

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 10—April, 1892.

I.

RECENT DOGMATIC THOUGHT IN THE NETHERLANDS.*

THE Dutch theology of the nineteenth century has been discussed more than once by both foreign and native writers. The following is a list of the more important treatises on the subject: CHR. SEPP, *Proeve eener pragmatische geschiedenis der Theologie in Nederland van 1787 tot 1858*, 3d ed., Leiden, 1859; D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE, *La crise religieuse en Hollande*, Leyde, 1860; Dr. G. J. VOS, *Groen van Prinsterer en zijn tijd 1800–1857*, Dordrecht, 1886; *Idem.*, *Groen van Prinsterer en zijn tijd, 1857–1876*, Dordrecht, 1891; Dr. J. H. GUNNING, J.Hz., *Het Protestantsche Nederland onzer dagen*, Groningen, 1889; Dr. J. A. GERTH VAN WYCK, art. "Holland," in Herzog und Plitt, *Realenc. für Prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, vi, s. 254–266; JOHANNES GLOËL, *Hollands Kirchliches Leben*, Würtemberg (1885); Dr. ADOLPH ZAHN, *Abriss einer Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche auf dem Europ. Festlande im 19ten Jahrhundert*, 2te Aufl., Stuttgart, 1888, etc. As secondary sources of information all these and other works may render excellent service, but the works of the representative theologians themselves will alone give an insight into the principles and nature of the successive tendencies.

Dutch theology during the present century has been subject to various influences. Its character has been molded in turn not only by Calvinism, which has always continued to live among the

* [Our readers are indebted for the translation of Dr. Bavinck's paper to Prof. G. Vos, Ph.D., of Grand Rapids, Mich.—EDITORS.]

II.

GENUINENESS OF ISAIAH XL-LXVI.

THE last section of the Book of Isaiah embraces his ministry after the miraculous overthrow of Sennacherib's army, and occupies chaps. xxxviii-lxvi. The first two chapters, xxxviii and xxxix, are historical and introductory to what follows. After such a judgment as Judah had now suffered and such a deliverance, it might be hoped that the hearts of the people would be fully turned to the Lord. But the obduracy foreshown in the vision of chap. vi, with its fearful train of consequences, was not yet at an end. A better prince than Ahaz now sat upon the throne; and to the public deliverance just experienced was added the individual mercy of a restoration from mortal sickness; and yet, when the people were once again tried in their monarch, Hezekiah showed that he had not escaped the taint of the prevailing corruption. To the messengers of Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, sent to congratulate him on his recovery, and probably also to induce him to join in a league against Assyria, the same king who, on repeated occasions before, had displayed such an implicit trust in God, vain-gloriously exhibited all his treasures. Isaiah is sent to announce to him the loss of this wealth, in which he prided himself and in which he placed a confidence that should have been reposed in God alone. This exhibition, which was designed to impress the king of Babylon with Hezekiah's greatness and power, would only serve to inflame his cupidity. "Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith Jehovah. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon."

The people are not allowed to indulge in vain exultation over the fall of Sennacherib, as though they were thenceforth safe from judgments. As far as the language of triumph was proper, its utterance was committed to Nahum. Isaiah points to the weightier woe before them, the last and the sorest which he was commissioned to foretell. From this announcement the rest of his ministry takes its shape. His work of threatening is now ended. Henceforth he

devotes himself to administering comfort, not in limited passages or solitary chapters as heretofore, lying amidst gloomy denunciations, but in the great body of all that follows. His aim is to console God's true people, both of that and of coming generations, and prevent them from being swallowed up with overmuch sorrow in the prospect of the endurance of this great calamity. It was so great and unprecedented a disaster, that God's earthly kingdom should be broken up, the atoning sacrifice abolished, the mediating priesthood deprived of its functions, Jehovah's dwelling place reduced to ruins and his people carried away from the land which he had given them into the heart of a powerful heathen empire, that some very peculiar and extraordinary measures were needed to prevent the pious from falling into utter despair. For this reason, among others, the comfort granted in view of this event is furnished not only by contemporary prophets, but by one of a former age, that the people might be gradually schooled with reference to it; and might thus be taught to look upon it when it occurred not as an unforeseen and unexpected calamity, but as an appointed measure in God's great scheme of providence, which had been revealed and provided for long beforehand. For a like reason, the consolations intended for the people suffering under the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes were also sent in a preceding age by the prophet Daniel.

The comfort which Isaiah gives in chaps. xl-lxvi, in the prospect of the Babylonish exile, is drawn, as it is admirably stated by Dr. Addison Alexander, from "the mission and destiny of the chosen people," which may accordingly be stated to be the general theme of these chapters. The topics particularly dwelt upon are the occasion of the sufferings for which consolation is here afforded, their design and their issue. They were occasioned not by the weakness or forgetfulness of their divine Protector, but by their own sins. They were designed to fit them for their task as the chosen people, and to further its discharge. They would issue in rich blessings which were in store for them. No strict method is followed by the prophet in the treatment of his theme, and, consequently, no logical division of these chapters is possible. A formal division is suggested, however, as was first observed by Rückert, by the recurrence of the same verse at the end of chaps. xlvi and lvii: "There is no peace, saith Jehovah, unto the wicked." This may be regarded as the emphatic termination of distinct portions, declaring that the wicked should be excluded from participation in the blessings therein announced; the book closing (lxvi. 24) with the yet more awful declaration that, besides this negative exclusion, the wicked were reserved for the worm that dies not and the fire that is not quenched. Three portions are thus constituted of nearly equal

length, each consisting of nine chapters—chaps. xl–xlviii, chaps. xlix–lvii, chaps. lviii–lxvi. These groups may be distinguished by the prominence given in each to a particular topic, without this being in any instance the exclusive theme. In the first special attention is given to the deliverance to be wrought by Cyrus in overthrowing Babylon and freeing the Jews from exile; chap. xlv may be regarded as the characteristic chapter of this division. Babylon and the Chaldeans and Cyrus are nowhere named after these first nine chapters. The captivity and consolation under it are only the starting point of this great prophecy, from which it rises to the contemplation of the entire future before the people of God. In the second division emphasis is laid upon the sufferings of the great servant of Jehovah, their vicarious nature and triumphant issue; the fifty-third being the characteristic chapter. In the third division the future glory of the people of God is exhibited, and, as in one of Isaiah's earliest discourses, chaps. ii–iv, made the basis of reproof and exhortation; the characteristic chapter is the sixtieth.

Perhaps the suggestion of Hahn may not be altogether fanciful, that this triple division is already shadowed forth in the triple comfort with which the prophecy opens. The prophet is instructed (xl. 2) to cry unto Jerusalem three things; first, that her warfare, her definite period of toilsome service, is accomplished; second, that her iniquity is pardoned and acceptance granted; third, that she hath received of Jehovah's hand double for all her sins—not double punishment, as though the meaning were that she had suffered twice as much as her sins deserved, or twice as much as the Lord had intended to inflict, but double blessings, blessings most ample and full, notwithstanding all her sins. In unfolding this triple comfort the prophet dwells successively upon those events or aspects of the future in which it was to be realized. He illustrates the promise of an end to Zion's warfare by pointing to the termination of that great period of affliction which lay before them, the Babylonish exile. The second comforting assurance of the pardon of their sins finds its basis and pledge in the vicarious sufferings of the servant of Jehovah. And the third, the double blessings to be received, shall have its accomplishment in the triumph and glory which await the true Israel of God.

The critical question is here forced upon us as to the authorship of these chapters, and it is to the discussion of this question that the present paper will be devoted. Are these chapters the genuine production of Isaiah, or are they the work of some writer of a later age, a prophet of the exile, the so-called deutero-Isaiah, or, as Ewald denominates him, The Great Unnamed?

Before entering upon this discussion it is important that we

should have a clear understanding of the precise point at issue. It is distinctly confessed at the outset that these chapters contain explicit reference to events which took place long after the time of Isaiah, and of which he could have had no knowledge by any natural means. We have no argument at present with those who deny the possibility or the reality of supernatural foresight; with whom it is an axiom that there is no minute fulfillment of predictive prophecy; who find nothing in the utterances of the prophets but inferences from known facts, or vague presentiments based on religious ideas, and refuse to admit any distinct and unambiguous pre-science of events lying beyond what has been called the prophetic horizon. With all such the question is determined in advance, and there is no room for argument. Whatever arguments they may adduce are merely to sustain a conclusion previously reached, and which rests in their minds on an *a priori* ground. This prophecy makes undoubted mention of the exile and of Cyrus and of the release of the captive Jews. And if this excludes the possibility of Isaiah being the author, and makes it certain that the prophecy could not have been written until the exile had taken place and Cyrus had appeared, and the hope had arisen in the minds of the captive Jews that this portended their release, the case is beyond argument. But if the existence of supernatural predictions of remote events in the future is an open question to be settled by the facts and the evidence, and not to be negatived by mere dogmatic presuppositions, then we think that it can be shown to the satisfaction of any candid mind that there is no good reason to abandon the old and well-established belief that Isaiah is the author of these chapters.

The external evidence is all in favor of the genuineness of this disputed section. It is found in a book which is entitled (chap. i. 1), "The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz." This book was in existence when Chronicles was written, and is referred to, 2 Chron. xxxii. 32, by the title which it now bears. It is distinctly alluded to in Eccles. xlvi. 22-25, where special reference is made to the contents of these chapters. In the decree of Cyrus, permitting the return of the Jews, as recorded, Ezra i. 2, he says: "All the kingdoms of the earth hath Jehovah, the God of heaven, given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem." This seems to contain an evident allusion to Isa. xlv. 28, xlv. 13: "Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him:" "he shall perform all my pleasure: even saying of Jerusalem, she shall be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." Josephus Antiq., xi. 1, 2, expressly says that Cyrus was moved to restore the Jews to their own land by reading these prophecies of

Isaiah concerning himself. When the Greek Septuagint version was made, the Book of Isaiah contained precisely what it does now. Isaiah is spoken of by name twenty-one times in the New Testament; and in eleven of these times he is connected with quotations from the chapters now under consideration. This book has been in the custody of the Jewish people or of the Christian Church from the time of its first appearance, and has been guarded by them with the care due to a constituent of the sacred canon. And no doubt was ever expressed respecting the genuineness of any part of it until recent times.

It is impossible to account for these, as well as other disputed chapters being found in the Book of Isaiah if they are not his. They must have been put there either innocently or fraudulently. But the idea of an intentional forgery or a willful fraud is so preposterous under the circumstances, and so inconsistent with the character of these writings and of the jealous care with which the sacred books were guarded, that this charge is rarely or never made. And yet it is equally inexplicable how they could have been innocently mingled with the genuine writings of the prophet. It has been conjectured that they might have been written upon the same roll by copyists who were short of paper, or added for safe preservation to different partial collections of the prophet's writings before they had as yet been united into one book, or that they might have proceeded from another Isaiah living during the exile and the identity of names led to a confusion of their writings. And emphasis has been laid upon the fact that there is no separate title to these chapters ascribing them to Isaiah. But neither is there a separate title to chaps. xxviii-xxxiii, nor to the different discourses in chaps. vii-xii, which all admit to be Isaiah's. With all these conjectural suggestions it still remains unaccounted for that writings of such extent, so remarkable in their character and doubtless so influential, could have appeared so near the time of the collection of the canon, and yet not only the name and person of the author be unknown, but every trace of their origin and history be so completely lost that they were annexed to the writings of a prophet living a full century and a half before; and this, though they differ from them so completely in style and contain such unmistakable evidence of late date, that critics of the present day are able to single them out and assign them to their true position. This difficulty would exist if there were but one interpolated or spurious prophecy. It is greatly aggravated by their number and by their being found scattered through the book; and this book is, moreover, constructed upon a regular plan into which these spurious portions enter as important parts, and the symmetry of which will

be marred, if not destroyed, by their removal. To which it should be added that there is not in the entire Old Testament an anonymous book of prophecy; even the smallest of the minor prophets is kept distinct and referred to its proper author. To attribute such large and important prophecies as these to some great unnamed, as the critics do, is to violate all Old Testament analogy.

The most plausible objection to the genuineness of chaps. xl-lxvi is that the exile is not predicted as a future event, but that the people are uniformly represented as already in exile, the land desolated, Jerusalem destroyed, the temple burned and needing to be rebuilt. "Thy holy cities are become a wilderness, Zion is become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire: and all our pleasant things are laid waste" (lxiv. 10, 11; cf. xlv. 26-28, xlv. 13, xlvii. 6, xlviii. 20).

Now the question to be considered is whether this and similar language is spoken by the prophet by way of anticipation, or whether it is the description of an actually existing situation. And in order to reach a correct answer to this question, observe:

1. The number of passages which in their proper force imply an allusion to the exile in Babylon or the anticipated return from it is not large. Many which are quoted as relating to it have in strictness no such meaning. The highway to be made in the desert (xl. 5) is not for the return of the people from exile, but, as is expressly declared, for Jehovah to come back to the people. Opening blind eyes (xlii. 7), bringing the blind by a way that they knew not (xlii. 16), the release of prisoners and bringing forth them that are in darkness (xlix. 9, li. 14, lxi. 1), are figures for guidance in perplexity and release from calamity which are general in their nature and are as applicable to other necessities and distresses as to the exile. The conversion of the wilderness into pools and a dry land into springs of water (xli. 18) is not a precaution for the supply of the literal necessities of the people on their way from Babylon, but a figure for joyful changes, as the converse (xlii. 15) is for the opposite. The allusion in xliii. 16-20 is to the exodus from Egypt, not from Babylon. When a return of exiles is promised it is not from Babylon merely, but from every quarter, from north, south, east and west (xliii. 5, 6, xlix. 12), as in xi. 11, which is acknowledged to be from Isaiah. Waste places of eternity and desolations of many generations (lviii. 12, lxi. 4) cannot be restricted to a captivity of but seventy years. The limitation of these various expressions to the Babylonish exile and deliverance from it, is certainly not demanded by the proper force of the language, which need have no such specific application. Such vague and general expressions

agree very well with the idea that the prophet is looking down over a period of affliction and trial, which does not shape itself before his mind into precise and definite forms. Observe further:

2. The absence of anything to connect the writer himself with Babylonia. There is no suggestion of any locality or of his surroundings, such as we find, for example, in Ezekiel, who really did live in exile. This Delitzsch confesses (*Comment. über Jesaia*, p. 402). He says: "Ezekiel was much more concretely linked with Babylonia. He tells us the name of the place where he was settled with other exiles, and where, by the Chebar, he was called to the office of a prophet; how the Spirit came upon him while sitting with the elders assembled in his house, and how his fellow-exiles were talking of him by the walls and in the doors, and how the distresses of the future were set forth by personal experiences of his own; and how the news of the fall of Jerusalem loosed his tongue after a long period of silence. In the chapters before us there is no such personal and local coloring. And, further, in all that is said of Babylon and Cyrus there is very little that is specific." Dr. Cheyne, whom no one will suspect of undue bias to traditional opinions, says (*Comm. on Is.*, Vol. ii, p. 232): "The fact must be allowed of the paucity of allusions in chaps. xl-lxvi to the special circumstances of Babylon. It was indeed so conspicuous as to induce Ewald to suppose that the author resided in Egypt. It is not unfavorable to the authorship of Isaiah, who might have learned almost as much about Babylon as is mentioned in these chapters either from traveling merchants or from the ambassadors of Merodach-baladan. . . . This paucity of Babylonian references would be less surprising were it not for the very specific allusions to Palestinian circumstances in some of the later chapters."

It is hardly consistent with the writer's being in Babylonia that he should speak of Ur of the Chaldees from which Abraham was called as "the ends of the earth" (xli. 9), or that the forms of idolatry which he describes (lxv. 4 ff.), offering swine's flesh and lodging in sacred caves, were Egyptian, not Babylonish customs.

Knobel finds in these chapters numerous references to different events in the life of Cyrus, his various victories, a projected expedition against Egypt, his march against the allied nations under Croesus and victory over them, all which it is universally confessed is purely imaginary. But it illustrates what might have been expected if the writer had been a contemporary of Cyrus. Observe again:

3. There are repeated passages which reflect the state of things prior to the exile and as they were in the days of Isaiah.

Thus, in xliii. 22-24, the people are reproved for their neglect of the worship of the temple. "Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; thou hast been weary of me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honored me with thy sacrifices. I have not made thee to serve with meat offerings, nor wearied thee with frankincense. Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money; neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices. But thou hast made me to serve with thy sins; thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." The meaning of this passage cannot be, as has been sometimes represented, that no offerings were brought because they were providentially hindered from doing so, since the temple was destroyed, its services were suspended, and the people were in exile. This would not prevent them from calling upon God, which they are here reproved for not doing. Nor could they have been censured for not bringing sacrifices, when it was out of their power to do it. The implication of the passage is that they might have offered sacrifices to the Lord if they would, and that the only hindrance lay in their being weary of him and their indisposition to his service, in consequence of which they either made their offerings to other deities or presented them in such an unacceptable manner that he did not regard them as offered to himself. It is further intimated that this is a charge which they could not deny. If they could say anything in exculpation of themselves, they are bidden to do so. "Put me in remembrance; let us plead together; put forth thy cause that thou mayest be justified." And the Lord further declares his purpose to punish them for their sin, implying that the punishment had not yet been inflicted. "Therefore, I will profane the princes of the sanctuary, and I will make Jacob a curse and Israel a reviling." It is necessary to change the vowels of the text to make this read as though it referred to what had already taken place, as in the Authorized Version, "I have profaned . . . and have given."

Again, in lxvi. 1-3, sentence is passed on those who place their dependence upon the material temple and the outward ceremonial. "The heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool; what manner of house will ye build unto me? and what place shall be my rest? . . . He that killeth an ox is as he that slayeth a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as he that breaketh a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation as he that offereth swine's blood; he that burneth frankincense, as he that blesseth an idol." No house that man can build and no sacrifices that man can offer are worthy of God's acceptance, or are other than abominable in his sight when presented as meriting his favor. The prophet is not here combat-

ing a hypothetical case or dealing with the general truth of the worthlessness of sacrifices at a time when it was impossible to offer them, but is denouncing an actual class of transgressors, whose punishment still lies in the future, as is shown by what immediately follows: "Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations; I also will choose their delusions and will bring their fears upon them."

The existence of the temple is not only presupposed in the passages already cited, but in others as well. Thus, in lxvi. 6, a retribution inflicted by the Lord dwelling in Jerusalem and in the temple is thus described: "A voice of tumult from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of Jehovah that rendereth recompense to his enemies." And the regular observance of the temple ritual is implied in lxvi. 20: "They shall bring all your brethren out of all the nations for an offering unto Jehovah . . . to my holy mountain Jerusalem . . . as the children of Israel bring" (the verb is a frequentative future, habitually bring) "their offering in a clean vessel into the house of Jehovah."

So again, lxv. 11: "Ye that forsake Jehovah, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for Fortune and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny; I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter." Here the people are reproached for forsaking the worship of the temple and the penalty for their transgression lies in the future. The temple was, therefore, standing and the exile had not yet begun.

The people are still further charged with seeking the aid of foreign monarchs, instead of putting their trust in God alone; the very charge which Isaiah brought against Ahaz, and which he again brought against the people in the time of Hezekiah, when they were bent upon concluding an alliance with Egypt. Thus (lvii. 9, 11): "Thou wentest to the king with ointment and didst increase thy perfumes, and didst send thine ambassadors far off . . . and of whom hast thou been afraid and in fear that thou liest and hast not remembered me?" Hosea describes like embassies from the Ten Tribes in similar terms (xii. 1): "They make a covenant with Assyria and oil is carried into Egypt." Such negotiations necessarily imply the continued existence of the kingdom of Judah and would be impossible in the exile. And that it was still the period of God's forbearance, and his judgment had not yet come upon them, is implied in the words that immediately follow the passage cited (lvii. 11): "Have not I held my peace even of long time, and thou fearest me not?"

That the judgment threatened had not yet been inflicted, but was impending and future, is also implied (lvi. 9-lvii. 2) in the sum-

mons to their foreign foes under the emblem of wild beasts to devour the helpless flock, whose watchmen are blind, whose watchdogs are dumb and cannot bark, and whose senseless shepherds are intent only upon gain and pleasure, while the righteous perish and merciful men are taken away, entering into peace and resting in their beds, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come.

The repeated mention of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah (xl. 2, 9), and the glad announcements made to them seem more naturally to suggest the cities themselves than their ruined walls or their inhabitants in exile. That Lebanon should be chosen by way of illustration when a mountain is spoken of (xl. 16), seems to point to a writer in Palestine; and Hephzi-bah, the name of Hezekiah's queen (2 Kgs. xxi. 1), applied to Jerusalem (Isa. lxii. 4), seems to point to a writer of the time of Isaiah.

These evident points of connection with Palestine and preëxilic times led Ewald to suppose that certain paragraphs written before the exile had been interpolated in these chapters. The manifest unity of the entire section, however, confessed by the great body of interpreters, makes any assumption of interpolation untenable, and compels those who maintain its origin in the exile either to force a meaning upon these passages foreign to their true intent or to suppose with Dr. Driver (*Isaiah, His Life and Times*, p. 188) that the prophet "borrows passages written originally in the age of Jeremiah and applies them to the generation of the exiles." Cheyne goes farther (ii, p. 230) and suggests "the possibility that the author of chap. xl-lxvi not only put old ideas and phrases into a new setting, but also incorporated the substance of connected discourses of that great prophet, of whose style we are so often reminded in these chapters—Isaiah." That is to say, we have here the substance of Isaiah's discourses wrought over by a later hand. Cheyne needs to take but one short step further in the same direction to bring him to the true ground.

Dr. Driver argues that "the unity of the prophet's work requires it to be accommodated" "to the situation of the exiles." The sins here charged "might form to Isaiah, as they formed to Jeremiah, the ground for an announcement of impending exile; they can in themselves have no bearing on the future of the exiles more than a century afterwards." In opposition to this it must be said: (1) That this prophecy was not designed exclusively for the benefit of the exiles to the disregard of the prophet's contemporaries. (2) That, so far as we know, it had not been revealed to Isaiah, and he had no reason to expect, that the exile would not take place for more than a century. Assurance

had been given that the judgment would not be sent during the life of Hezekiah (xxxix. 8), to whom fifteen additional years were promised after his sickness. This leaves no great chasm, in the prophet's mind, between the men of his own generation and the exiles.

The only way to unify this great prophecy, without putting force upon any of its constituents, is to admit that the prophet, while chiefly immersed in the thought of the fearful calamity which impended over Judah and Jerusalem and in that of the coming deliverance, nevertheless betrays from time to time the state of things existing around him. He speaks with a clear foresight of certain outstanding facts in the future, which are sharply delineated, but mostly he uses the language of figure and vague and general terms. He never depicts in any detail the situation or surroundings of the exiles. He mentions no locality or incident which associates him personally with the exile. But every now and then occur expressions which betray a Palestinian and preëxilic environment and show what the actual position of the writer was.

4. There is another important series of passages which lead to the same conclusion. In numerous paragraphs, some of them of considerable length, the prophet combats the folly and absurdity of idolatry, showing the absolute impotence of idols which are manufactured of ordinary materials and by common workmen, and cannot so much as stand or move without assistance, and cannot help or protect themselves, much less their worshipers (xl. 18-20, xli. 6, 7, 23, 24, xlii. 8, 17, xliv. 9-20, xlv. 16, 20, xlvi. 1, 2, 5-7).

One design of such passages doubtless is consolatory. What is the might of their idolatrous oppressors, whose idol gods can do them no good and their foes no harm, as opposed to Israel who, however weak in themselves, have the almighty Jehovah for their protector? But these passages are admonitory likewise (xlviii. 5), and intended to rebuke the idolatrous tendencies of the people and to lead them to abandon what was so senseless in itself and so dishonoring and offensive to their own God, the Mighty One of Jacob, the Holy One of Israel. It is this polemic which leads to the introduction of those frequently recurring phrases, "I am Jehovah and there is none else, the first and the last; I will not give my glory to another," etc., and of the numerous epithets attached to the name of God, viz., the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, the Redeemer, etc.

In other passages the idolatry prevalent among the people is more directly described, which they practiced upon high and lofty mountains and under every green tree, sacrificing children in the valleys under the clefts of the rocks (lvii. 5-7); sacrificing in gardens and burning incense upon bricks, sitting among the graves, lodging in

caves, eating swine's flesh and broth of abominable things (lxv. 3, 4, lxvi. 17), perpetuating thus the iniquities of their fathers (lxv. 7). There is plain reference here to the Moloch abomination practiced in the valley of Hinnom and to places frequented for idolatrous purposes in the land of Canaan and to rites introduced from Egypt. All this, it is well known, existed before the exile, when both historians and prophets bear testimony to the strange fascination by which Israel was perpetually inclined to borrow the practices of the pagan nations around them. But the uniform testimony of exilic and postexilic writers is that this spell was broken by the exile. Of the continuance of these practices by the exiles there is no proof whatever. Those who allege that idolatry flourished in the exile in the manner described in these passages, have no authority for their statement but that which they derive from these very passages which are in question.

5. Yet another series of passages, still more decisive of the pre-exilic origin of these chapters than any yet adduced, argues the exclusive deity of Jehovah as opposed to all idol gods from his omniscience in predicting these events and his omnipotence in bringing them to pass. The stress which the prophet lays upon this argument is evident from the frequency and the emphasis with which he recurs to it. The nations are formally summoned to a majestic trial, in which the respective claims of Jehovah and of the idols to godhead are to be decided (xli. 1, 21-29). The idolaters are bidden first to produce their cause and show forth their strong reasons. They are challenged to prove their divinity by making known the future. "Let them bring forth and declare unto us what shall happen." "Declare ye the former things, what they are," *i. e.*, your previous predictions, already uttered; "that we may consider them and know the latter end of them." We will examine into any prophecies, which they have ever made in the past, and note their issue, whether they were or were not fulfilled. "Or shew us things to come." If they have never uttered any predictions in the past, let them predict the future now. "Declare the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil," exert some power, do something, good or bad, "that we may be dismayed and behold it together." As they utterly fail to give any evidence whether of foreknowledge or of power, sentence is passed upon them accordingly. "Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought; an abomination is he that chooseth you."

The idols have been tried and have been found wanting. Jehovah now brings forward His side in this great argument. He has raised up the Conqueror to overthrow Babylon and to deliver His people, agreeably to ancient predictions. "I have raised up one from the

north and he is come: from the rising of the sun one that calleth upon my name; and he shall come upon rulers" (the word is especially used of Babylonish rulers) "as upon mortar and as the potter treadeth clay." Now who, he asks with the confidence that there can be only one answer, who predicted this long before it took place? "Who hath declared it from the beginning, that we may know? and beforetime, that we may say, He is righteous?" *i.e.*, he has gained his case; the verdict must be rendered in his favor. The answer is self-evident, and no formal reply is needed any more than to the question (xl. 12), Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand? None but Jehovah has predicted this in advance. "Yea, there is none that declareth, yea, there is none that sheweth, yea, there is none that heareth your words. I am the first to say unto Zion, Behold, behold them, and to give to Jerusalem one that bringeth good tidings." The idols are absolutely mute and can give no response, even when consulted on the subject. "Behold, all of them, their works are vanity and nought: their molten images are wind and confusion."

Here is an explicit claim of having predicted the coming and the work of Cyrus long in advance. Jehovah predicted it and Jehovah brought it to pass in accordance with the prediction. The idol deities had not foretold it nor uttered a word on the subject. Jehovah's claim to be the one only true God is rested on this fact, while the idols are denounced as utter nothingness. Now, if the prophet by whom all this was spoken lived at the time that the critics indicate, near the close of the exile; if he merely announced what was already obvious to sagacious observers; if he did not speak of Cyrus until Cyrus had actually made his appearance; nor of his march upon Babylon, until his armies began to move in that direction; such language is altogether unaccountable. There is no escape from the conclusion that, even if the author of this prophecy lived in the exile, he intended to make the impression that his prediction had been in existence long before, and he gave it out as an ancient prediction, such as the omniscient God, who knew the end from the beginning, alone could have uttered. And this involves not only a groundless charge of fraud and the assumption of an imposture where detection was inevitable, but is, besides, fatal to the whole critical position. It is self-contradictory to say that a writer represents these events as taking place around him and that his historical position is to be determined accordingly, while, at the same time, he alleges the mention of them as evidence of divine prescience.

Dr. Driver affirms that the predictions here referred to are not those contained in the prophecy itself, but previous predictions

already fulfilled, which are urged as a reason why the new announcements now made of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus and the release of the Jews should be believed. Cyrus is alluded to as already stirred up when the prophecy opens. The prophet introduces Cyrus as known and only claims foreknowledge of what he will do.

But this view is not consistent with the passage already considered and less still with others that are yet to come before us. It is of the stirring up of Cyrus, as well as his trampling down the princes of Babylon, that the question is triumphantly asked, Who hath declared it from the beginning? *i. e.*, from a very ancient time (cf. xl. 21, xli. 4, xlvi. 16). The appearance of Cyrus is always spoken of in the preterite for a very obvious reason. The argument for the divine origin of these prophecies was not complete until Cyrus had actually appeared. While in his appeal to former prophecies Isaiah may include those previously delivered which had already been accomplished, his main concern is with those which he is now uttering. And he makes his confident appeal to those who shall witness their incipient fulfillment. When Cyrus had actually appeared, as here predicted, the prophecy was proved to be indeed from God, and no doubt could remain as to the fulfillment of the rest.

As represented by the prophet, it was a contest between Jehovah and the gods of Babylon, just as the miracles of the days of Moses were the signs of the contest between Jehovah and the gods of Egypt. The absolute superiority of Jehovah was to be demonstrated in the one case on the score of his omniscience, as in the other on the score of his omnipotence; in the one by prediction, as in the other by miracle; and we are entitled to expect as signal a manifestation of God's greatness and glory, transcending all human possibilities, in the one as in the other. The attempt to pare it down until it is brought to the level of ordinary human experience takes all the meaning out of the prophet's words. It must be something signal, some very extraordinary manifestation of predictive power, which outranks what is found elsewhere in prophetic disclosure, if it is to be worthy of the occasion on which it is introduced, and be such a manifestation of Jehovah's omniscience as will fitly and convincingly exhibit it, as it professes to do, in its absolute superiority to all opposing claims. Again, xlii. 9: Behold the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them. The prophet's announcements are made before there were any external indications of their occurrence.

In xliii. 9-12 the prophet reverts to the same theme. He sends

out once more his universal challenge to all nations. Who among them can declare this and shew us former things? let them bring their witnesses that they may be justified. Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah. I have declared, and I have saved and I have shewed, and there was no strange god among you. Therefore, ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and I am God. The people knew and could testify that these predictions had been uttered under circumstances which put their divinity beyond question.

In xlv. 3, 4 stress is laid upon the fact that he called Cyrus by his name: "That thou mayest know that I am Jehovah, who call thee by thy name. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel, my chosen, I have called thee by thy name. I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." What was there remarkable in Cyrus being called by his name? Nebuchadnezzar and Pharaoh-hophra are called by their names in prophecies by Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But if Cyrus was yet unheard of and unborn, it was indeed a signal instance of prediction. Similar passages to those already cited are found in xlv. 21, xlvi. 9-11, xlviii. 5-7, 16, all dwelling upon the proof furnished by these remarkable predictions that Jehovah alone is God.

6. The critical inference that the chapters now under consideration belong to the period of the exile labors under an additional difficulty. It is chargeable with the mistake of confusing the ideal with the actual present. The prophets not infrequently transport themselves into the midst of the scenes which they are describing, and speak of the future as though it were present or even past. Thus, in the burden upon Tyre, in chap. xxiii, the prophet speaks throughout as though Tyre had already been taken, and he looks forward from this ideal position over the seventy years of depression and subsequent revival that are to follow. Commonly, such passages are brief, and the prophet soon returns again to his true position. The only thing peculiar about the chapters now under consideration is that the prophet maintains his ideal position in the exile through such long, continuous passages as he does. But there is in chap. xxiv-xxvii a similar example, in which the ideal position of the prophet differs from the actual throughout.

In the chapters before us the prophet does not maintain the same ideal position without change. Commonly, he speaks as if from the midst of calamity and suffering and looks forward to the fall of Babylon and the deliverance of the exiles. But sometimes he speaks as though Babylon had already fallen and the period of full deliverance had already come. Thus, at the very outset (xl. 2): Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished; that her iniquity is pardoned; that she hath

received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. So, in xlvi. 1, 2, the gods of Babylon are spoken of as already captured and laden as beasts of burden for transportation at the will of the conqueror. And, li. 3: Jehovah hath comforted Zion; he hath comforted all her waste places and hath made her wilderness like Eden and her desert like the garden of Jehovah. In chap. liii he takes his position between the humiliation and the glory of the Messiah; the former is described as past; the latter as future. And we have already seen that in other passages his true historical position betrays itself in his language.

The prophet might very well take for granted the existence of the exile, which he had previously predicted, and which his contemporary, Micah, iv. 10, had predicted likewise. And it would be contrary to the analogy of all his previous predictions if he had announced so great a calamity as the coming exile and foretold no deliverance from it.

It is, of course, impossible to treat exhaustively so large a subject as the genuineness of chap. xl-lxvi in the compass of a single article. We have not aimed to present it in all its aspects, nor to adduce all the arguments which can be urged. We have confined our remarks to the chief critical objection, to which all others are subordinate, viz., that these chapters throughout make the impression that they were written in the exile. It has been shown that this is by no means the case; that much which they contain is absolutely at variance with such a view, and that there is no view of the case with which all the parts can be made to harmonize but that which a steadfast tradition, sanctioned by the inspired writers of the New Testament, has assigned to them, viz., that the author of these chapters is no nameless prophet of the exile, is no deutero-Isaiah, but is Isaiah the son of Amoz.

It has not been possible, in the narrow space at our command, to enter upon the question of the diction of these chapters. The critics are accustomed to parade long lists of words and phrases occurring in the acknowledged writings of Isaiah which are not to be found in chap. xl-lxvi, or occurring in chap. xl-lxvi which are not found in what they are pleased to consider his genuine prophecies. They employ a like method in the dissection of the Pentateuch, and we are treated to lists of expressions peculiar to P and J and E and all the rest. Upon those who have not given special attention to the subject such lists may naturally make a profound impression, and they may be thought to supply a really convincing argument of diversity of authorship. But in truth nothing can be more fallacious. The absolute futility of such a style of reasoning is well illustrated by

Dr. Stanley Leathes,* who shows that there is ten times the reason on the ground of diversity of diction for assuming a deutero-Milton or a deutero-Tennyson that there is for imagining a deutero-Isaiah.

PRINCETON.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

* *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ* (Boyle Lectures for 1868), pp. 282, 283. Dr. Leathes says :

“It may be interesting to observe from the following instances the possible diversity of language which may obtain in works known to be from the same author.

“L’Allegro is a poem of 152 lines ; it contains about 450 words. Il Penseroso is a poem of 176 lines and contains about 578 words. Lycidas is a poem of 193 lines, which are longer than those of either of the other two, most of them being heroics ; its words are about 725.

“It is plain, therefore, that Milton must have used for Il Penseroso 128 words not in L’Allegro, and for Lycidas 275 words not in L’Allegro and 147 not in Il Penseroso.

“But what is much more remarkable is the fact that there are only about 125 words common to L’Allegro and Il Penseroso ; only about 135 common to Lycidas and L’Allegro ; only about 140 common to Lycidas and Il Penseroso ; only about 61 common to all three.

“That is, Milton must have used for Il Penseroso 450 words not in L’Allegro, and for Lycidas 590 not in L’Allegro. He must have used for Lycidas some 585 words not in Il Penseroso and more than 660 not occurring in both together.

“Also, there must be in L’Allegro some 325 words not in Il Penseroso and 315 not in Lycidas ; and there must be in Il Penseroso nearly 440 words not in Lycidas.

“Again, Tennyson’s *Lotos Eaters* contains about 590 words ; *Ænone* has about 720. Thus the latter must contain 130 words not in the former ; but a comparison shows that there are only about 230 words common to the two poems. That is, there must be 490 words in *Ænone* which are not in the *Lotos Eaters*, and there must be in the *Lotos Eaters* about 360 words not occurring in *Ænone*. That is, the shorter poem has 360 words which the larger one does not contain.”

The above extract is quoted by Dr. Edersheim in his *Prophecy and History in relation to the Messiah* (pp. 283, 284).