

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

---

1848.  
MARCH, 1847.

---

## ARTICLE I.

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES, *delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow, May, 1845, in connection with the objects of the Free Church of Scotland.* FIRST SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1845.*

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES. SECOND SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1846.*

The first series of these lectures is by the Rev. Drs. Candlish, Wilson, and McFarlane; and the Rev. Messrs. Thomas McCrie, Robert W. Stewart, Wm. K. Tweedie, and J. G. Lorimer.

The subjects are as follows:

- I. The Mutual Relations of the Churches of Christ.
- II. The Independent Eastern Churches.
- III. The Ancient History of the Waldensian Church.
- IV. The present condition and future prospects of the Waldensian Church.
- V. The Religious History of Holland and Belgium since the Reformation.
- VI. Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in Switzerland, and especially Geneva.
- VII. The Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in France.

The *Second Series*, contains seven lectures by Messrs. Wilson, Forbes, Fairbairn, Bryce, Tweedie, Hetherington, and Buchanan. Their subjects are:

VOL. I.—No. 4.

1

## ARTICLE V.

*The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah.* By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1846 8 vo. pp. 652..

*The Later Prophecies of Isaiah.* By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1847. 8 vo. pp. 501.

These volumes have been before the American public, the first for nearly two years, and the last nearly a twelve-month. As yet they have not been noticed, so far as we have observed, in any other than those passing introductions to the reader's acquaintance, with which the editors of our daily and weekly journals are wont to greet every new claimant. It was our purpose to have given them that extended and careful review their importance demanded, ere the present moment, but having been interrupted in carrying into execution this design, we greatly fear that the remarks which on their perusal occurred to us, have escaped our memory beyond the power of recall. What we may therefore lack in minute criticism, must now be made up in giving those general impressions which are left behind, and which perhaps are better suited to the ends we should keep before us in such a publication as ours, the general edification of our readers, than those details which so few, comparatively, are disposed to appreciate.

When one undertakes to write a commentary on the Scriptures, there are various plans suggesting themselves to the mind, according to which such commentary may be written. It may be the aim of the writer to produce a work which is practical wholly, whose object shall be to cultivate religion in the heart,—or doctrinal, to deduce and inculcate the doctrines of religion,—or critical, to explain the words merely, and to lay bare the train of thought in the mind of the sacred writer. The methods pursued, are as various as the employments, the genius, tastes and

ends of the interpreters themselves. Those commentaries which have been elaborated, in the first instance, for public expositions from the pulpit, will differ from those which have grown out of the private notes of the biblical student, designed, when first undertaken, merely for his own satisfaction. Those which have arisen from the academical prelections of a professor, and those which were designed to be taken in the hands of the student and leisurely perused;—those which have a parenetic object, and those which aim at the calm reason of the reader;—those which seek to exhaust the subject, and those which aim to give a brief and cursive view of the train of thought and the main points handled, must of necessity have each its own method, and are valuable or not, according to the degree in which they accomplish the ends at which they aim. But where the end is precisely the same, much depends upon the genius, tastes and studies of the writer. One will devote his principal labour to the explanation of the manners and customs alluded to, or to antiquarian researches amid the monuments and institutions of ancient nations; another will develop the poetic beauties of the sacred writer. One will enrich his pages with patristic, another with rabbinic lore. This one will strive to draw forth the meaning of the author by a view of the context chiefly, and deduce it in a given passage from the supposed train of thought, and that will seek the same end by a process purely philological. And whether he shall do this by resorting in the Hebrew Scriptures to that language alone, or to its cognate languages, or shall explain the New Testament by illustrations drawn from the fathers or from the classic models, will depend on the tastes and previous studies of the interpreter himself. Much was expected from Professor Alexander. His reputation was deservedly high as a scholar and an instructor. In his previous criticism of others who had ventured on the same field of interpretation, he had shown that he well knew what a commentary on Isaiah ought to be. He had been for years engaged in accumulating the materials, under the most favorable circumstances of access to the best labours of his predecessors, and of constant study of the author he interpreted, with the view to impart instruction to others. With these facilities and this preparation, it was expected that his work would supply a desidera-

tum in theological literature which was felt by all students of the original Scriptures. If there was in some a measure of disappointment when the work made its appearance, it may be accounted for in part from these high raised expectations,—in part from the intrinsic difficulty of this species of composition, and in part from the fact that to appreciate fully the work, it is almost necessary to peruse it at large, with the original Scriptures before you, and in the use of other commentaries with which it may be continually compared. That it holds a very respectable place among the best of these works, and is a truly valuable aid to the student of the Scriptures, we presume cannot be denied.

The author informs us in his preface, which of the various plans on which commentaries are written, he designed to adopt. He aimed, he says, at the specific end “of making the results of philological and critical research available for purposes of practical utility.” For this purpose, “it was found indispensable to fix upon some portion of the reading public, whose capacities, acquirements and wants, might be consulted in determining the method and form of the exposition.” Profound orientalists are too few amongst us to authorise a work addressed exclusively to them. The obscurer parts of Scripture are more successfully opened to the popular mind by the agency of an intelligent ministry. To this ministry, therefore, he proposed to furnish a “partial succedaneum for many costly books,” “enabling them to profit by the latest philosophical improvements and discoveries, without the inconveniences and even dangers which attend a direct resort to the original authorities.” Among other reasons why the professed interpreter should content himself with furnishing the raw material to the preacher’s hands, is the impression of the author that “much of the fanciful and allegorical interpretation heretofore current, has arisen from the failure to discriminate sufficiently between the province of the critical interpreter and that of the expository lecturer or preacher.” The author has aimed too to give, to some extent, a history of the interpretation of this prophet; and in this, while he has drawn from various sources, he has given a prominence to the modern German writers, not of choice, he says, but of necessity, because of the abundance of their labours in this department, their extensive influence, and his own design

of combining "the valuable processes and products of the new philology with sounder principles of exegesis."

The two volumes are prefaced with suitable introductions, in which the several questions of a general nature are discussed, touching the prophetic character and office, and that of Isaiah in particular; the various controversies respecting the genuineness of different portions of these prophecies which the misplaced and irreverent learning of the German mind has originated, as well as the characteristics of the several commentators who have attempted to explain the book of Isaiah, and the various sources of illustration, which presenting themselves in rich profusion, proffer their aid to the enquiring scholar. We presume we shall best meet the wishes of our readers, if we run through the several topics on which our author has spoken, somewhat in his own manner, but with as much brevity as the nature of the subject will allow.

The Hebrew prophets were extraordinary teachers whom God raised up from time to time by a special call, and on whom he bestowed a peculiar inspiration. They did not succeed each other, as did the ordinary teachers, the priests and Levites, by hereditary descent, nor were they usually inducted by any outward ceremony of man, or by any appointment of a preceding prophet to the office they were called of God to occupy. The one case of Elisha, who was called by the agency of Elijah, who first became his assistant and then his successor, both as president of the prophetic schools and in the general office of prophet, is not sufficient to indicate to us a *general* rule of appointment. The cases of Saul, rather, who was temporarily under the prophetic impulse, and those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and John, show that the prophet was moved by a direct and powerful operation of the Spirit, to the performance of those acts of instruction, by which his office was indicated to others. In some instances, as in Moses and Jonah, there was a felt reluctance to entering upon the office, which was allowed by the Holy Spirit to interpose a temporary delay in the performance of its duties. In others, Jehovah spake to the prophet by a strong seizure of the hand, (*behezka<sup>h</sup> yad<sup>h</sup>*) and holy men of old spake as they were borne along (*φερομενοι*) by the Holy Ghost. Yet was there a succession of

\* Isaiah 8: 11.

prophets, with but few and occasional interruptions, from Moses to Malachi, a period of 1200 years, fulfilling thus the promise to the Jewish people through their lawgiver, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you like unto me,"\*—a prophecy which while it principally looked forward to Christ for its fulfilment, included also the whole circle of prophets, whose office it should be, from Moses down, to speak of him, and to hold up before the people this great Deliverer, in whom the prophetic office would find its most illustrious example, and who should speak as never man spake:† "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."‡

It is a very limited view of the prophet's office, to suppose it confined to the predicting of future events. Professor Alexander, agreeing with other writers on this subject, has shown, that neither the Greek terms *εγγρημι* and *εγγρηνης*, nor the Hebrew *nabhi*,§ admit of being restricted to the utterance of predictions merely. The former terms were used of him who spoke authoritatively in the name, and as the *nuntius* of God, and the latter, in its primitive form and meaning, expresses the idea of utterance; *nabha*, *protulit verba*, *nunciavit*. The classic passage, which explains, of itself, the meaning of the word, is Exodus iv: 1—17, where the Lord says to Moses, "Aaron shall be thy *nabhi* unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God." As Aaron stood related to Moses, received from him what he should say, and communicated it to the people, so the prophet stands to God, an *internunciatus* between Him and his people. The prophet was sometimes inspired to speak of the past as well as the future, as Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar the dream which he had forgotten; and the substance of their prophetic teaching shows that they inveighed against the sins of the people, stood as watchmen on the walls of Zion, to espy the approach of danger, and that it was their especial commission to maintain the principles of the theocratic government, the fundamental basis of which was the law given by Mo-

\* Deut. 18: 15—18.

† Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. 1, pp. 71, 72. Calvin on Deut. 18.

‡ Rev. 19: 10.

§ Hengstenberg strives to shew that this has a passive form, and implies also the receiving as well as the uttering of revelations.

ses. Hence they as fully filled their office of prophets when they inveighed against alliances with foreign nations, and trusting in any arm of flesh, against the finery, affectation, and luxury of Jewish females, and against idolatrous worship, as where they had visions of future things, and made known the calamities or blessings in store for Israel.

Professor Alexander seems to extend the term prophet to those men who were raised up on special emergencies, as were the Hebrew judges, as Sampson and others, who were directed and controlled by a special divine influence. But though Joshua is reckoned in Jewish tradition as a prophet, and though Samuel, the prophet, was also a judge, we presume the term is not properly applied to any except such as were occupied in part or principally in communicating, by oral or written teaching, the divine will to men. Saul, the first Hebrew king was, for a season, guided by a special influence from above, until the spirit of God departed from him in anger, and the kingdom was given to the son of Jesse. Yet it was not, we conceive, by virtue of that influence that he was called a prophet, but because he was suddenly inspired to pour forth utterances similar to those of the prophets, when on two occasions he visited Samuel at Ramah, and came for a season in contact with the schools of the prophets. Even to him as a king appointed and guided by the Spirit of God, these utterances, and this prophetic *afflatus* were unusual, so that it excited surprise, and became a proverb—"Is Saul also among the prophets?" Joshua was called a prophet, in like manner, not in his capacity of leader of the armies of Israel, but rather as one of the writers of the sacred Scriptures.

On the nature of the prophetic inspiration, we see nothing in the views of Professor Alexander, to which we are disposed to except. We have supposed that in those portions of their teachings, whether oral or written, in which there is no discernable difference between them and other sacred writers, their inspiration was of the same nature with theirs. The Holy Spirit used them as his instruments, *such as they were*, possessed of those intellectual endowments, peculiarities and culture, which they had through the more ordinary providence of God. And as they were *human* instruments, possessed of human attributes, which it was no purpose of the spirit to obliterate or to depress, the characteris-

tic genius, style, temperament of each, appears in whatever was written. And yet this did not occur because the Spirit merely suggested thoughts to their understandings, and then left it for them to express them as they might, but because, in some way — which, though in some points analogous to other operations of the divine Spirit upon the human understanding, can nevertheless not be properly understood by us — without destroying their mental identity, he accompanied their intellectual efforts, leading them on till every thought was clothed in language, appropriate when they were considered, because it was the natural expression of the thought within, and appropriate when the divine Author himself is considered, because clearly conveying, and without defect, what he designed to convey. In this respect the inspiration of the prophets was not peculiar. But there *was* a peculiar state, which *marks* the prophetic inspiration: it is that which is termed by Professor Alexander, Hengstenberg, Jahn, and others, *the state of immediate vision*.\* “If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto you *in a vision*, and will speak unto him in a dream.” “I *saw* also the Lord sitting upon a throne,” said Isaiah. “Balaam, the Lord of Beor, hath said, and the man *whose eyes are open* hath said: he hath said which heard the word of God, which *saw* the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open. I *see* him,—but not now: I *behold* him,—but not nigh.” And Michaiah said “I *saw* all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd.”† The name *seers*, given to the prophets, and *visions* applied to their oracles in a multiplicity of synonymes, which our want of proper type prevents us from presenting to the eye, mark the grand peculiarity of the prophetic inspiration. And it is for this reason, as Hengstenberg remarks, because the communications made to them were in this form, that Abraham and other patriarchs are sometimes called prophets. This view of the method of prophetic revelation will probably account

\* Hengstenberg's Christology, I, p. 229. Also in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Bib. Literature, Article Prophecy. Jahn calls it *the prophetic perspective vision*. Introduction, p. 367. In istis antem duabus partibus, *somnio* inquam et *visione*, continentur omnes Prophetiæ gradus. Maimonides' Moreh Nebhochim, p. 293. Comp. pp. 307—9.

† Numb. xii: 6; Is. vi: 1; Num. xxiv: 3, 4, 17.

for all those bodily affections and states with which the seasons of their inspiration were sometimes attended. Professor Alexander differs from the supposition of Hengstenberg, that the prophet was in that state of passive subjection to a higher power, in which the free exercise of his faculties was suspended, which the Greeks called *κωπια*. And if *ecstasy* is understood in that sense, of a "morbid" state of mind, not natural to it when under strong and overpowering impressions, we are disposed to yield our concurrence. But the term was also used of other mental states, from ordinary wonder and surprise, up to the highest species of trances. The passages on which Hengstenberg relies are that in Peter, "Holy men of God spake as they were *borne along* by the Holy Ghost"—the condition of Balaam, who fell to the ground—of Ezekiel, John, and Daniel, all of whom were overpowered by the prophetic visions, falling to the ground as if dead, sinking down with faintness, as did Daniel, who, after the vision was sick certain days. To these we may add the case of Paul, who was caught up to the third heaven, and heard unspeakable things which it was not lawful to utter; who says of himself, that whether he was in the body or out of the body he could not tell—but speaks of himself as enjoying at this time abundance of revelations. If it is understood that these states of excitement, and of exhaustion and temporary bewilderment, were the *effects* of the astonishing visions presented to the mind, and not the states necessary to their first perception, we see no evil in the idea. But it is right, and even especially necessary, that we should guard against any representation which would imply any dethronement of the reason or suspension, even temporarily, of any of the powers of the understanding. The physical effect was the natural result of powerful mental excitement, of revelations to the mind of stupendous, or fearful thoughts, an effect which is analogous to what takes place now, from the communication of exciting truth, for which the mind is unprepared.

It has always been the favorite resort of sceptics to represent the Hebrew prophets as affected in the same way as Cassandra or the priestess of Apollo, with a kind of *sacred madness*.\* But the heathen was but a profane counterfeit

\* Furor Divinus.

of the true inspiration, and the oracles of Paganism but the awkward imitation of what rumor or hoary traditions had conveyed to them, as having existed in earlier times, among the chosen people of God. Between these and the intelligent utterances of the Hebrew prophet there is an immeasurable distance. And a care should be had to distinguish accurately the one from the other.

Whether the prophets understood their own predictions has been much disputed. On this point our author does not touch. But even to ourselves, we seem sometimes to be led on, in our unprompted reasonings, to the discovery and utterance of truths whose full import we do not perceive, till we afterwards make it the subject of reflection. Much more the prophet, who was borne along by the prophetic impulse, must often have been carried onward, if not beyond his own perceptions of what he announced, yet beyond his own realizing understanding of what the vision which he clearly saw with his mental eye, should mean. If, as is probable, near events were seen in the same mental vision with those remote, and both were commingled in the representation, there was abundant reason why this revelation should become the subject of after study and reflection, and abundant room for the prophets to "search diligently what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." I. Pet. 1: 10, 11.

Professor Alexander, though he considers the whole subject of prophetic education one of surmise and conjecture, does not discard the idea that there may have been a preparation for the proper discharge of the prophetic office, through the process of education. Not that they could act as prophets without inspiration, but he would probably agree with what is expressed by Witsius, Hengstenberg, Lightfoot, Stillingleet, and others, that God for the most part conferred the prophetic office on those who had been educated in the schools of the prophets.\* Amos speaks of it as an unusual procedure, that he, who was neither a prophet nor the son, [i. e. the pupil,] of a prophet, but a herdsman and a gatherer

\* Witsius *Miscellanea Sacra*, Tom. 1. L. 1. C. 10. §10; and Hengstenberg.

of sycamore fruit, should be taken as he followed the flock and made to prophesy unto the people of Israel.—Amos vii: 13, 14.

On the promulgation and preservation of the prophecies, the author briefly recounts the several theories. The opinion we regard as most probable, and which accords in general with his, we proceed to mention. After the establishment of the Mosaic economy, the prophetic office seems gradually to have become more and more distinct and well defined. Under the judges the influence of the prophets was great, but about the time of the institution of the monarchy under Samuel, and in some measure in connection with the prophetic schools, it became more distinct and powerful. Until this period, their mode of publishing their prophecies was by oral speech; but about this time, perhaps because their communications now looked forward more to the future condition of the people of God, and were of increasing importance to after times, they were written down for the benefit of the church in future ages, as well as for their wider dissemination among the cotemporaries of the prophet. In all probability they were also orally delivered in some public place, before the people, either before or after they were written: or, if the prophecy was made, as it sometimes was, by symbolic actions, instead of words, these acts were subsequently, under the divine inspiration, made a matter of record. Though circulated probably in private manuscripts among the people, they were also carefully engrossed, and formally deposited within the precincts of the temple, it may be supposed, with the same care with the law of Moses, and perhaps in the very place where it was repositied.

Professor Alexander supposes that the arrangement of the sacred writings, which was made by Ezra, was determined thus: The five books of Moses, the foundation of the whole, had, as was natural, the first place; then came the writings of those who had not only the *donum propheticum*, but the prophetic office, and who were also by divine appointment, the historiographers of the Jewish nation, viz: the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, constituting the collection of the early prophets, then the later prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, who were called the larger prophets, to distinguish them from the twelve

minor prophets; then, in the third place, the writings of men who enjoyed inspiration without holding the prophetic office, including the Psalms, the writings of Solomon, Job, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. These answer to the New Testament division of the Law, the Prophets, and the other books.

Of the noble fraternity of the prophets Isaiah was an illustrious member. Endowed, as we should judge, with the loftiest natural gifts, and, as has been supposed, favored with even a courtly education, imbued with the deepest piety as a subject of sanctifying grace, and lifted to the most exalted height of prophetic inspiration, his writings have been in the highest degree attractive to the student of the Scriptures, and have been illustrated and explained by the first minds of modern and ancient times, beyond almost any other of the Jewish books. His prophetic ministry was a long one, extending through the entire reigns of three kings, and part of the reign of a fourth, perhaps of a fifth, continuing at least forty-seven, and perhaps, as some suppose, for the extraordinary period of seventy years. He was a cotemporary of Micah and Joel, as Hengstenberg supposes, in the kingdom of Judah, and of Hosea, Amos, and Jonah, in the kingdom of Israel—and belonged to the first prophets whose oracles are preserved in separate written documents. The affairs of the Jews were become exceedingly involved with those of neighboring countries; Egypt on the West, and Assyria on the East, made Palestine a conterminous country to both, alternately tributary, the highway of their armies, and the theatre, even then, before it was trodden by the heels of the Macedonian phalanx, of civil wars, and the object of oppressive exactions. Other lesser nations, meanwhile, on every side, were in restless excitement. The church and people of God were environed with unexampled dangers, both as to their civil independence and their religious purity. Judah, too, was vexing Ephraim, and Ephraim Judah, when Isaiah and his cotemporary prophets came on the theatre of action. Every thing was in commotion. There was distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear. And then, with a proneness to forget God, as danger retired to a distance, relapsing into security, they began anew to live in open injustice and indulgence,

and in secret idolatry. Into this scene of various excitement, Isaiah and his fellow-prophets are commissioned to come forward and denounce judgments upon the chosen people, and on surrounding nations. He names, by the divine command, the first of his two sons, Shear Jashub, "A Remnant Shall Return," and the second, Mahershalalhashbaz, "Hastens the Spoil, Speeds the Prey." His whole domestic state and arrangements were made to be symbolic and prophetic: while he himself wore a garment of sackcloth, as did many other prophets, the badge of grief and repentance. He was commissioned also to administer consolation, to predict the downfall of the oppressors of Israel, the return of his people, under Cyrus, to their own habitations; and, through the gloom which brooded over the future, to proclaim the coming of the Messiah, to describe, with historic minuteness, the circumstances of his death and burial, and to speak of the future glories of the church. These are moving themes, and are spoken of with a beauty, pathos, lofty grandeur, and surpassing sublimity, of which, out of the Scriptures, the world can show no other equal examples.

One of the most remarkable and characteristic features of the modern learning in Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, especially of the Germanic European school, is its disposition to sit in judgment upon the books of Scripture, to call in question the genuineness of particular words, phrases, passages, chapters, and sometimes of whole books; to set aside the entire testimony of past ages, whether cotemporary with the sacred writers, or subsequent, whether belonging to the Jewish or Christian Church; to arraign before their tribunal each individual portion of a sacred author, and to place the *disjecta membra* the one on the right hand and the other on the left, according to the decisions of their daring but capricious judgment. Just in proportion as past times have concurred with a satisfied faith in the authorship, and integrity as it respects the parts which compose the writing, of any portion of the Old Testament, have these learned but sceptical divines uttered their doubts, as if it were a *virtue* to differ from what has been before unhesitatingly received—as if it were *heroic*, just in proportion as a writing is deemed sacred by the church, to lay on it their ungodly hand, and deprive it of all the authority with which it has been invested by the belief that it is the indu-

bitable writing of men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

One main point of value in the commentary before us, is the antidote it furnishes to these speculative opinions of the German critics. While the learned author is alive to all which is truly valuable in their writings, he furnishes, in his historic account of the progress of their opinions, in his discriminating objections to their principles of criticism, in the dexterity with which he brings forward one theory to demolish its predecessor, and sometimes in the caustic satire with which he notices their decisions, the best antidote to these unscrupulous critics which we have met with in our English literature. To their critical, or as *we* should term them, to their *uncritical* processes, the book of Isaiah has been unmercifully subjected. We already have historic doubts of this school in circulation on this side the Atlantic, in the Introduction to the Old Testament by De Wette, translated by Theodore Parker;\* and though the American translation of Hengstenberg's Christology, and a few other books, give to some extent the opposing arguments, we regard it as timely that these theories should be exposed, and the fallacies on which they rest laid bare, and deeply imprinted on the minds of every student of the Scriptures.†

The Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church, alike concurred in the integrity and genuineness of the text of Isaiah, down to the middle of the 18th century. Koppè was the first one who called this in question. In his edition of Lowth's Commentary, he suggested the idea that the book of Isaiah was a prophetic Anthology, first collected after the Babylonish exile. Eichorn took up and improved upon the hints of Koppè.‡ "If I am not deceived," says

\* 2 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1843.

† There are means of refuting these loose critics of Germany from other Germans of a sounder faith. It is right that Greek should be brought forward to meet Greek. And since the German learning will come to us and is likely to reach us through less desirable channels, it is with peculiar pleasure that we find it here winnowed and sifted, animated with a more sacred glow, and purged by passing through the menstruum of the high and holy doctrines of our own exalted but condemned faith. We certainly prefer that it should come through the alembic of Princeton, rather than through the conduit of the Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, the translator of De Wette, and the author of "The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity."

‡ Kleinert erben die Weissagungen in Iesaia, T. 1, iv. vii.

he, "in my opinion of the origin of our present Isaiah, it grew out of an Anthology of the prophetic poetry which had survived the Babylonish exile." He ascribes the preservation of the prophetic writings to such collections, 'made by individual members of the Jewish State, sometimes out of partiality to the writings of particular prophets, sometimes out of religious motives, or for other unknown reasons. These collectors indulged themselves in all manner of liberties, prefixing titles according to their views of the contents of each particular prophetic fragment, commingling the older and the more modern, those relating to their own and those relating to foreign lands, without any regard to chronological arrangement. When, after the captivity, the Jews gathered into a library the fragments of their national authors, they brought together into one book, all that tradition ascribed to a particular author as his work, and all which contained any thing that especially concerned him. Thus, under Isaiah's name, they placed all historical fragments in which his writings were mentioned, (as Is. 36. 39.) although they did not acknowledge him as the author. When the collectors of our canon proceeded to the arrangement of the prophets, Daniel was probably not in their hands, on which account it was put in the third collection, the Hagiographa. As the whole stock of prophetic oracles, consisted of the fragments now found in our Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, these divided themselves into four parts, adapted to four rolls of about the same size and volume. Jeremiah and Ezekiel, by themselves, filled each one parchment, leaving no room for any thing else. There were now found among the smaller (and perhaps private) collections of prophecies: 1. A more considerable one, of which Isaiah was the foundation, but with which were united many other fragments of earlier, cotemporaneous, and later prophets; and 2. A larger, and many smaller ones, in which last the prophecies of our so called minor prophets were written together; and 3. A series of oracles without the name of their author. This remainder they divided again, as it appears, into two parts. The collection of prophecies with Isaiah's name, was indeed sufficiently respectable by itself, but it was too small to constitute an entire roll. They united with it the extracts from the historic books, in which Isaiah appears as an actor,

(Is. 36—39,) and the remaining anonymous prophecies. The materials thus grew to the size which was requisite to fill a parchment of about the same dimensions with the roll of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Finally, to the fourth roll they assigned the shorter prophecies, which had been passed by, which were accompanied with the names of their authors, and which yet remained from the times before the exile, and to these they appended the latest prophets Haggai, Zecacharias and Malachi. In this way originated four collections of prophecies of nearly equal size.\* We are more particular in giving the theory of Eichorn, because of the great influence it had in shaping the opinions of those who followed him. It was brought forward by Eichorn with that brilliant eloquence and dexterity which make his writings so captivating. It was advanced to a wider occupancy of the public mind, by the writings of Doederlein, Justi, Paulus, Baner, Bertholt, De Wette,† Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Ewald, Umbreit, Hitzig, and others, either with some variations from the theory of Eichorn, or in entire accordance with it. By flattering the reigning spirit of the age, its contempt of the ancient, its idolatry of reason and of unlimited speculation; by the splendor of their learning, and the appearance of profoundness which they gave to their cause; they won for these opinions a wide control over the German mind. There were not wanting able opponents of these views. Hensler, Piper, Beckhaus, Jahn, Dereser, Van der Palm, Moëller, Uhland, Greve, Arndt, and more lately Hengstenberg, Kleinert and Schleier, have lifted up their voice with equal ability in the cause of truth. This voice for a season was unheeded, and though there seems to be a turning back to the old paths by gradual approaches, is still unheeded by the great body of German scholars. In part,

\* Eichorn *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4 te Band. S. 50–52.

† As a specimen of the objectionable manner in which De Wette speaks of the prophetic books, take the following: "Some prophets, in writing down their oracles, seem to have designed to produce a complete literary work; others, at least, wrote down their separate speeches in a collection. Only a few flying leaves of some other prophets appear to have got into circulation; and these have been badly interpolated, in a course of uncritical treatment, provided with false inscriptions, put in a false connection, or worked over anew. Finally, it has happened that later predictions have been falsely attributed to the old prophets. This has been done, not merely as an idle sport of fancy, but with real, prophetic design!"—De Wette on the O. T., vol. ii., p. 363.

this is ascribed by Kleinert and also by Prof. Alexander, to the fact that these men conceded too much to their opponents, and admitted too far the principles on which they reasoned. But it was more owing to the restless spirit of the age. A sneer at the opinions of their opponents, as antiquated, "*antiquirte Meinungen*," or an exclamation, "*sonderbar genug!*" was sufficient in most minds to settle the question forever. States of mind often prevail among a people, favorable to the uprooting of all that has been acquiesced in, and it only needs some man of genius and influence, to lead the way, for the majority to leave substantial good in the mad pursuit of that which is ideal, to overlook the substance and grasp the shadow.

Almost every portion of the first part of Isaiah has been assailed by some one of the writers we have mentioned. The only portions which have not been, are chap. i., 3-9: xvii., xx., xxviii., xxxi. But the principal point of attack has been the later prophecies, from chapter xl.-lxvi. These, as we have seen in the theory of Eichorn, were regarded by him as a collection of prophecies, or a prophetic anthology, composed of the productions of various unknown authors, collected subsequently to the exile. To this, Gesenius, and others, have stood opposed. They have shown, and this conclusively, that this latter portion of Isaiah constitutes one continuous discourse, and proceeded from one author. But this author, *the Pseudo-Isaiah*, they affirm could not have lived in the days of the real Isaiah; he must have lived after the exile. The reasons given for this opinion, as summed up by Kleinert, who has brought them together out of the writings of Gesenius and De Wette, are briefly these: (1.) The allusions to the circumstances of the Jewish people and of foreign nations, especially the Chaldees, are those of the last period of the exile. (2.) All this seems to have reference not to the future as something *predicted*, but to the *present* state and circumstances of the nation, to the (stand-point) existing circumstances of the prophet himself, and with these circumstances the prophecies of the future stand conjoined. (3.) In *Isaiah's* mouth, such language must be as unintelligible as it is devoid of aim. Before a return from captivity could be announced, he must first predict the captivity itself. (4.) It is against the usage of the Hebrew prophets to prophecy so

individually and specifically, as Is. 44: 28. 45: 1. 48: 14, 20. 43: 14. (5.) He appeals to earlier predictions concerning the return of the people from captivity, which had now been fulfilled, and which he subjoins, 42: 9, 45: 19, 21, 46: 16. This presupposes a later prophet, who was contemporary with the events. (6.) In all which the prophet says of the existing circumstances of the people and of their political connections, he stands on firm historic ground, and all agrees in the exactest way with the historic truth. But whatever he says of their future condition, is ideal, joyful, animated hope, which far exceeds the reality. Had Providence deemed it best that Isaiah, in a supernatural way, should prophecy respecting Cyrus, he would have disclosed the state after the exile also with historic truth, not in exstatic ideal scenes which would never be realized. (7.) The language, the phraseology, have in the Pseudo-Isaian portions a peculiarity which the genuine Isaiah knows not. (8.) The use of the later Hebrew or Chaldaic idioms, demonstrates a later age. (9.) If prophecies under the name of such a distinguished prophet as Isaiah, had been in existence in the days of Jeremiah, who suffered abuse and persecution, because he predicted a captivity which no one believed, he would have appealed, without doubt, to such a distinguished predecessor, as his defenders did, in his justification, to an altogether indefinite prediction of Micah. Kleinert S. viii. — xxi.

These we may well suppose contain the weight of the objections to Isaiah. It is easy to detect the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, the first and fundamental error whence all proceeds. It is the principle that the mind of men cannot be made to possess a distinct and definite perception of future things. This springs first out of an unconverted, unbelieving heart; out of an ill-concealed infidelity; out of the very pyrrhonism which characterized Tindal, Thomas Paine, Hobbes, Bolingbroke, and Spinoza. The work of grace is unknown in the heart, and every thing supernatural and miraculous is denied. The principle itself has before been asserted by Voltaire: "We cannot know future events," says he, "because we cannot know what is not." If these prophets were really inspired, and if God revealed unto them the future, especially if the mode of revelation was by vision, in which future things were made present realities to the

mind, the very supposition implies that the allusions of the prophet should be taken from that future, in which his mind in these moments of high inspiration lived and acted. These things not only became present realities, but are described as such; and from that future, in which he thus seemed to himself to be, the prophet, under the divine illumination, could look forth into a remoter future, and discover there visions of glory, and be filled with joyful hope and anticipations of what is in store for the people of God. And it is plain that while his physical being, his breathing body might exist in the present moment, his ideal existence might shift from point to point as he was borne along *φερομενος* by the Holy Ghost. It is plainly as easy for Him who sees the end from the beginning, to reveal events with historic definiteness to the mind of the prophet, as in vague generalities. It is an astonishing misapprehension, if it be not a wilful blindness, to regard prophecy as vague and of uncertain application. And it costs much wresting of the Scriptures, and great displacing of dates, the manufacturing indeed of a chronology for the nonce, as it respects these writings, to carry out this view with the slightest show of plausibility. "Not the usage of the Hebrew prophets to prophecy so individually and specially!" And yet Josiah was predicted by name, and what he should do to Jeroboam's altar, specifically mentioned, three centuries and a half before Josiah lived to fulfil the prediction. We would quote too the entire prophecies of Isaiah, Chap. xiii., xiv., xxi., had not these also, as if for the sole purpose of removing them out of the way, been assigned to a period after the exile. Yet the prophetic writings are full of equally minute predictions of prostrate empires and ruined cities. Not one of these has history disproved. Jerome was embarrassed in commenting in the 4th century, on Ezek. xxvi: 14, where the prophet, apostrophizing Tyre, the Liverpool of the ancient world, twenty-four centuries ago, says, "Thou shalt be built no more." He was embarrassed because that mart of the nations, was then apparently reviving. All-devouring time has swept on, and written his indelible and truthful comments on Ezekiel's prophecy, more full and able than Jerome could. Tyre is indeed become like "the top of a rock"—"a place to spread nets upon,"—her granite pillar and marble columns lie broken beneath

the waves—her stones, her timber, and her dust, have they laid in the midst of the water. Out of the book of Psalms, and this *Pseudo*? Isaiah, you may read the life and atoning death, the burial, resurrection, and mediatorial reign of Christ our Saviour, his pierced hands and feet, the bitter potion he drank on the cross, his raiment parted by lot, his agonizing cry, his burial in the sepulchre of the rich, all written, as even these critics must allow, from five to ten centuries before his birth. As to style, it is well known that it varies with the age and circumstances of the author: That forms of expression which have been favorite at one period of life, are displaced by other forms of expression at another. Other scenes, other society, other trains of thought, contact with other minds, other states of body, all affect the language in which one expresses his ideas. Professor Alexander has applied these principles of the higher criticism, so much vaunted by the German critics, to the Satires, and *Ars Poetica* of Horace. He shows that the *απαξ λεγόμενα* in the latter are sufficiently numerous, if we apply the same test, by which portion after portion has been removed from Isaiah, to establish the spuriousness of that. In the same way, Prof. Lee shows that we might with equal propriety maintain, from the difference of style between the oration against Cataline and the offices of Cicero, and between the *Æneid* and *Bucolics* of Virgil, that they could not have emanated from the same author. That the man who wrote *Lady Macbeth*, could not have written “*Much Ado about Nothing*.” He who wrote *Paradise Lost*, could not have written the little poem termed *L'Allegro*. So that it might be shown by numerous deductions, that there must be a *Pseudo-Cicero*, *Virgil*, *Shakspeare*, *Milton*;—and he affirms that with little trouble it might be shown, “that there are pseudo-authors under any name, not excepting those of *Bertholt*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Gesenius*.” The alleged *Aramæan* words, or rather words used in an *Aramæan* or *Chaldee* sense, Prof. Lee, with much positiveness, denies to have any such sense beyond what occurs in the portions of *Isaiah* acknowledged genuine.\* And even if they did, we ask, was not *Palestine* surrounded on every side by na-

\* *Sermons and Dissertations on the Scriptures*, by the Rev. S. Lee, B. D., &c. &c. &c., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge London, 1830.

tions speaking these dialects, so closely allied with the Hebrew? Are not the words or idioms of sister dialects continually creeping into each other's territories? Did not Dr. Johnson grieve lest Englishmen should come at length to babble a dialect of France? Might we not expect *a priori* their partial prevalence in all the periods of Jewish literature—and are they not in fact found in the oldest and the latest Hebrew writings,—in Moses, in Solomon, as well as in Ezekiel and Ezra. And might there not from some special reason, now indiscernable, be an influx of them at the particular time Isaiah wrote.

These theories devour one another. That which is defended as genuine by one man, is rejected as spurious by the scholar that comes after him. The judgment, founded on such data, must be fluctuating and uncertain. The idea of a prophetic anthology, collected after the exile, is a pure fiction. The presumption is entirely against it. The external and internal arguments are alike against it. The fact that the other prophetic writings, as those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and those of the minor prophets, contain only the writings of those whose names they bear, is against it. Josephus, and every Jewish authority from him down, are against it. The apocryphal writings of the Jews are against it,—and although there is an answer to each of the arguments quoted above, as it were at the point of our pen, we have probably spent time enough already to show that the theory is a cunningly devised fable.

Our remarks are becoming so extended, that we must pass over briefly what we had intended further to say.

We have in common with the Jewish and with most Christian interpreters, since Vitringa, supposed that the arrangement of Isaiah's prophecies is not always in the exact order of their delivery. And especially, that chapter vi. contains an account of Isaiah's call and inauguration to his prophetic office. Others indeed regard it, and Prof. Alexander among them, as designed to prepare him for a discouraging and painful revelation which was to follow. Others, that it was designed to encourage and reassure him when he was about giving up his prophetic commission. And others still, that he first prophesied as a candidate for that office, to which he is now more solemnly ordained. These suppositions may in some one or other of their forms

be true. For it does not vary from the experience of faithful ministers of the word at the present day, that they should have their call to the holy office, as it were renewed, especially when they are cast down at their ill-success, or have some new convictions of the exaltation, majesty, holiness, and pardoning love of "the Lord," as they see him "sitting upon his throne." But in favour of the view now common, though our author and Hengstenberg, both advocate that to which we have just alluded, is the fact that similar visions occurred at the call of Ezekiel and Jeremiah to the prophetic office, and to John also, when there were vouchsafed to him visions of God in the isle of Patmos, and he was made the prophet of the new covenant. There is something analogous too in every real call to the ministry now, — there is, in like manner, a vision of the Lord, especially of Christ, in his glory and awful holiness, a deep conviction of our undone condition and present unworthiness, — a sense of pardon, and of sin and guilt purged away and removed by the application of atoning blood, symbolized by the live coal from the altar of sacrifice applied by the seraph to the lips of the prophet. It is then that we hear moving the silent depths of our soul, the voice of the Lord Jehovah, "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" and it is then that we reply, "Here Lord am I," "Send me."

To allow for this supposition, it is not necessary to have recourse to the declaration of the Talmudists, that these prophecies were arranged by the men of Hezekiah, or to introduce the hypothesis of a later compiler. Isaiah may have collected and arranged his own predictions, and adopted, for some reason not now wholly discoverable, some other than the chronological order.

In mentioning the causes which have led to this speculative, daring, and unsatisfactory criticism, which has torn this prophetic book into fragments and distributed the *disjecta membra* among so many imaginary authors of various later periods, and has, as in the case of Lowth, led to arbitrary alterations of the text, Prof. Alexander enumerates the influence of the critical processes of the school of Bentley, as transferred to the Scriptures, the extravagant application to the Arabic and other cognate languages, to explain the Hebrew idioms; the general imitation of the methods of

interpretation which had been adopted in the classics; the exaggeration of the poetic element in the prophetic writings undesignedly promoted by Lowth's Prelections on Hebrew Poetry, and more especially by his commentary on Isaiah, which gave countenance to the efforts of the earlier neologists of Germany, "to blot out the distinction between poetry and prophecy,—between the ideal inspiration of the Muses and the real inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Add to these the prevalence of the maxim, that "there can be no distinctive prophetic foresight of the distant future." These elements combined in an unscriptural, unsanctified mind, are doubtless the fruitful causes of the havoc which has been made with all that is truly sacred in the prophetic style and character, or which must be admitted to exist in writings which claim from us an implicit submission, as our only rule of faith and practice. We were not however wholly prepared to agree with him, in his censure of the mode of printing the prophetic writings, which was introduced by Lowth, and has been so extensively copied. While we would not have this method introduced, as it has been to some extent, in editions of the Scriptures designed for the general reader, the poetic element has been so much overlooked in past ages, that we see no objection to it but the contrary, in illustrative works, as those of Gesenius and Henderson, addressed to the eye and understanding of those who are already sufficiently acquainted with the poetic idiom of the Hebrew, not to misapprehend it. We are well aware how this poetic theory of parallelism, strophes, stichoi, has been exaggerated and abused, so that as in Is. 7: 8, a prosaic passage occurring in a poetic parallelism, is removed by Gesenius and others, as an interpolation, not merely because of its chronological difficulties, but influenced *von aesthetischem Gefühl*, by his sense of what belongs to good taste. But we are persuaded that the "*numerous prose*" of Isaiah, is something quite different from the balanced periods of "Seneca, Augustine, Larochevoucauld, Pascal, Johnson and Macauley." Although there is a frequent descending to the plain straight-forwardness of prose, there is also a most perceptible resumption of the parallelism of thought, which creates at once a corresponding rhythm in the style. And it is this passing and repassing from the one to the other species of composition, which •

constitutes no small part of those interesting surprises which give such life and spirit to the prophetic composition. Much of Milton's incomparable *Paradise Lost*, more of Wadsworth, and still more of the most measured parts of Shakspeare, would lose their poetic rythm in the estimation of most readers, if printed as plain prose. There are reasons of an hermeneutical, and reasons of an apologetic nature, for having the poetical character of these books truly understood. Paine characterized the style of Isaiah as prose run mad. We should throw around it all the dignity which really belongs to it.

The volume containing the Later Prophecies of Isaiah, is prefaced by an able and instructive introduction. The author begins by pointing out the two main particulars in which the Jewish people had perverted the true design of the divine arrangements in relation to themselves. They had come to ascribe an inherent efficacy to the rites of the ceremonial law, and to imagine their preëminence to arise from some ground within themselves. They forgot that they were set for the salvation of the world, or rather of that chosen people which was to be gathered from all nations, and of which they were the representative and symbol. Till Christ came, his elect people were represented by this chosen nation. This nation again were represented by the Levitical tribe, and in a still more concentrated form, by the priestly family, until the representation was finally concentrated in a single person in the family, who was himself also a type of the head, Jesus Christ. Of this relation, which they sustained to other nations, the arrangement for the reception of proselytes ought to have reminded them. For forgetting these great principles—for departing from God, and relying upon an arm of flesh—for their abominable idolatries, and their heartless hypocritical worship, the carnal Israel, Isaiah taught them, would be rejected, while the true Israel would be gathered out of all kindreds, languages and tongues. In the midst of these, their living Head, the Servant of Jehovah, the Messiah, stands,—who is sometimes spoken of in his own personal character, at others, as including within his mystic body more than himself, those even who are united with him,—he stands as “a colossal figure between the church of the Old and that of the New Testament, as

a Mediator, an interpreter, a bond of union, and a common head."

In common with most of the later interpreters, Professor Alexander regards these prophecies as constituting one continuous but desultory discourse, in which, though there is a sensible progress of thought, it is interrupted by retrocessions and resummptions, so as to baffle all attempts at a strict logical analysis. He does not believe the great subject of these prophecies to be the restoration from Babylon, which is not more frequently mentioned than the Exodus from Egypt, but rather the true destiny of the people of God in all after ages. It has given dissatisfaction to some persons, that Professor Alexander finds in the closing chapters no allusion to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. Those passages which J. D. Michalis and Henderson so understand, he applies to the future ingathering of the heathen nations, not excluding the Jews, into the Kingdom of God. This he has done without committing himself as to the question whether their return may not be predicted elsewhere.

It remains that we should speak of the general character of these volumes. The first impression we obtain from them is, that of laborious industry, extensive reading, and real learning on the part of the author. All that is truly valuable on this prophet he seems to have carefully consulted. The commentaries of Chrysostom and Jerome were made use of, especially in the earlier chapters—those of Jarchi, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, among the Rabbins; Luther and Calvin, and occasionally others among the Reformers; Junius and Tremellius, Cocceius, Grotius, Vitringa, J. H. Michaelis, Gill, Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, Eichorn, Gesenius, De Wette, Maurer, Hitzig, Hendewerk, Barnes, Henderson, Ewald, Umbreit, Knobel, Koppe, Augusti, Bertholdt, Hävernick, Drechsler, Clericus, Hengstenberg, and many other authors among the moderns; and the ancient versions seem also to have been carefully consulted, and are continually quoted, especially in the first volume. Nor do grammatical and lexical researches appear to have been omitted. And while all the means which a judicious scholar would use, seem to have been employed in ascertaining the sense, there is no appearance of leaning upon mere authority. Less apparent use is made of the cognate languages, than

is usual among modern European scholars, especially of Germany, and less care is used to illustrate the manners and customs to which allusion is made by the prophet. This has perhaps resulted in part from the conviction that too much has been made of these sources of illustration by others. The work is peculiarly valuable, as giving a history of the more modern labours of European scholars upon these prophecies, and still more, from its polemic aspect towards the German rationalism in all its forms, and its just antagonism to the false principles of criticism, which have made such havoc with the sacred text.

No work is perfect, and we notice, as defects, in this, that the number of opinions enumerated, and the brevity which it was necessary to use, sometimes leaves the reader at a loss which the author designed to approve, the translation given at the commencement of the comment is the only thing to which we can resort to decide the question, and this sometimes fails us. The author occasionally, too, though rarely, seems to leave a difficult point without wholly deciding it in his own mind. When this occurs, we are always disappointed. An instance of this may be found on page 121 of the Earlier Prophecies. There is sometimes, too, an authoritative decision as to the meaning of a word or passage, when we would have been better pleased to have had the reason of the decision likewise given. But notwithstanding this, and though there are some points on which we feel disposed as yet to differ from the learned author, we are compelled to speak of his commentary on Isaiah in terms of the highest praise.

The book itself is got up by the enterprising publishers, in the best style of American typography, and in our judgment is the most important original work in explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures that has yet emanated from the American press—a work of which, when compared with those of the best European scholars, our country has no reason to be ashamed. We shall look with interest for further efforts from the same pen, and trust the day is not far distant when our American Presbyterian Church will contribute her full share to this department of sacred learning. Most devoutly do we wish that this work may be the means of arousing our Presbyterian ministry to a more diligent study of the Old Testament, in the original tongue.

How slight is our claim to be interpreters of God's word, who, as soon as we enter the ministry lay our Hebrew Bibles upon our shelves, and forget, with a hasty and regretless oblivion, that noble and heart-stirring language in which God spake from Sinai in the voice of words, in which the church for three thousand years chaunted the praises of Jehovah, in which the Holy Spirit moved such a noble train of rapt prophets to speak of the advent of the Son of David, and of the ever increasing glories of his Kingdom. While we commend it to the more earnest study of candidates for the ministry, we commend it also to ministers themselves. We should be worthier sons of our worthy sires, if we should revive what we once knew of this sacred tongue, and continue, as we are happy to know some do now, in the daily reading of the Hebrew Scriptures.

---

---

ARTICLE VI.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the Southern States; together with an Appendix, containing Forms of Church Registers, Form of a Constitution, and Plans of different Denominations of Christians.* By CHARLES COLCOCK JONES, D. D. Philadelphia. 1847.

The great length to which this Number of the Review has already extended, prevents us from noticing this valuable pamphlet of Dr. Jones' as its importance demands. It is such a practical view of the entire work of the Religious Instruction of our Coloured Population, as we would expect from the wisdom, large