The first instance adduced is this (p. 102): “The prophets are unanimous in announcing the destruction of the cities of the Philistines.” Whereupon he confesses: “It is true, indeed, that scarcely any traces remain of the very ancient glory of the five cities. They have shared in the same fate that has smitten the whole of Palestine. They have been laid desolate or have gradually decayed; after Jerusalem, indeed, but still like her

they too have fallen." This, however, he refuses to accept as the proper fulfilment of the predictions for two reasons. First, because "the judgment contemplated is plainly one that would be executed *soon*. When delayed for a long period it ceased to be a judgment, especially in such cases as we find in Amos (1 : 6-8) and Ezekiel (25 : 15-17), where a specific sin is mentioned as the reason of Jahveh's displeasure." But why the divine retribution forfeits its character if it does not occur soon is not very clear. There is something striking, no doubt, in a penalty that follows swiftly upon the heels of transgression. And yet most men would concede equal impressiveness to a doom which is sure to come, however long delayed. The length of the interval renders it all the more certain that God does not forget, and that even-handed justice will not fail eventually to strike its mark. And that the prophets in particular, with whom it is that we are now concerned, did not judge it essential that a recompense must be speedy appears both from their directly declaring the reverse (Hab. 2 : 3), and from their undisturbed confidence when this very demand was made by presumptuous sinners of their own day (Isa. 5 : 19 ; Jer. 17 : 15 ; Amos 5 : 18). This Dr. Kuenen seems here to have overlooked, though his memory is less treacherous in another place when he has an end to answer by it (p. 360) : "The fulfilment of their predictions can be to themselves, to a certain extent, matter of indifference ; that is to say, the fulfilment in this or that specific form at that specific time. It is to them a settled truth that Jahveh is righteous, and not less that at some period his righteousness shall be revealed in a dazzling and unmistakable manner ; but *how* and *when* this revelation shall take place is a question of subordinate importance. . . . If it is not fulfilled now, then it will be fulfilled at a later time." If now, by Dr. Kuenen's own confession, the element of time enters so little into the prophet's expectations, by what right can it be demanded that the prediction must be fulfilled speedily or it is no fulfilment at all in the sense intended by the prophet ? This is surely unreasonable, unless he has himself specified some limit within which it must occur.

Is this done in the present instance ? There is no pretence of it in Amos, Joel (3 : 4-8), Ezekiel, Zephaniah (2 :

4-7) or Zechariah (9 : 5-7) ; only Isaiah (14 : 31) and Jeremiah (47 : 2) speak of a calamity to come upon Philistia from the north ; and " whenever Isaiah and Jeremiah make mention of an enemy out of the north, they intimate, in no doubtful manner, that they are thinking, the former of the Assyrians, the latter of the Chaldeans." Well, did the Assyrians and Chaldeans bring the predicted distress upon Philistia ? Assyrian monuments furnish abundant evidence on this point. Sargon took Hanun King of Gaza prisoner and led him away into Assyria.¹ The King of Ashdod made his submission to Sennacherib, while the King of Ashkelon with his whole family were carried captive to Assyria, and a vassal placed upon the throne in his stead ; the princes of Ekron were slain and impaled, numbers of the people sold as slaves, and a king created subject to Assyria.² Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal include the kings of Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, and Ashdod in their lists of tributary monarchs.³ And as Nebuchadnezzar subdued Phenicia and Syria, and carried his arms into Egypt,⁴ he must have overrun the whole Philistine region. So far, therefore, from these prophecies remaining unaccomplished, the very fulfilment that Dr. Kuenen asks for did take place. The Philistines were chastised by both Assyria and Babylon, and the judgment predicted, instead of ceasing with these preliminary fulfilments, went on until the region was reduced to the desolation that it now is.

But Dr. Kuenen's second objection is that " the punishment of the Philistines takes place, according to the prophets, in the interest of Israel. It is against the people of Jahveh that they have transgressed ; it is the people of Jahveh, therefore, that shall reap the fruits of their destruction, take possession of their territory, and incorporate the remnant of them with themselves. In other words, with the prophets the lot of the Philistines forms a contrast to that of the Israelites. In the prophecy of Isaiah, Zion, founded by Jahveh, and a safe refuge for the poor of his people, stands in opposition to Philistia, whose inhabi-

¹ " Les Inscriptions Assyriennes des Sargonides," p. 36.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 44, 45.

³ Schrader, " Keilinschriften und A. Test.," pp. 229, 230.

⁴ Josephus, " Against Apion," i. 19.

tants perish by famine and sword. The same prophet expects that the reunited tribes 'shall fly upon the shoulder of the Philistines toward the west'—that is, shall extend their dominion in that direction and make the Philistines subject to them." We might point him to the fact that the Jews under Jonathan Maccabæus and Alexander Jannæus did capture the Philistine cities; that the name Philistine thenceforward ceased out of history; and that the population of the region was subsequently absorbed into or supplanted by Jewish residents. But has not the ancient glory of Israel faded away as well as that of the Philistines? Instead of the contrast which prophecy leads us to anticipate, have they not alike fallen into decline and ruin? The answer to this question obviously involves the correctness of the prophetic expectations regarding Israel, and, to avoid needless repetition, must be reserved until the prophecies respecting Israel come regularly before us in the course of our inquiry. Meanwhile let it be noted here that all that the prophets have said concerning the Philistines has been in the fullest and strictest sense accomplished. The only point which, for the reason stated, we leave unsettled at this stage of the discussion is, Do the fortunes of Israel stand in the required contrast to those of Philistia?

The next prophecies adduced are those against Tyre by Isaiah (chap. 23) and Ezekiel (chaps. 26–28). Of the latter Dr. Kuenen says (p. 107): "What he predicts for Tyre is nothing less than entire destruction. The many nations that march against her to battle 'shall destroy her walls and break down her towers.' Jahveh 'shall sweep away her dust—the layer of earth on which her houses and gardens were placed—and make her a bare rock.' Thus she shall become 'a place where men spread nets in the midst of the sea.' The multitude of nations that execute this judgment are led by Nebuchadnezzar, the king of kings. He shall lay siege to the city, and finally 'shall enter in through her gates as men enter into a conquered town.' Then plundering and devastation follow until Tyre has ceased to exist."

Now, Dr. Kuenen confesses that "Tyre capitulated" to Nebuchadnezzar at the end of his long siege of thirteen years, and "wholly or partially lost her independence." And that this was really the case is abundantly demonstrated in Movers' elab-

orate investigation of this point,¹ an author whom none can suspect of being biased in his conclusions by a regard for the authority of the prophet. He further admits, what is too palpable to be denied, that "Tyre is at present an insignificant fishing village." Every trait in the prophetic description has long since been matched by the event. But he complains that this desolation was not effected all at once; the fulfilment of the prophecy was not exhausted by the victory of Nebuchadnezzar. The city was not laid waste by him, nor its trade destroyed. It continued to be a powerful and wealthy merchant city even under the Persian dominion. All that the prophecy declares has come to pass. The correspondence between the word of the prophet and the condition to which this mistress of the seas has been reduced is signal and undeniable. But this was not brought about by Nebuchadnezzar alone. It was not the issue of his single siege. It was not accomplished in one age, nor by the operation of any one cause. The city was weakened and humbled by Nebuchadnezzar. It was still further humiliated by Alexander the Great. Other wars and struggles followed. Other causes conspired to dry up the sources of its prosperity. And because the desolation described by the prophet was only fully reached after a long interval, and was the result of many combined influences, it is most strangely argued that this must not be regarded as the fulfilment of Ezekiel's prediction. One would think that the greater the lapse of time and the more complicated the causes at work, the more decisive and complete would be the evidence of a far-reaching foresight, and that it was no merely human calculation from limited and imperfect data. The proof of prophetic power is surely not diminished or destroyed because that is foretold which only He could know who sees the end from the beginning, and to whom a thousand years are as one day.

But, says Dr. Kuenen, "Is it not clear as day that it [the prophecy of Ezekiel] announces the overthrow of the Phenicians as being *close at hand*?" The prophet says no such thing. On the contrary, it is "clear as day" that such a limitation of the prophecy to what was "close at hand" is wholly gratuitous, and

¹ "Das Phoenizische Alterthum," i. pp. 427-450.

is a covert assumption of the very question at issue. If the announcement made by Ezekiel were only a shrewd conjecture from the existing political situation, the prophetic horizon would have to be narrowed accordingly, and nothing that was remote or that was dependent upon causes not yet apparent could be admitted to fall within its scope. And after the prophecy has thus been degraded to a merely human anticipation, it is comparatively easy to show that it has failed. Eliminate or refuse to recognize the stamp of its divinity, and its non-fulfilment naturally follows; for that is tacitly involved in the primary assumption. Only it is strange, on Dr. Kuenen's view of the case, if the prophecy in its true intent, as understood by Ezekiel and his hearers, was restricted to events "close at hand," that they could themselves have retained any confidence in it as a message from God; for it was falsified before it was even put on record. The siege of Tyre came to an end years before the book of Ezekiel was issued, and Tyre still survived. Now, if no exactness of correspondence in the future between the event and the terms of the prediction could be a fulfilment of the latter in the sense put upon it by the prophet and his contemporaries, how does it come to pass that it was not utterly discredited in their esteem and refused a place in this collection professing to be uttered under the immediate inspiration of God?

Dr. Kuenen himself, when he would convert prophecy into a vague presentiment or a pious deduction from the moral government of God, admits that the time when Jehovah's righteousness should be revealed is to the prophets "a question of subordinate importance" (p. 360). They were convinced that the haughty oppressors of his people would some time be laid low by his avenging arm, but it was not indispensable that this should be done immediately. "When their anticipations were not realized, they will have easily satisfied themselves with the thought that the fulfilment would doubtless occur at a later period. In truth it makes a *very essential difference* whether any event is estimated *in and on account of itself* or as *the form in which something else is revealed*. In the first case, its non-realization is a bitter disappointment, and for him who announced it a painful humiliation; but this bitterness and this pain are not felt when recourse is at once had to the conviction:

if it is not fulfilled now, then it will be fulfilled at a later time ; the righteousness of Jahveh endures and *must* positively some time come to light.”¹ Dr. Kuenen fanciēs that Ezekiel himself expected Nebuchadnezzar to accomplish all that he uttered in his prediction respecting Tyre. This is nowhere stated in the prediction itself. It is merely Dr. Kuenen’s opinion. But suppose him to be correct ; what then ? We do not claim omniscience for the prophet, but simply inspiration and unerring truth for his prediction. And even on the low view of prophecy entertained by Dr. Kuenen, the essential thing in the prophet’s mind was the vindication of God’s righteous judgment ; the time when this should take place was of little consequence. The fact, not the period of its manifestation, was what he regarded as absolutely certain. Whenever this manifestation should occur, it would be to him the fulfilment of his prediction. How can Dr. Kuenen, therefore, on his own principles, justify his assertion that the event must be “ close at hand ” in order to verify the prophet’s anticipation ? Much less can it be necessary to the accomplishment of that which is a direct revelation from the omniscient God himself. In fact, it looks somewhat like grasping both horns of a dilemma at once, when Dr. Kuenen, in his zeal to fasten human infirmity on the prophecies, affirms with one breath that a particular event “ close at hand ” must have been intended by them, so that nothing else can be a fulfilment of them, and with the next declares that the manifestation of Jehovah’s righteousness is the one fixed conviction of the prophets, irrespective of either time or mode.

But, says Dr. Kuenen, “ Ezekiel himself declares that his expectations concerning the fate of Tyre were not realized ” (Ezek. 29 : 18–20). “ Son of man, Nebuchadrezzar King of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyre : every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled : yet had he no wages, nor his army, for Tyre, for the service that he had served against it ; ” whereupon the land of Egypt is promised him for his wages. Dr. Kuenen very naturally apprehends that this proof will be suspected of being so very strong as to be

¹ The italics in the various quotations from Dr. Kuenen are invariably his own.

worth nothing (p. 110): "How by any possibility can Ezekiel come forward as a witness against the realization of his own prophecy?" The fact is that the sense put upon this passage is an utter perversion of its meaning. Nebuchadnezzar must have performed the work against Tyre which the Lord had assigned to him, or he would not have earned the wages which are here promised him and declared to be rightfully his. The prophet revokes nothing of his former prediction. He confesses to no failure or disappointed expectations. He makes no attempt to accommodate the expressions which he had previously used to an event which had turned out differently from his anticipations. He simply says, Nebuchadnezzar has done his work, which was an exceedingly toilsome one, and has thereby earned a larger wages than the spoils of Tyre afforded him; he shall have Egypt in addition to make up full payment. There is nothing surely in this that looks as though Ezekiel regarded his prophecy against Tyre as having failed in so far as respects the work committed to Nebuchadnezzar, but the very reverse.

Nevertheless, says Dr. Kuenen, "this much is plain, that Nebuchadnezzar did not enter in through the gates of Tyre as men enter into a conquered city" (Ezek. 26:10). How does he know? And "as little did his troops carry away the wealth of Tyre and plunder her merchandise" (v. 12). Tyre was open seaward during the entire siege. The wealthiest citizens may have fled to distant colonies and taken their goods with them (Isa. 23:6, 7, 12). The treasures of their sanctuaries may likewise have been temporarily removed for safe-keeping. And the terms of the capitulation, of which we know nothing, may have limited the amount that the conqueror should receive. It is very easy to understand how he could have "made a spoil of its riches," and yet not be adequately paid for his long and toilsome service.

In regard to Isaiah's prediction against Tyre (chap. 23), Dr. Kuenen complains that its fulfilment is sometimes sought in the siege of that city by Shalmaneser King of Assyria, and sometimes in that by Nebuchadnezzar; and he insists that a choice must be made between them. But what is there to hinder its embracing both? It is a declaration of God's work of judgment upon Tyre to be executed partly by one instrument and partly

by another, which in the actual unfoldings of history met its partial accomplishment in different periods successively, but is here gathered up into a single picture of its future destiny.

To the general prediction of its overthrow, the prophet adds the specific statement (vs. 15-18) that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years, after which her trade shall revive and her gains, instead of being treasured up for her own advantage, shall be holiness to the Lord. Dr. Kuenen remarks that "facts like those announced here cannot pass away without leaving some traces." And they have not done so, even though he professes that he has not been able to find them. The term of her humiliation is at once explained by the declaration of Jeremiah (25 : 11) that the land of Judah and all contiguous nations, among whom (v. 22) Tyre is expressly included, should serve the King of Babylon seventy years. This is precisely the interval between the decisive victory gained by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish over Pharaoh-necho King of Egypt (Jer. 46 : 2), which opened his way to Jerusalem and the neighboring kingdoms that had combined against him, and the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. That Tyre continued after its siege by Nebuchadnezzar to be subject to Babylon till the latter city was itself overthrown by Cyrus is apparent from an extract which Josephus¹ has fortunately preserved for us from Tyre's own annals. This informs us that Hiram, who was reigning in Tyre when Cyrus became king of Persia, as well as his brother and predecessor, had been brought from Babylon to be placed upon the throne.

But what shall be said of the predicted conversion of this heathen city with its wealth to the service of the Lord? There has been an incipient fulfilment of this which should not be overlooked. Tyre had its Christian disciples in the days of the apostles (Acts 21 : 3-6), and subsequently a flourishing church. It was the seat of a bishop; its cathedral was the most elegant structure in Phenicia; synods were held there. It had a Christian population down to the time of the crusades, when it was erected into a Latin archbishopric under the patriarch of Jerusalem. One of the most noticeable among the ruins of ancient

¹ "Against Apion," book i. § 21. A hint of Tyre's reduced condition at the close of the exile may be found in the fact that Zidon is mentioned before it, (Ezra 3 : 7) instead of after it, which is the usual order.

Tyre is that of a Christian church, which was originally a large and splendid structure. This, however, is but the budding of a fulfilment, and by no means all that the prophecy leads us to expect. The consideration of what further is involved in it can best be postponed to a subsequent part of this inquiry, when it shall be taken up again, together with the claim made by Dr. Kuenen (p. 110) that the punishment of Tyre, as of the other neighbors of Israel, should precede the return of Israel to their native land on the ground of Ezek. 28 : 24-26. We can only appreciate this correctly when the prophecies respecting Israel shall come before us.

The next prediction introduced is that of Jeremiah (49 : 23-27) against Damascus, where the whole ground of cavil is based upon an ambiguous word in the English version, of which advantage is taken to put a sense upon it which the original will not at all admit. "How is the city of praise not left!" is thus paraphrased, "Why might not Damascus have remained?" and this affirmed to imply "its permanent desolation;" whereas the first glance at the Hebrew is sufficient to show that "left" in this place means not permitted to remain, but forsaken, and there is no intimation whatever that it should not survive or recover from the threatened blow. In the scanty accounts that we possess of this entire period, it is not surprising that the event referred to has passed without mention. Josephus (Ant. x. 11, 1) speaks of captive Syrians taken to Babylon at the outset of Nebuchadnezzar's reign; and the subsequent course of events makes it more than probable that this was again repeated.

Of Ammon and Moab it is predicted, as Dr. Kuenen states, that "the two nations shall both be driven away or extirpated, and their cities shall be laid waste." And he adds, "this fate has in fact overtaken them." But he objects (p. 114) that "they were still inhabited and flourishing up to the seventh century of the Christian era;" whereas "the prophets do not expect [Isa. 11 : 14; 25 : 10; Zeph. 2 : 9, 10] that Moab and Ammon shall in the course of ages lose their national existence along with or even after Israel, but *that Israel shall be a witness of the destruction of their enemies, and shall reap the fruits of that destruction.*" "The prophecy that Israel shall appear as the inheritor of Moab and Ammon of itself absolutely forbids

us to see the realization of what Zephaniah expected, in the ruin of those nations six centuries after the second destruction of Jerusalem." But the punishment was not altogether postponed to this late period. The entire region was subdued and ravaged by Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus (*Ant. x. 9, 7*) specially mentions the subjugation of Coele Syria, Ammon, and Moab. That he purposed specially to attack the Ammonites we learn from Ezek. 21 : 20 ; and he had reasons for so doing both in the combination into which they had entered against Chaldea (Jer. 27 : 3), and in their harboring and perhaps instigating Ishmael the murderer of Gedaliah, whom the King of Babylon had made governor after the capture of Jerusalem (Jer. 40 : 14 ; 41 : 2, 15).

The relation of these lands to Israel when restored will be postponed until that subject is considered in connection with other nations.

For proof of the fulfilment of the predictions respecting the Edomites we need not go beyond that furnished in Dr. Kuenen's own pages, and which he vainly endeavors to set aside. In the time of Malachi, as 1 : 3, 4 expressly states, Esau's mountains and his heritage were lying waste. If this was effected, as there is every reason to believe, by Nebuchadnezzar in the expedition¹ five years after the destruction of Jerusalem, in which he subjected the Ammonites and Moabites and advanced into Egypt, then here we have the evidence that "nearly a century after the end of the captivity," when the Jews were restored and Jerusalem was rebuilt, Edom was still a desolation, and the prospect of recovery was as remote as ever. This certainly is not "the very opposite" of the representation in Joel 3 : 19, 20, but precisely coincident with it. Obad., v. 18, Ezek. 25 : 14 found accomplishment in the spoliation of the Edomites by Judas Maccabæus, then by John Hyrcanus, "who completely subdued them about B.C. 130, compelled them to adopt the rite of circumcision, and incorporated them into the Jewish state ;" then "by Simon son of Gioras, the head of one of the factions. The nation of the Edomites is mentioned no more after the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) : it was partly

¹ Josephus, *Ant. x. 9, 7*. This is not at variance with Ezek. chap. 35 or 36 : 5, which were uttered just after the fall of Jerusalem (33 : 21), nor with Isaiah 34, which was not written in the exile, but long before it.

incorporated with the Jewish nation, partly blended with other Arabian tribes. Meanwhile their former capital, Sela, and a great part of their ancient territory had already, many centuries before, passed into other hands." It is now reduced to utter desolation. Its interval of wealth and flourishing trade, during which it is better known to us by its Greek name Petra, and when it was occupied by others than Edomites, does not prevent this region, first wrenched from the children of Esau, then wasted as at the present day, from bearing its striking testimony to the truth of the prophecies.

Ezekiel's prediction of the forty years' desolation of Egypt (29 : 11-16) has long proved perplexing to interpreters, and is, we frankly admit, somewhat difficult to reconcile with Herodotus' statement (ii. 177) that the reign of Amasis, a considerable portion of which falls within this predicted term, "was the most prosperous time that Egypt ever saw." This is no new embarrassment raised by Dr. Kuenen, however; the whole matter had been thoroughly sifted, and every thing possible to be said had been said about it, before he was born, and that without shaking the confidence of those veteran scholars in the divinity of the prophet's word. In spite of Dr. Kuenen's confidence that the result which he has obtained "defies all reasonable contradiction and will in the end be generally received," we think it can be made to appear that he is over-hasty in his conclusions. From the time of the decisive battle of Carchemish, at all events, as Dr. Kuenen correctly states, Jeremiah predicted that Nebuchadnezzar would invade Egypt and subdue that country (Jer. 46 : 13-28). This he still continued to affirm years afterwards, when Jerusalem had been destroyed, and Gedaliah murdered, and the wretched remnant of Jews fled, contrary to the prophet's earnest remonstrance, to Egypt for protection (Jer. 43 : 8-13 ; 44 : 12-14); and the death of King Pharaoh-hophra by the hands of his enemies is made the sign of its fulfilment (44 : 29, 30). Ezekiel repeats with still more particularity that Nebuchadnezzar shall invade the land of Egypt, and that it shall be desolated for forty years, and the Egyptians shall be scattered among the nations; but at the end of forty years they shall be regathered into their own land, though Egypt shall thenceforth be a base kingdom, and no

more exalt itself above the nations nor be any more the confidence of the house of Israel.

Now, of all this Herodotus gives no account. He makes no mention of the subjugation of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. But it is to be borne in mind that Herodotus received his information from Egyptian priests, and they did not scruple, as he himself declares his belief more than once (iii. 2, 16), to falsify the truth of history in their own interest. Herodotus nowhere mentions Pharaoh-necho's defeat by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish, which put an end to Egyptian rule in Asia, and this though he speaks of that very expedition of Necho and his victory over Josiah at Megiddo. He nowhere speaks of Nebuchadnezzar at all, or of his coming into armed collision with Egypt. And yet the silence of Herodotus does not, even with Dr. Kuenen himself, discredit the battle of Carchemish, or call in question its decisive character. Still further, Herodotus never alludes to the conquest of Egypt by any king of Assyria; and the assertion of the capture of Thebes made by Nahum (3 : 8-10) was discredited by Dr. Kuenen and other similar critics, on the ground that no ancient historian mentions it, and the monuments existing in unbroken continuity make no allusion to it and have no room for it. But an inscription of Assurbanipal was found in which he relates the fact, and the critics were obliged to retract. The records of the Assyrians are similarly oblivious of defeats suffered by themselves. Sennacherib records in full his annual successes, but makes no allusion to his disastrous overthrow, of which we know both from the sacred historians and from Herodotus, the Egyptian priests having no motive for silence in this instance.

The silence of Egyptian informants is, therefore, not conclusive of the non-occurrence of what was disastrous to Egypt or mortifying to its pride. Now, if Dr. Kuenen will but distinguish between what the prophets actually say and what he imputes to them as their meaning, but which they do not say, we do not despair of convincing even himself that what the Jewish prophets predict respecting Egypt is entirely consistent with what Herodotus relates of the corresponding period.

"Hophra," he says (p. 124) with a flourish of italics, as though the prophet were contradicted point-blank by the testi-

mony of the historian, "did *not* fall in the war against Nebuchadnezzar." Well, no prophet said that he would. Jeremiah says (44 : 30), speaking from the mouth of God, "Behold, I will give Pharaoh-hophra King of Egypt into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life." Again (46 : 26), "I will deliver them"—*i.e.*, Pharaoh and all them that trust in him—"into the hand of those that seek their lives, and into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar King of Babylon, and into the hand of his servants." Now, what is the testimony of Herodotus? It is thus summed up in Dr. Kuenen's own words : "An insurrection broke out. Amasis, who was commissioned by the king to suppress it, placed himself at the head of the insurgents, defeated the mercenary forces, took Apries (Hophra) prisoner, and after some hesitation consented to his death." Is not the language of Jeremiah fulfilled to the letter? Pharaoh-hophra was delivered into the hand of them that sought his life.

But in his zeal to bring forth a contradiction where there is entire harmony, Dr. Kuenen holds the following most extraordinary language : "The narrative of Herodotus leaves no room for a temporary subjection of the Egyptians to the Chaldeans, or even for a successful invasion of their country by Nebuchadrezzar. How could Hophra have been able to undertake an expedition against Cyrene in 569 B.C., if in or after 570 B.C. he had been defeated by Nebuchadrezzar? For in this year, the twenty-seventh of Ezekiel's captivity, the conquest of Egypt by the Chaldeans had not yet, according to this prophet himself (29 : 17-21), taken place. Is it not absurd to suppose that it happened immediately thereafter, still in 570 B.C., and in the following year had been already forgotten?" It is astonishing that Dr. Kuenen can either content himself or expect to blind his readers by so transparent a trick as this. He has made an absurd supposition, which no one dreams of entertaining, as though it were involved in the truth of the prophet's prediction, but he has altogether evaded the simple and obvious explanation of the case which offers itself at once upon his own statement of the facts.

If Nebuchadnezzar had not yet invaded Egypt 570 B.C., and Hophra was involved in civil war 569 B.C., what more natural,

or more in accordance with the usual policy of ambitious monarchs, than that these domestic disturbances had either been fomented for the purpose or were seized upon as the occasion of foreign interference? Thus Sir Gardner Wilkinson: ¹ "We can readily imagine that the Assyrians, having extended their conquests to the extremity of Palestine, would, on the rumor of intestine commotions in Egypt, hasten to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded them of attacking the country. . . . From a comparison of all these authorities, I conclude that the civil war between Apries and Amasis did not terminate in the single conflict at Momemphis, but lasted several years; and that either Amasis solicited the aid and intervention of Nebuchadnezzar, or this prince, availing himself of the disordered state of the country, of his own accord invaded it, deposed the rightful sovereign and placed Amasis on the throne, on condition of paying tribute to the Assyrians. The injury done to the land and cities of Egypt by this invasion, and the disgrace with which the Egyptians felt themselves overwhelmed after such an event, would justify the account given in the Bible of the fall of Egypt; and to witness many of their compatriots taken captive to Babylon, and to become tributary to an enemy whom they held in abhorrence, would be considered by the Egyptians the greatest calamity, as though they had forever lost their station in the scale of nations. And this last would satisfactorily account for the title of Melek, given to inferior or to tributary kings, being applied to Amasis in some of the hieroglyphic legends accompanying his name."

If this view of Wilkinson and others is correct,—and it is difficult to see what well-founded objection can be made to it,—then it is perfectly easy to reconcile the statement of Herodotus that Pharaoh-hophra was put to death by the Egyptians, to whom he was delivered over by Amasis, and that of Josephus that he was slain by Nebuchadnezzar. The Egyptians were the immediate actors, but it was at the instance of the King of Babylon.

Dr. Kuenen's attempt to discredit the authority of Josephus, who here expressly vouches for the fulfilment of the

¹ "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians," vol. i. pp. 177-179. See also notes to Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii. 177, and chap. viii. of appendix to book ii. pp. 322 ff.

prophet's predictions, will scarcely gain the approval of any who do not agree with him in his foregone conclusion. Josephus¹ expressly appeals to the authority of Berosus for the affirmation that Nebuchadnezzar "conquered Egypt and Syria and Phœnicia and Arabia, and exceeded in his exploits all that had reigned before him in Babylon and Chaldea." The charge that Berosus is "altogether unhistorical" in speaking of Egypt as subject to the Chaldean empire prior to the time of Nebuchadnezzar sounds strangely since the discovery of Assurbani-pal's conquest of Egypt, which on the fall and partition of the Assyrian empire would come under the dominion of Babylon, or at least be claimed by it. And how could Nebuchadnezzar have exceeded all other monarchs of the great Asiatic empire in his exploits if he failed in his attempt upon Egypt, which others had subdued? The language of Megasthenes, that Nebuchadnezzar "subdued the greater part of Libya and Iberia," is doubtless an exaggeration; but upon what could such an exaggeration have been built if he never even penetrated into Africa?

The allegation that Josephus infers his facts from the predictions is utterly groundless and gratuitous. That he mentions² the predictions respecting the King of Babylon's conquest of Egypt, and adds "which things came to pass," implies, on the contrary, that he discriminates between the prophecy and its fulfilment, and had independent information of the latter. That he borrows freely from the historical statements of Jeremiah is no ground for the unworthy sneer that he has been "caught in the very act" of narrating as fact that for which he had no historical voucher. The circumstance to which Dr. Kuenen appeals (p. 128), that Josephus does not record "the forty years' desolation of Egypt, and the subsequent partial restoration which Ezekiel mentions," shows that he does not simply and without warrant convert prophecy into history, as is charged upon him. The attempt to involve Josephus in chronological conflict both with himself and with the prophet Ezekiel is based upon the following passage from the section

¹ "Against Apion," i. 19.

² "Antiquities of the Jews," x. 9, 7.

just now quoted: "On the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, which was the twenty-third of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, he made an expedition against Cœle-Syria, and when he had possessed himself of it, he made war against the Ammonites and Moabites; and when he had brought all those nations under subjection he fell upon Egypt in order to overthrow it, and he slew the king that then reigned and set up another, and he took those Jews that were there captives and led them away to Babylon." Upon this Dr. Kuenen comments as follows: "That the Chaldeans conquered Egypt in the year 581 B.C. is irreconcilable with the testimony of Ezekiel, from which it is evident that the conquest had not yet taken place in the year 570 B.C., and with the account of Josephus himself that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre for thirteen years—probably from 585 to 572 B.C.: the invasion of Egypt cannot surely be regarded as an episode of that siege!" This is merely the cavil of one who is determined to create difficulties at all hazards: it has no other foundation than the assumption, without one word in Josephus to justify it, that all the events grouped together in the paragraph above quoted occurred in one and the same year.

And now, after all the ado made about these prophecies respecting Egypt, and the confident assertion that nothing but "dogmatical reasons" can lead any to continue to defend them, the case stands thus: The silence of Herodotus respecting a conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar is no just reason for questioning the reality of its occurrence. The facts that he does state coincide perfectly with the assumption of such a conquest, and are moreover in entire harmony with the statements of Josephus, who positively avers it, and the correctness of whose narrative there is no sufficient reason for impugning; while it is both intrinsically probable, and has the explicit warrant of Berosus, a native Babylonish historian. In fact, the entire history of the period and the whole life of Nebuchadnezzar are unintelligible without the invasion of Egypt, which was the natural sequence of the victory at Carchemish, and of the struggle for predominance in Western Asia between the great empires of the east and south (see 2 Chron. 35:21).

Nebuchadnezzar, too, had steadily followed up his victory

by the siege of Jerusalem, by overrunning the contiguous lands, Moab, Ammon, and the rest, and by the reduction of Tyre, which finally opened the way for this long-contemplated campaign. That this was the well-understood policy of the Babylonish monarch from the beginning, is shadowed forth by constantly repeated predictions to this effect from Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as Dr. Kuenen must confess; for even upon his low views of prophecy they reveal the popular expectation, and the convictions of shrewd thinkers, and the drift of events. Vitranga suggests, not improbably, that it was the current expectation of an invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar that gave rise to the oracle reported by Herodotus (2, 58), that Necho, in building the canal to the Red Sea, was "laboring for the barbarian." And the fact that Nebuchadnezzar was occupied during the later years of his life with his magnificent buildings and adorning Babylon implies the success of his invasion, and that he had reached the summit of his ambition and terminated the long strife between the empires.

But what, it may still be said, is to be thought of Ezekiel's prediction of the forty years' desolation of Egypt? These forty years are plainly the residue of the seventy years' domination of Babylon foretold by Jeremiah (25: 11, 12), beginning with the battle of Carchemish, which broke the power of Egypt and established the empire of Babylon in the west, and ending with the capture of Babylon and subversion of the Chaldean empire by Cyrus. A trifle more than thirty of these predestined years had elapsed when Nebuchadnezzar ended his siege of Tyre, and now, the last obstacle removed, was prepared to strike the final blow which he had meditated from the outset, by pushing his conquests into the very heart of Egypt. Thus began that period of desolating war and humiliating subjection to a foreign yoke which was terminated only by Babylon's own fall, in round numbers forty years, historically reckoned perhaps thirty-six or thirty-seven years; though, if absolute precision to the very letter be demanded in the fulfilment, while in the absence of full historical data of the period it cannot be rigorously demonstrated, there will be little difficulty in assuming it. The beginning and the end of such a period of calamity cannot be sharply defined.

Egypt was harassed by internal dissensions, and doubtless by incursions from the troops of Nebuchadnezzar before his invasion was made in force. And the power of Babylon in the remoter parts of the empire was not instantly dissipated upon the capture of the city.

The surprisingly strong language of the prophet (29 : 10, 11), "I will make the land of Egypt utterly waste and desolate : . . . no foot of man shall pass through it, nor foot of beast shall pass through it, neither shall it be inhabited forty years," admits of a twofold vindication. I. These universal and sweeping expressions are necessarily limited by the nature of the case. It is a strong description of the desolation which would follow in the track of war, the consternation, pillage, massacre, which would so change the face of the peaceful and populous empire that it might be said to convert it into a desert. It is the natural language of hyperbole, which every one understands, and in which it would be contrary to sound interpretation and be a perversion of the real meaning of the writer to insist on the exact literality of the expressions ; as much so as when the evangelist says (John 21 : 25), that if all the acts of Christ were to be written the world itself could not contain the books. Compare Luke 19 : 40. It might as well be insisted that the language of every metaphor is to be pressed in its most literal sense. This is not interpretation, but perversion.

2. Again, it is to be borne in mind that prophecy does not always exhaust itself in a single fulfilment. This is the case here. The prophet Ezekiel, while speaking more immediately and directly of the judgment to be inflicted on Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, nevertheless has as his more general theme God's whole work of judgment upon Egypt, by which its hitherto colossal power and greatness were to be broken, and it should cease to be the object of idolatrous trust to Israel (29 : 16) that it then was and had long been. The first and preliminary stage in this process of degradation and humiliation was to be effected by Nebuchadnezzar : this was the initial yet decisive blow which presaged and involved all the rest. In describing it, consequently, the prophet does not view it as an isolated act and apart from its connections, but places it in combination

with all that properly appertains to it in the design of God, links it with its whole train of predestined sequences, and virtually gathers into one picture what God in bringing this to pass designed to effect. The purpose of God which sent Nebuchadnezzar into Egypt was not limited to that one act, but contemplated the reduction and humiliation of Egypt. This invasion was but the first step of a more comprehensive plan, the initiative and pledge of more to follow, an integral part of an indivisible whole as viewed in the divine mind and as here regarded by the prophet. Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Egypt as the first member of a closely concatenated series carried with it in the purpose of God all that was to come after, all that Egypt was thenceforward to suffer from subsequent invasions and oppressions by Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, Mamelukes, and Turks. And the strength of the prophet's expressions are graduated accordingly. While primarily spoken of Nebuchadnezzar, they have a residuary meaning that covers all that has since been developed from them. In like manner our Lord, in his memorable prophecy (Matt. 24), in which he blends together the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world as constituent parts of one grand drama of divine judgment on transgression, adds, "Verily this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." The first stadium of accomplishment, the foretaste and assurance of the whole, was then to be completed in the destruction of the Jewish capital, though there is a residuary meaning in his words which shall not be fully exhausted until the final judgment.

Dr. Kucnen does not disguise the contempt with which he regards this mode of interpreting prophecy, as though it were arbitrary in the extreme. We shall not at this point of the discussion enter as yet upon its defence and confirmation. If prophecy is, as it claims to be, a divine product, there is no reason why it should not thus take its shape from the divine purposes. Whether it does so in actual fact we shall inquire more particularly hereafter. We only remark at present that such a mode of interpretation, if feasible and proper, would satisfactorily explain the prophet's language, and justify us in peremptorily and in the most decided terms reversing our author's confident conclusion (p. 128), "that the future of

Egypt was concealed from Ezekiel, and that the reality did not even remotely correspond to his postulates."

Isaiah's prediction (20 : 4), "that the king of Assyria shall carry the inhabitants of Egypt and Ethiopia away ignominiously out of their land," was fulfilled to the letter, as is shown both by Nahum 3 : 8-10 and by an inscription of Assurbanipal—testimonies which are adduced by Dr. Kuenen himself (p. 121), and which he vainly seeks to set aside by the quibble that Isaiah "expects" this to be done by Sargon, whereas it was effected by his great-grandson. The sufficient reply to which is, that the meaning of the prophecy is to be determined not by what Dr. Kuenen conceives to be the "most obvious supposition" of what Isaiah "expects," but by its own explicit declarations. It was an expedition of Sargon which gave occasion to the prophecy; the triumph over Egypt, however, is ascribed not to Sargon, but to "the King of Assyria." The assault made by Sargon was followed up by his successors until the words of the prophet were amply verified.

It is no prejudice to the inspiration of Isaiah or of Micah if "the overthrow of the Assyrian empire is not predicted" by them. Such a prediction could not be expected from Micah, for his prophecy is limited exclusively to the fortunes of the people of God. Isaiah, on the other hand, does foretell Assyria's downfall with prominent reference indeed to Sennacherib's disastrous defeat (10 : 24-34; 17 : 12-14; 30 : 31 ff.; 31 : 8, 9), but in terms which may easily be understood as reaching much further and implying a more complete destruction. But at any rate the prophet is not omniscient. He has no predictive faculty by which he can survey the future at will. He knows barely what is revealed to him; of all else he is as ignorant as ordinary men. The fact that Isaiah depicts in the blissful future "a highway out of Egypt to Assyria" (19 : 23), and that Micah 5 : 5, 6 describes the coming Redeemer as Isaiah's protector against Assyrian invasion, may or may not warrant Dr. Kuenen's inference that for aught they knew the Assyrian empire would last until Messiah's days. But in either case the language is as consistent with strict truth as in any of those numerous instances in which the prophets set forth the future under figures borrowed from the present or the

past. How can the unknown be more intelligibly and impressively represented than by emblems taken from what is known and familiar? Thus when Isaiah would express the thought that the exiles of Israel shall be brought back to their own land under immediate and evident divine guidance and protection, he represents their return from the land of their oppressors as a fresh exodus out of Egypt, in which the miracle of the Red Sea shall be repeated (11 : 15), and water again brought for them from the rock (48 : 21). The particular forms in which this almighty intervention shall be exerted on their behalf are of small account compared with the essential fact itself. Thus, too, when Ezekiel would make Israel sensible that they were on a par with the worst offenders, and that their future restoration was wholly of God's unmerited mercy, he tells them that Sodom and her daughters shall likewise be restored to their former estate as well as they, and be associated with them in the closest intimacy and relationship (16 : 53, 55, 61) ; not, of course, that there was to be a literal resurrection of the cities of the plain, destroyed by fire from heaven, but that the same grace which rescues Israel will reach to Sodom's spiritual counterpart, and bring into restored communion with God and into fellowship with his people the most degraded heathen, the very dregs of the human race. Compare Isa. 1 : 10 ; Rev. 11 : 8.

It may have been of little consequence to Isaiah or to Micah, or to their contemporaries, to have the political changes disclosed to them by which Assyria was to be superseded on the map of the world or erased from the roll of nations ; but it was of vast moment to them to know that, whether the ancient Assyria should survive or whatever new Assyria might arise to take its place, the strife between the great empires of the world should hereafter give way to peaceful and amicable intercourse, and instead of their present animosity toward the people of God, they should be heartily united with Israel in the service of Jehovah. And should any future Assyria venture to molest Israel or disturb his peace, his Messiah would effectually protect him and avenge his cause.

Of Nahum's and Zephaniah's predictions of the total destruction of Nineveh, Dr. Kuenen well says, " History has set its seal on these anticipations." He claims, however, that

there was "one respect in which their predictions were not confirmed by the issue. Nineveh was depopulated and became a desolation in a comparatively brief space, but still not all at once" (p. 131). But how this militates against the truth of the prediction does not appear; much less what there is to justify Dr. Kuenen in speaking as he does (p. 133) of "the opposition between the contents of the prophecy and the historical reality." A summary statement of an event occupying long periods of time and passing through various phases, which seizes on its main features or depicts it in its consummation, may be just as true and for some important purposes vastly more effective than an account which enters into every minute detail. Nahum vividly describes the assault upon Nineveh, its capture, and its desolation. That this would all be finished at a stroke he does not say. The fact is revealed to him; the length of time that it would occupy, and the successive steps through which it would attain to full accomplishment, are not revealed. But the fulfilment is none the less accurate on that account, now that every item in the prediction has been verified; in fact, the longer the process the more far-seeing is he who can infallibly forecast its termination, and the clearer the evidence that it is no mere deduction of human sagacity.

To this view of the case Dr. Kuenen interposes two objections. 1. "It is judicial *punishments* which the prophets announce. But the destiny of the heathen nations loses that character when slow decay takes the place of sudden destruction." Unless Dr. Kuenen is disposed to dispute the moral government of God altogether, and to deny the reality of divine retributions in this world, he must mean, not that punishment ceases to be such because tardily inflicted or slowly evolved, but that men are in this case in danger of not recognizing it as such, and of being diverted from considering it in its real nature as a judicial infliction to what is merely subordinate and incidental. And this brings to light a prominent reason for that frequent peculiarity of prophetic representation which we are now considering and at which Dr. Kuenen takes such offence. The prophet not only discloses but interprets the future. It is the finger of God in human events which he is particularly concerned to mark. Prophecy is not the random disclosure of the

future for the sake of gratifying curiosity, exciting wonder, or even confirming a divine commission. This last is an incidental end of great value, but the prophet is mainly and properly the inspired religious teacher and guide of the people. The purposes of God in the future, so far as these are revealed to him, supply lessons of warning and instruction. He is concerned with the future only as it manifests the grace or the justice of God ; with coming calamities only as judicial inflictions, with coming good only as a fruit of the divine favor. The minutiae of historical detail, if disclosed to him, would be nothing to his purpose ; the intervals of time, the fluctuations and varying phases of events, the second causes concerned in their production, are all unessential to the end for which prophecy is communicated, viz., that of impressing moral and spiritual lessons on the minds of the people. In fact, they are not only of inferior consequence, but it would be disturbing and distracting to introduce them. The lesson of God's judgment on a guilty nation is made more impressive by presenting it in its unity, by gathering it all up into one summary, comprehensive view, which shall truthfully represent and faithfully depict it in the aggregate or in certain marked and salient features, and direct attention to the moral sequences and the design of God in the whole from first to last. And, if this is to be done, it is of course necessary to pass over slightly or altogether leave out of sight much that is purely accessory and contingent, and which would only serve to turn away the thoughts from the main point to be inculcated

And this is important, not only for the immediate hearers of the prophet, but for those as well who live when the events predicted come to pass, to give them the true key for the understanding of that which they behold. Dr. Kuenen says, " Surely none of those who witnessed the decay of heathen nations could regard it, as the prophet wished it to be regarded, as the execution of a sentence pronounced by Jahveh." But, instructed by the prophet beforehand, men can do this : they can then trace in the slow evolutions of history what he has fore-shown in his condensed picture and set in its true divine relations. This " deviation in details," therefore, " between the prediction and the historical fact," at which Dr. Kuenen cavils,

results from the divine adaptation of prophecy to its proper end in the instruction and training of the people of God.

Dr. Kuenen's second objection to the view that a neglect of the relations of time is consistent with the truth of prophecy is that prophecy not infrequently does take cognizance of these relations. "Fixed dates are not wanting in the prophecies. The prophets thus show that they perceive very well that dates are any thing but indifferent. In a number of prophecies the cardinal thought itself stands or falls with the succession of events therein announced." This is certainly so. And we quite agree with Dr. Kuenen's criticism upon those who speak of the "perspective" character of prophecy as if it were one of its invariable features, or of inner intuition as the fixed form of prophetic revelation, that they attribute to all prophecies what is applicable only to a portion of them. The phenomena of vision may be serviceable in illustrating that frequent peculiarity of prophetic representation, to which we have before adverted; but to resolve prophecy into vision and to determine its laws accordingly, is to enter the region of doubtful speculation. The Spirit of the Lord is limited to no one method in making his disclosures. The ends of his revelation are better answered sometimes, as we have seen, by excluding all reference to the lapse of time; at others definite dates are given, and the chronological order of events is distinctly indicated. And when the latter is the case, the fulfilment must of course conform to the statements of the prophecy in these particulars.

The special application which Dr. Kuenen proposes of this principle is the following: "Is the judgment upon one or other heathen nation promised to the people of Israel, and represented as the reparation of the wrongs which they had endured, then the possibility of such a prophecy being realized ceases from the moment that Israel loses its national existence, and thus can no longer reap the fruits of the destruction of its enemies" (p. 136). The fallacy of this is obvious. Israel sustained a twofold character. It was both a political and a religious body. It was a nation, with its affinities of race and its hereditary institutions; and it was the people of God, in covenant with him, and embracing those who feared his name and obeyed his will. These two aspects, though historically blended in Israel, were

not inseparable ; and even while they were united they might be and they were mentally distinguished. Now, nothing can be plainer than that in their promises of future good the prophets contemplate Israel, not as a nation, but as the people of God. It is their constant theme that the wicked must be purged out of Israel by divine judgments (Isa. 1 : 24 ff.) before the promised blessings can come, and the holy seed alone shall be spared (Isa. 6 : 13) ; though they were as numerous as the sand of the sea, only a remnant should return to the Lord and stay themselves on him (Isa. 10 : 20-22). It shall be well with the righteous ; it shall be ill with the wicked (Isa. 3 : 10, 11). All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword (Amos 9 : 10). There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked (Isa. 48 : 22). Their possession of the temple that was called by the Lord's name, and of the land which he had given them (Jer. 7 : 14), and the promises made to their fathers (11 : 3 ff.), would not save them if disobedient and unfaithful. It was shown to Jeremiah (ch. 24) under the emblem of the good figs and the bad figs, and to Ezekiel in the vision of his eleventh chapter, that the wicked, however they might be outwardly connected with Israel, were no real part of it (Hos. 1 : 9), and they had no proper share in the blessings that were in reserve. But, on the other hand, the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord shall share the privileges of his people (Isa. 56 : 3-8). Egypt and Assyria, when they too serve the Lord, shall occupy the same relation to him as Israel (Isa. 19 : 23-25). The merchandise of Tyre (Isa. 23 : 18) shall, like every thing in Jerusalem (Zech. 14 : 21), be holiness to the Lord. Of all the nations that have provoked divine judgments, the Lord declares (Jer. 12 : 16), " If they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, the Lord liveth, then shall they be built in the midst of my people." " Many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people " (Zech. 2 : 11). Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Ethiopia are to be accounted as native-born in Zion (Ps. 87 : 4).

On the basis of such statements, which abound upon every page of the prophetic writings, we are amply justified in affirming that the national existence of Israel was to the prophets quite a distinct thing from the existence of Israel as the people

of God. They clearly contemplated the possibility that the former might be overturned ; they over and over again positively predict that it shall be ; but the latter abides perpetual, unaffected by the ruins of the former. The national existence of Israel is no more. But the people of Jehovah, who worship and fear him, who reverently receive and obey his Word through Moses and the prophets, are more numerous than ever. They belong to every nation. They are found in every land. They are sprung from every race and family of mankind. These are the Israel of God in the true sense of the prophets, who regard not natural lineage, but spiritual kinship.

So far, then, from the termination of Israel's "national existence" having set a limit to the fulfilment of the prophecies under consideration, the enlargement of the faithful remnant of Israel by the accession of believing Gentiles is supplying the required conditions and preparing the way for a fulfilment in a fuller and more adequate sense than ever. The fulfilment began in each case with the judgment inflicted upon these nations severally by Assyria or by Babylon before Israel's political existence was extinguished, and when they could behold the avenging of their cause by the providence of God, and to some extent reap the benefits of it before the captivity or after the return. But "the meek shall inherit the earth." And the time is yet coming when these desolated seats of the ancient foes of God's people shall be occupied by those who truly fear his name.

These are the two talismans, on whose magical virtue Dr. Kuenen relies to set aside what have been hitherto ranked among the most signal fulfilments of prophecy ; and thus easily and effectually are they disenchanting. They cannot abide the test of a candid examination. It is not essential to the accomplishment of a prediction that it should take place speedily or all at once, when the prediction itself makes no such requirement. And the loss of Israel's national existence does not put an end to the possibility of fulfilling the judgments predicted on their foes. We accept without hesitation the view which he imputes to believers in prophecy (p. 135), that it is "fulfilled exactly and literally, or in another form and at another period, but still *always fulfilled*," though we repel the latent

sarcasm in his form of putting it, as though their only concern were to bring out a fulfilment by fair means or by foul. The truth is, that an honest interpretation of prophecy and comparison with the facts of history uniformly carries with it the evidence of a fulfilment; and this is only to be escaped by some such method as that of Dr. Kuenen, imposing arbitrary conditions not authorized by the prediction, and refusing to admit a fulfilment, however obvious, unless these are complied with.

To the predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah respecting Babylon, with the exception of some trivialities the bare statement of which would be a sufficient refutation, he has nothing to object but "the lingering process of decay through which the mighty city passed" to its desolation so accurately foretold ages before.

Dr. Kuenen confesses that all which the book of Daniel contains respecting "Alexander the Great and his successors," and especially "the fortunes of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that prince's measures against the Israelitish religion," is strictly accurate. But then he alleges that the account of the latest years of Antiochus and all beyond that time is contradicted by the event; and its account of matters "before Alexander the Great is not only incomplete, but defective, and partly inaccurate." Hence he infers that this book cannot have been the genuine production of the prophet Daniel, but must belong to a much later date. "The writer's ignorance of these facts is at once explained if we assume that he wrote in the age of Epiphanes, and that in the year 165 B.C. But how can that ignorance be made to agree with the supposition that he was enlightened by supernatural revelation with regard to all the preceding matters? Did that revelation begin to fail him at a certain point?" But how if no such ignorance exists except in Dr. Kuenen's imagination, or must we even say it, his misrepresentation? How, still further, if the book contains clear and unambiguous prophecies, which have been undeniably fulfilled, reaching far beyond the date when he himself alleges it to have been written? His argument against its genuineness and its inspiration then falls of itself; and the admission which he has made of its correctness in relation to events

long after Daniel's time becomes a confession of a long series of predictions accurately accomplished.

This it is not difficult to show. The charge (p. 144, note 7) that, whereas Antiochus died in Persia, it is predicted (Dan. 11 : 40-45) that he should find his end in Palestine, is refuted by simply reading ver. 45, "And he shall come to his end, and none shall help him ;" this was to be after he had planted "the tabernacle of his palace in the glorious holy mountain," but that it should be immediately after or in the same locality is neither said nor implied. An error is pretended in the 2300 days (8 : 14), and in the three and a half years (12 : 7), the 1290 and the 1335 days (vs. 11, 12) ; but their literal exactness is defended not only by believing interpreters as Hävernick, but even by others who, like Bertholdt and Lengerke, attach no more credit to prophecy than Dr. Kuenen himself. The statement that the writer of Daniel "knows only of four Persian kings" has no other foundation than the circumstance that he has occasion to speak of Xerxes (11 : 2) as the fourth after Cyrus (10 : 1).

The assertion that "he is in error even with regard to the Babylonian kings, of whom the last is according to him Belshazzar, the son and, as it appears, the successor of Nebuchadnezzar," is a very extraordinary one in the present state of our knowledge on this subject. Until a comparatively recent time Belshazzar was a puzzle, and the charge that the author of the book of Daniel had blundered here was freely made. No other writer of antiquity makes mention of such a prince. All who speak of the last king of Babylon call him Nabonned, or by some name so nearly approaching this in form as to be plainly identical. According to Berosus, he was not of royal descent, but reached the throne by a successful conspiracy ; and, instead of being put to death when Babylon was taken (Dan. 5 : 30), he was at that time at Borsippa, which he surrendered without a siege, and was in consequence generously treated by Cyrus, who made him governor of Caramania, where he died. Xenophon, indeed, says that the king, whom he styles "impious," but does not give his name, was slain in the capture of Babylon. But it was the fashion to discredit Xenophon and Daniel, and to affirm that the native historian Berosus must be right. Thus the

case stood until a few years since, when the whole matter was cleared up and Daniel thoroughly vindicated by the discovery of a cylinder¹ of Nabonned, King of Babylon, in which he makes repeated mention of his eldest son Belshazzar (Bel-sar-ussur). No doubt Nabonned had associated his son Belshazzar with himself in the sovereignty. When Nabonned was defeated by Cyrus, and obliged to shut himself up in Borsippa, Belshazzar remained in Babylon and perished in the overthrow of the city. If we suppose Nabonned to have been married to a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar,² who would then be the queen of Dan. 5 : 10, Nebuchadnezzar could with as much propriety be called the father of Belshazzar (Dan. 5 : 2 ff.) as David is called the father of King Josiah (2 Chron. 34 : 2, 3). If now, as Dr. Kuenen would have us believe, the book of Daniel is the production, not of a contemporary and an eye-witness, but of some nameless Jew of Palestine nearly four centuries after the fall of Babylon, how comes it to pass that it alone of all ancient writings has preserved the name of Belshazzar and the memory of his existence ?

Another equally unfortunate thrust at the credibility of Daniel is the charge that he " thrusts in the Median monarchy between the Babylonian and the Persian." His mention of the brief rule of Darius the Mede, which is also certified by Xenophon, and has besides such intrinsic probability under the circumstances, is another instance of minute accuracy where other historians of the period have passed over in silence a reign attended by no lasting consequences and eclipsed by the greater glory of that of Cyrus. The idea of a " Median monarchy," however, following the Babylonian and distinct from the Persian, is not sanctioned by Daniel, but foisted upon him by Dr. Kuenen for a purpose of his own. In order to bring the contents of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 2) and of the

¹ Menant, " *Babylone et la Chaldée*," pp. 254 ff.

² This supposition is commended not only by its perfectly reconciling all the statements in the case, and by the analogy of Neriglissar (Nergal-sharezer), the successful conspirator against his brother-in-law Evil-merodach, but likewise by the fact, attested by the Behistun inscription, that Nabonned had a son Nebuchadnezzar, who was twice personated by impostors in the reign of Darius Hystaspes.

vision of the four beasts (chap. 7) into the period preceding the time which he has fixed for the composition of the book, he maintains (p. 141) that "the four kingdoms are the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian, and the Grecian (that of Alexander the Great and his successors)." But that the Median and the Persian are not two, but one and the same kingdom, appears from the fact that the Medes and Persians are always united, both in this book and elsewhere. It was announced to Belshazzar (5 : 28), "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." Under Darius the Mede the law is that of the Medes and Persians (6 : 8, 12, 15). The ram with the two horns in the vision of ch. 8 represents (v. 20) the kings of Media and Persia. So under Ahasuerus (Xerxes) it is Persia and Media (Esth. 1 : 3, 14, 18), the Persians and the Medes (1 : 19). And in the Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspes we find repeatedly the same combination, Persia and Media, the Persian and Median army. The same thing appears from the nature of the case. The Median was not overturned by the Persian kingdom, as the Babylonian by the Persian and the Persian by the Grecian; but there was simply a change in the reigning monarch by peaceful legitimate succession. The four heads of the third beast (7 : 6) indicate the fourfold division of the third monarchy, which was true of the Grecian kingdom (see 8 : 8, 22), but inapplicable to the Persian.

If, now, the Medo-Persian is but one kingdom, the second, and the Grecian the third, then the fourth kingdom must be the Roman—which best suits the description, and which is the interpretation that has been put upon it from the beginning. This delineation of the character and conquests of the Roman empire, the erection of Messiah's kingdom while it still lasted, its subsequent weakness and subdivision, and the arising of a great persecuting power out of it, are predictions which were manifestly fulfilled long after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and which require the assumption of a divine supernatural foresight, even though the book were written at as late a period as that to which Dr. Kuenen himself assigns it; not to speak of the further prophecy of the seventy weeks (9 : 24-27), fulfilled in the ministry and vicarious death of Jesus Christ at the predicted time, and the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem. Can

such evidence of inspiration coexist with imposture? Can predictions such as these, the reality of which even the most advanced critical hypothesis fails to set aside, be joined in the same production with pretended predictions which are not really such, which are not genuine utterances of the prophet from whom they claim to be, but falsely issued in his name after the events had come to pass? This prediction that the Grecian empire would be succeeded by the Roman further shows that Daniel did not expect the resurrection and final judgment to follow immediately after the deliverance from the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus corrects the false inferences drawn from the transition in 12 : 1, 2. Moreover, if the book of Daniel were a spurious production, first written and published 165 B.C., and contained the extravagant and fanatical expectations imputed to it by Dr. Kuenen respecting the miraculous death of Antiochus in Palestine, to be followed at once by the coming of the Messiah and the resurrection—expectations which were falsified by the event within two years—must it not have been discredited at once? How could it ever have gained credit as the genuine work of a true prophet of God, who lived nearly four centuries before? and especially how could it have attained such speedy and acknowledged influence that the book of Maccabees, in recording the history of these times, adopts its very language and borrows its forms of expression?

In regard to the judgments predicted upon Israel, Dr. Kuenen is at great pains to represent the prophets as at variance with one another and with the facts of the case; and the methods which he employs are as extraordinary as the results at which he arrives. He alleges that neither Hosea nor Amos "expect the destruction of the kingdom of Judah," though they clearly intimate that it shall be destroyed (Hos. 1 : 11 ; 8 : 14 ; Amos 2 : 5 ; 9 : 11); and this is besides a subject foreign to their theme, in which silence cannot with any propriety be construed as a denial. Amos predicts the captivity of the ten tribes, but Dr. Kuenen cavils because he does not explicitly mention the Assyrians, nor state how long it would be before the exile, and because he exhorts the people to repentance; from which the inference is drawn that he could not

have foreseen that they would remain obdurate, and that the judgments which he threatens would really be inflicted. He endeavors to show that Hosea is vacillating and self-contradictory, and finally confesses that he "does not contradict himself, if we regard his intention more than the words he employs."

Micah 3:12 predicts the destruction of Jerusalem, which was accomplished by the Chaldeans. Isaiah predicts that it shall be spared in the invasion of Sennacherib.¹ And this is gravely represented as a contradiction, though, to make it out, Micah's comment on his own words (4:10), "thou shalt go even to Babylon," must be eliminated from the text, and Isaiah's prediction of the Babylonish captivity (39:6) is oracularly pronounced to be spurious.

Isaiah predicts (7:7, 8) that within threescore and five years Ephraim shall be broken that it be not a people, and (v. 16) that this process of extinction shall be begun by the desolation of the land of Ephraim before a child could reach that age at which it could know to refuse the evil and choose the good. To Dr. Kuenen's mind these two passages contradict one another, though both are in exact accordance with the event—the one fulfilled by Tiglath-pileser, the other by Esarhaddon. Of the latter he rids himself in the easiest manner possible by

¹ Of course Dr. Kuenen makes the most that he can out of the chronological difficulty which Assyrian scholars pretty unanimously agree to find in Isa. 36:1 and the parallel passage 2 Kings 18:13. While the testimony of the monuments confirms the statements of these chapters in the most remarkable manner, and even in minute particulars, it would appear that Sargon was still King of Assyria in Hezekiah's fourteenth year, and that the invasion of Sennacherib very probably did not take place till thirteen years later. "It is impossible," he says, p. 288, "to imagine that we have here an error of a copyist; but how then can a blunder so remarkable have originated with regard to such an important fact?" His solution is that an expedition of Sargon has been confounded with that of Sennacherib, and this mingling of two separate events, which awakens a suspicion of other inaccuracies, betrays a writer long posterior to the occurrences themselves. In his opinion this narrative was not written by Isaiah himself, but has been adopted into the volume of his prophecies from the books of Kings. Consequently, "*in its present form,*" it "is about a hundred and fifty years later than the events which it records" (p. 287).

Refreshing as it is to find Dr. Kuenen thus playing the unaccustomed rôle of an assertor of the accuracy of the received text, we cannot help thinking that, if the conclusions of Assyriologists be correct in this instance, the

assuming an interpolation. Allow him to expunge what he pleases, and to put his own meaning on what he suffers to remain, and he need not find it difficult to prove or disprove any thing he likes.

Isaiah further predicts (7 : 15, 16) that Judah should be relieved from the present invasion by Syria and Ephraim within three or four years ; that butter and honey, the subsistence of a ravaged country, should not be eaten beyond that time. Dr. Kuenen refers it to a subject that it has nothing in the world to do with, and makes it mean that the invasion by Assyria and Egypt spoken of in the subsequent verses of the chapter should occur within this brief interval. And then he triumphantly exclaims (p. 169) : " But it did not take place. In the reign of Ahaz, and also during the first half of the reign of Hezekiah, Judah continued to be exempt from an Assyrian invasion."

Jeremiah's prediction, steadfastly adhered to from the beginning to the end of his ministry, of the overthrow of Jerusalem and the exile of the people, was confessedly fulfilled. But Dr. Kuenen tries to break its force by alleging that other prophets took a contrary view. Habakkuk's brief prophecy is wholly occupied with the judgment upon the Chaldeans ; we cannot accordingly expect in it a statement of what shall befall

readiest mode of reconciliation is to assume an error in the number, and to suppose that "fourteenth" has been wrongly substituted for "twenty-seventh." It would not be difficult to account for such a mistaken attempt at correction on the part of transcribers. Hezekiah's sickness (Isa. 38 : 5 ; comp. 2 Kings 18 : 2) occurred in the fourteenth year of his reign. Hastily assuming the order of narration to be the order of time, and inferring a closer chronological juxtaposition from the general expression "in those days" (Isa. 38 : 1) than the terms really require, transcribers may have judged that consistency demanded the number "fourteenth" in 36 : 1, and have made the requisite emendation. But now if chaps. 38, 39 really precede 36, 37 by thirteen years—and that they are prior in order of time appears from 38 : 6—then a convincing argument thence arises that these chapters are original in Isaiah and borrowed thence in Kings. This inversion of the chronological order is unaccountable in Kings ; while in Isaiah the whole structure of the book demands it. The entire preceding section of the book of Isaiah consists of prophecies relating to the Assyrian invasion, and is first completed by the narrative of its actual occurrence. Then the sickness of Hezekiah, followed by the King of Babylon's message and the prediction of the captivity in Babylon (39 : 5-7), begins a new section, containing prophecies relating to that event and the deliverance from it.

Jerusalem, and yet even here see 1 : 5-10. Upon this book Dr. Kuenen makes the following most extraordinary comment : " In vain do we attempt to thrust in the fall of Jerusalem anywhere into his prophecies. Habakkuk has not even a faint presentiment of it ; or rather he denies distinctly that such a catastrophe should be admitted into Jahveh's purposes." Joel of the preceding period, and Zechariah (chap. 12-14) from the period after the exile, are dislocated from their true position, affirmed on the most precarious critical grounds to be Jeremiah's contemporaries, their language applied to a matter of which they are not treating, and they are thus made to declare that, contrary to the allegations of Jeremiah, the land would not be invaded by the Chaldeans, or that the Lord would visibly interfere at the moment of the capture of the city. And to cap the climax, the false prophet Hananiah (Jer. 28) is bolstered up by being placed in such company, and represented as declaring in the name of Jehovah, with as much right to be considered his messenger as Jeremiah, directly the opposite of what the latter asserted. And on this showing it is affirmed that we have here prophet against prophet !

As for " the predictions which have reference to the restoration of Israel," Dr. Kuenen affirms, and he italicizes his affirmation, "*not one of them has been realized.*" We admit, without a moment's hesitation, that if these predictions are to be understood solely in a national and local sense, they have never yet been accomplished in any thing like their full extent of meaning. But this very fact creates a presumption against such a limitation. The judgments denounced against Israel and the nations have all been inflicted, as we have seen, notwithstanding Dr. Kuenen's contradiction. And it would be strange if in the promised blessings there is no correspondence whatever between the prediction and the reality ; and this especially as there was in the return from the Babylonish captivity an incipient fulfilment of these promises in every particular, which, as Dr. Kuenen is himself forward to assure us, the subsequent prophets recognized as " the beginning of the realization" of them (p. 194), and which they accepted as the pledge of their full and final accomplishment. There was a return from exile, though it was partial, not total ; and there was no such vast multiplication of

the people as had been promised. There was an end of the schism and of all hostility between Judah and Ephraim, though no complete union was effected of these two branches of the covenant people in one body. They were led by a prince of the house of David, but no son of David sat as king upon his father's throne; and Israel remained subject to the domination of the Gentiles instead of themselves ruling the world. There was not the full return of the people to God, nor the abundant tokens of his favor which were promised in the blissful future.

Considered as the first stage of accomplishment, the restoration from Babylon might well be reckoned, as was done by Zechariah and his compeers, as an earnest of more to come. But in itself it plainly fell far below the prophetic anticipations, and cannot be regarded as a complete and satisfactory fulfilment of what had been foretold in such glowing terms. And Dr. Kuenen is right in insisting that these predictions are no longer "capable of being realized," if this budding fulfilment has proved abortive, and after the lapse of two thousand years there has not only been no further progress toward fulfilment, but these imagined tokens of it have themselves been falsified and obliterated by the complete abolition of Israel's national existence and the long dispersion of ages. To urge, as the only defence that can be made on behalf of these predictions, that whereas they "are not realized as yet," they "*shall be realized* some time" by "the return of the whole of Israel to their native country and Israel's supremacy over the nations of the earth in the last days," is to "contradict the explanation of the old prophecies which is presented in the Old Testament itself" (pp. 186, 196).

But whatever may still remain to be developed in the future and in whatever form, the past has not been unproductive. The promise given in the return from captivity has already been succeeded by large results. The remnant of Israel has become a vast multitude. The Son of David is seated upon his everlasting throne, and is extending his conquests among the nations; and the blessings of his reign are unfolding themselves in the experience of mankind. The hope of Israel is realized in Christ and the Gospel. All the prophetic anticipations of com-

ing good for Israel and the world were linked with the great Redeemer and King, who was to arise from David's line.

Strangely enough, Dr. Kuenen goes groping through the whole Old Testament, and absolutely professes his inability to find any prediction of a personal and individual Messiah there at all. "The word 'Messiah' is not used in the Old Testament *in any one instance*," he tells us in emphatic italics, "to denote a descendant of David who shall reign over Israel restored" (p. 202). The promise to our first parents (Gen. 3 : 15) "has no connection" with this subject ; "the serpent is—a serpent and nothing more" (p. 377). The promise to Abraham is not that all families of the earth shall be blessed in him or in his seed, but that "he shall be so prosperous, his posterity shall be so numerous and fortunate, that nothing better or higher can be imagined than the enjoyment of what he or his race possesses." The blessing pronounced upon Judah (Gen. 49 : 10) is not of the coming of Shiloh, but of the coming to Shiloh, "the common sanctuary."

Jeremiah "does not expect one single king of David's family, but an unbroken succession of Davidic kings" (p. 205). The same is the case with Ezekiel (p. 209). So, too, Micah and Zechariah (9-11) : "the king whom they announce is described as one of the children of men, but therefore seems also of necessity to partake of mortality, the lot of them all." Probably in Zechariah 1-8 "the man whose name is Branch" is "regarded also by him as the first of an unbroken succession of rulers like to him." "In Isaiah also he is no supernatural being." "'Mighty God' (Isa. 9 : 6), viewed in itself, might have afforded some ground for the conjecture that a supernatural ruler was present to the mind of the prophet ; and that the more because the same name is employed elsewhere to denote Jahveh (10 : 21). But this conjecture is not confirmed : all the other features point to a king of human origin." "It is possible that Isaiah attributed an endless reign to the king himself whom he expected," but his meaning more probably is "that nothing shall interrupt the regular succession of the kings of his house."

In Isaiah 40-66, "the servant of Jehovah" is commonly understood by believing interpreters to denote the true people

of God, including and culminating in the Messiah, who was to spring from the midst of them, and with whom they are here associated or identified in their mission, character, and destiny, in humiliation and in glory. This simple and obvious interpretation is demanded by the reference (55 : 3) to "the sure mercies of David ;" it explains what Dr. Kuenen admits to be "undeniable, that the servant of Jahveh is sometimes described as if he were one individual ;" it also explains how he can have a work to do for Israel as well as for the nations, and how his sufferings can be unmerited and vicarious ; and it brings Isaiah into harmony with himself and with the other prophets. But Dr. Kuenen prefers to find here a diversity between the prophets : "The very remarkable phenomenon presents itself, that the expectations concerning the dynasty of David become disjoined from their proper object and are transferred to the whole people" (p. 220). He actually adduces the apparent conflict between the death and burial of the Servant of Jehovah (Isa. 53 : 8, 9), and his prolonging his days and enjoying a satisfying reward (vs. 10, 11), in proof that "the particulars which the prophet mentions must be distributed among the different persons who together constitute the collective number." And he alleges that "what is communicated regarding the destiny of 'the servant' does not admit of being harmonized with the description of the scion of David given by Isaiah and Micah" (p. 223).

The Son of Man, who came with the clouds of heaven (Dan. 7 : 13), is in his view not the Messiah, but the Israelitish nation. And Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks (9 : 24 ff.) has nothing to do with a Messiah of the house of David. The author, who is assumed to have lived under Antiochus Epiphanes, is simply describing, under the veil of prophecy, what had already taken place. Jeremiah 25 : 11, 12 ; 29 : 10, had assigned the term of seventy years to the desolations of Jerusalem, and this had been strictly fulfilled according to Ezra 1 : 1 ; 2 Chron. 36 : 22. But this imaginary author is supposed to have thought otherwise, and accordingly to have conceived that Jeremiah must have meant, not ordinary, but sabbatical years, or weeks of years, and to have developed in vs. 24-27, his conception of that prophecy and his adjustment of it to what had taken place

down to his own day. "The going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," which is (v. 25) the starting-point of the seventy weeks, is alleged to be Jeremiah's prophecy already referred to, though this relate to an entirely different matter from the building of Jerusalem—viz., the period of Babylon's domination and of Israel's subjection and captivity. From this prophecy in the fourth year of Jehoiakim until "an anointed prince," who is not the Jewish Messiah, but Cyrus, is declared to be "seven weeks," or 49 years; though in actual fact, and according to the biblical reckoning, it was 70 years (a computation which is implied even in Dan. 9:2), the discrepancy being laid to the account of ignorance in the writer. After sixty-two weeks more, or 434 years, "Messiah is cut off," not the Jewish Messiah, nor Cyrus as before, but the high-priest Onias. In reality Onias was murdered 365 years after the first of Cyrus, leaving an error of 69 years to be accounted for as the preceding. This is further aggravated in the present instance by the allegation made in a different connection, that the writer knew of no Persian king later than Xerxes, and that he imagined him to be the antagonist of Alexander. The deficit is thus swelled to 200 years, and it becomes necessary to assume that he assigned 362 years instead of 162 to the empire of Alexander and his Syrian successors preceding the death of Onias. And this enormous blunder is committed in a period with the details of whose history he shows such familiarity in chap. 11, that mainly on this ground the book is pronounced spurious and its date fixed during the persecutions of Antiochus! And all this to escape the plain reference of the prophecy to the advent of the Messiah. Can any one be so blind as he who is determined not to see?

Two things remain to be accounted for after this total abstraction from the Old Testament of the doctrine of the Messiah, and especially the disappearance in the latest prophets of any expectation even of a revival of the dynasty of David. One is that prophecies which are so destitute of any reference to the Messiah should ever have given rise to the expectation of his coming. Another is that they all admit of such ready application to Jesus Christ.

Dr. Kuenen objects that to find in Christianity the fulfil-

ment of the prophecies respecting Israel is to "spiritualize" them, and thus give them another than their real meaning. We reply, on the contrary, that with some diversity in outward form and incidental circumstances there is nevertheless the closest adherence to the essential meaning of the prophets. The fact is, as Dr. Kuenen states it (page 188), with the view, not of recommending, but of disparaging the current opinion on this subject : The prophecies of the Old Testament are "*more than fulfilled*, or in other words, the reality under the New Testament dispensation *far surpassed* the expectations under the Old."

The prophets everywhere recognize and insist upon the distinction between the outward forms of the Old Testament and their inward spiritual meaning. Isaiah declares (1 : 11-20) that it is not sacrifices and burnt-offerings, oblations and incense, treading God's courts, new moons and sabbaths, feasts and assemblies, that God requires, but purity of heart and life, and obedience to his will. When now he speaks (2 : 2-4) of the nations hereafter going up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob, it is plain that the external act of pilgrimage to that locality does not exhaust his thought : it is in fact a very subordinate part of it. Its only value or meaning to him is as the legitimate mode of expressing his essential idea that these nations would pay their worship to the God of Israel, would be taught by him of his ways, and would walk in his paths. And if any other mode of doing this is equally legitimate and acceptable to the God of Israel, who will say that it does not as perfectly meet Isaiah's expectation and correspond to his thought?—especially as a figurative character is given to this whole representation by its opening words. Dr. Kuenen himself says (p. 247) : "The prophet may be understood to have meant figuratively what he says about the exaltation of Zion on the top of the mountains ;" but he adds, "On the other hand, the pilgrimage to the temple on Zion must be understood literally. . . . We should deprive the prophecy of its meaning and force if we attempted to explain it spiritually." There is nothing to justify this assertion, or the arbitrary line here drawn between what is figurative and what is literal, unless it be the positive air with which it is done.

The same prophet, or, according to Dr. Kuenen's critical hypothesis, another prophet in a later age, declares (Isa. 66 : 1-3) that heaven is Jehovah's throne and the earth his footstool; man can build him no fitting house; the offering of oxen and lambs and incense is a crime and an abomination to him, except as joined with and expressing inward piety; he regards with favor only him that is humble and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at his word. He then adds (ver. 23): "And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah." Apart from the physical impossibility of weekly and monthly pilgrimages from all parts of the earth, even if this be limited to lands then known; apart also from the fact that this is greatly in excess of the requirements of the law, which enjoined pilgrimages to the sanctuary but thrice in the year, at the annual feasts—is it not plain that the stress is laid upon worship before Jehovah? The sacred seasons and the central sanctuary are simply referred to as the authorized place and times of acceptable service. If the same authority which had hitherto required them should hereafter dispense with them, of what account would they be in the prophet's eyes? It is to "worship in spirit and in truth" that his thought was directed, and not to worship in Jerusalem, except as the divinely prescribed place of a true and spiritual adoration.

Jehovah's worship, though for the time then present it had a local seat, was not, in the judgment of the prophets, bound to any one place by an indissoluble tie. The worship of their father Abraham, who was the friend of God (Isa. 41 : 8), was untrammelled by any fixed locality. The place for the sanctuary was "the place that Jehovah should choose" (Deut. 12 : 5). Jeremiah speaks of God's doing to Jerusalem as he had done to Shiloh, which he had abandoned (7 : 12-14 ; 26 : 6). He looks forward to a time when the ark of the covenant should not be remembered nor missed (3 : 16), and God's new covenant should be written in their hearts (31 : 31). Ezekiel in vision saw the glory of Jehovah forsake the temple and the city (11 : 23), and God himself promised to be a sanctuary to his exiled people in the countries where they shall come (v. 16).

And yet when a prophet, who so clearly distinguishes between the shell and the kernel, depicts the temple and the service and the holy land of the future, Dr. Kuenen insists that this must all be literally understood because of its "copiousness and entering into minute details" (p. 240). And the life-diffusing stream from the temple (Ezek. 47), which forms a part of the same picture, was in the intention of the prophet "an actual stream," because the description is "so exact and detailed" (p. 234), though the corresponding streams spoken of by Joel 3 : 18 and Zechariah 14 : 8 are admitted to be figurative. We are prepared to hear him say next, for a like reason, that the cherubim so minutely described (chap. 1) were actually existing beings, wheels and eyes and all; and the eagles of chap. 17 were literal eagles; and the women of chap. 23 literal women; and when the restoration of Sodom and her daughters is promised (16 : 53-61), the prophet expected the buried city of Sodom to be brought up from the bottom of the Dead Sea and restored to its former condition. He could still silence all objections by the same plea that he uses now (p. 242): "What we should almost designate as fantastic is evidently in complete accordance with his (Ezekiel's) ideals."

Dr. Kuenen himself points out (p. 191) the close connection between the ideas of the return of Israel to Canaan and their conversion to God. A return to Palestine without conversion to God would not be what was in the prophets' mind and heart. And it is only as Palestine was Jehovah's land that returning to it had any religious significance. A return to God and the enjoyment of his favor and blessing is the essential thought, and Canaan is but the outward form in which that favor was for the time concentrated.

Moreover, descent from the patriarchs is not with the prophets the constituent principle of the people of God. Participation in the blessings promised to Israel is not determined by lineage or by nationality, but by inward character and spiritual relationship. "Ye are not my people," said Hosea (1 : 9), speaking in the name of Jehovah to the ungodly Israelites, "and I will not be your God." The prophets with one voice denounce the judgments of God upon the sinners in Israel. The wicked mass must be purged away; they have

no part nor lot in the good things to come; it is only the pure remnant that are left for whom the promises are made. Ezekiel (11 : 15) was instructed to recognize "the whole house of Israel" in the exiles, to the disregard of the degenerate inhabitants of Jerusalem, who were abandoned of God and given over to destruction. And, on the other hand, the stranger that hath joined himself to Jehovah need not fear separation from the Lord's people (Isa. 56 : 3). And when (Isa. 19 : 25) "Jehovah of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance," what has become of national distinctions? ¹ How can even Dr. Kuenen, with any consistency, refuse to recognize in Christianity the universal worship of Jehovah predicted by the prophets, when he imputes to Malachi such an excess of liberalism that when he speaks (Mal. 1 : 11) of the incense offered to Jehovah's name in every place, "he is thinking of the zeal and sincerity with which the nations served their gods; he, convinced of the unity of Jahveh, regards their worship as being properly destined and intended for the one true God."

We have not adduced the authority of the New Testament, which is abundantly and decisively given upon this point, because this has no weight with Dr. Kuenen. We have interpreted the meaning of the prophets in this matter by their own utterances. And themselves being judges, no bar is interposed to the recognition of the fulfilment of their prophecies by the changes which have taken place in the outward forms of worship, or in its local seat, or in national relations. The prophets may not have been aware of the changes which Messiah's coming would introduce. There were wise reasons why the temporary nature of the Old Testament institutions should not be prematurely disclosed. But while the temporary form, in which their ideas were clothed, has been stripped away, the ideas abide in their unchanging reality and truth. All that was essential in the prophets' own estimation, and much more and better than they hoped or knew, has been accomplished in Christ and the Gospel.

¹ See the passages of like tenor quoted above, p. 33, and numerous others in the books of the prophets.

We have now examined *sciatim* every prediction classed by Dr. Kuenen among the "unfulfilled prophecies," whether relating to the Gentiles or to Israel. We believe that no objection, great or small, that he has brought against them has escaped attention. And we are willing to submit it to the candid reader whether he has made out a case in any one instance.

Upon this flimsy basis rests the entire argument contained in the volume which we are examining, every thing else being subsidiary and supplemental. The remainder, though offering abundant and very inviting matter for comment, must be despatched in a very few sentences. Dr. Kuenen seeks to rid himself of the prophecies which he confesses to have been fulfilled in three several ways.

1st. By appealing to the non-fulfilment of others, which he claims to have established; with what justice we have already seen.

2d. By the legerdemain of modern criticism, which peremptorily waives aside any witness that it is not convenient to hear, and which is ever ready to suspect the genuineness or the accuracy of the text upon grounds which, in their last analysis, cover an assumption of the very point to be proved—viz., that prophecy is impossible.

3d. By the gratuitous and unfounded allegation of bad faith on the part of the prophets themselves. He distinctly charges Jeremiah and Ezekiel in particular with having modified their predictions after the event, so as to make it appear that they had minutely and accurately foretold what they never had foretold at all. Thus he says, in regard to the latter prophet (pp. 328-330): "The passages of Ezekiel explained above contain *no real predictions*. Whatever he may have *spoken* to his fellow-exiles in the years preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, he has *written* the prophecies which we now possess *after that catastrophe*, without troubling himself in the least about literal reproduction of his oral preaching." "Though it may be impossible to reconcile such a method of procedure with our notions of literary good faith, yet it was not uncommon in ancient times, and specifically in Israel." "They are not real predictions, but historical reminiscences in a prophetic form, *vaticinia post eventum*." He would accordingly have us suppose

that these prophets falsely claim in their writings to have uttered time after time the most astonishing predictions, which met in every case a literal and precise fulfilment ; and yet their auditors, who must have known the falsity of this claim, at once accepted these writings and handed them down as true prophecies received by inspiration from the mouth of God. We confess that we are of Dr. Kuenen's own opinion with regard to this expedient of his (p. 328) : " Many will at once be inclined to reject it as—a subterfuge, by the help of which I try to escape from the dogmatical conclusions to which the literally-fulfilled prophecies of Ezekiel ought to have led." And how does this assertion, that Jeremiah and Ezekiel altered and retouched their predictions to make them correspond with the event, comport with what he maintains elsewhere, that both these prophets have included among their writings predictions (*e.g.*, respecting Tyre and Egypt) which had been glaringly and notoriously falsified in their own day, and that Ezekiel admits it without being in the least disturbed thereby (p. 110)?

The accounts given of the prophets in the historical books are swept away in the most summary and relentless manner. He admits (p. 401) that the predictions of " the prophets of the historical books extend far beyond their political horizon, are characterized by definiteness and accuracy, enter into the more minute particulars, and are all, without distinction, strictly fulfilled." But the narratives containing them are in his esteem utterly untrustworthy. " They are, *in the first place*, a reflection and striking representation of the religious belief of their authors, and only *in the second place* are they testimonies regarding the historical reality. This reality is *nowhere* to be found perfectly pure and unmixed in these narratives, in so far as they are any thing more than dry chronicles ; it is *always*, though in a greater or less degree, colored by the subjective conviction of the narrator." " *The representation given of the prophets and prophecy in the historical narratives of the Old Testament is no testimony regarding, but is itself one of the fruits of the real Israelitish prophecy*" (p. 436). " While the prophetic historians sketched the past of Israel, they not only felt themselves compelled to labor for the religious education of Israel, but they thought themselves also justified in making their description of

Israel's fortunes subordinate and subservient to that object. The considerations which would restrain *us* from treating history in such a manner, or would impede *us* in doing so, had for them no existence" (p. 443). In other words, Israelitish history is a pious fraud, concocted by the prophets from first to last, and this in spite of the exalted respect which he professes for their character and work!—and nothing whatever in it is to be credited but just what the critics tell us may be credited. Here is in a nutshell the principle and the method of all Dr. Kuenen's critical processes and results. He blows his subjective soap-bubble to whatever size he may fancy, and dances it before his readers in its variegated beauty and apparent solidity and readiness to burst.

It does not embarrass Dr. Kuenen in the slightest degree that the New Testament throughout "ascribes divine foreknowledge to the Israelitish prophets." He very naïvely says (p. 448): "Its judgment concerning the origin and nature of the prophetic expectations, and concerning their relation to the historical reality, may be regarded as *diametrically opposed* to ours." His elaborate attempt to show that the New Testament writers are guilty of inaccuracies and mistakes in quoting from the Old Testament, and that they misunderstand and misinterpret it, merely proves what was superfluously clear beforehand, that their conception of its meaning and spirit is radically different from his. Its chief value consists in the practical demonstration which it affords, that they who reject the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament, or any part of it, must by inevitable logical necessity reject likewise that of the New.

Dr. Kuenen sees in prophecy simply a deduction from the prophets' own religious convictions. Jehovah's purposes are inferred by them from their thorough persuasion of his inflexible righteousness and his sovereign choice of Israel to be his people on the one hand, and the judgment which they entertain of Israel's existing moral state or the character and conduct of Gentile nations on the other. Hence "the prophetic prediction of the future" is, as he states it (p. 359), the necessarily incorrect conclusion drawn from premises which themselves were only half correct. This naturalistic hypothesis falls with

the failure to prove the non-accomplishment of the predictions of the prophets. If, as is really the case, what they have foretold has unerringly come to pass, prophecy is thereby shown to be the word, not of him who knows not what a day may bring forth, but of Him who "declareth the end from the beginning." It is the word, not of man, but of God. And it is plainly futile to attempt to account for it on natural principles—as, for example, that Jeremiah's strong faith wrought upon the exiles, and their faith wrought upon Cyrus, who by a lucky chance appeared just at the right time and became the conqueror of Babylon (p. 315), and thus brought about the return from captivity after seventy years; or Isaiah by his faith persuaded Hezekiah and his people to persevere in their resistance to Sennacherib until fortunately the plague swept off his army (p. 298). On this principle such a chapter of accidents would be required to save the credit of the prophets as would involve that very supernatural intervention which the hypothesis was invented to escape; and that, too, in a form far more incredible than the simple faith of ages, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

WM. HENRY GREEN.