

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 35—July, 1898.

I.

THE PLACE OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY IN MODERN HISTORY.*

THE work done by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, in one aspect of it, is "the ablest and ripest product" of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But, in another view, it is the starting point of that splendid religious and political development of the English-speaking peoples, which, on its religious side, is marked by the evangelical revival and the modern Christian propaganda at home and abroad; and, on its political side, is marked by the enfranchisement of the peoples of the United Kingdom, the building up of autonomous colonies within the British empire, and the planting of the continental republic of the United States. Of course, every work done by man, just because it has place in the organic historical movement, has roots in the past and bears fruit in the future. Of the most of these works, we are entitled to say that each of them is one of a vast number of equally important steps which men are always taking in the march of humanity to its predestined goal.

But we shall fall into a grave historical error if we assign to the finished work of the Westminster Assembly a function in the history of the English-speaking peoples of any other than the highest and most critical import. The waters of the great Lakes move continuously through the St. Lawrence basin to the Atlantic Ocean. At no point is the movement uninteresting or without

* An address delivered at the celebration, by Princeton Theological Seminary, of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Westminster Standards.

III.

THE MODERN HYPOTHESIS AND RECENT CRITICISM OF THE EARLY PROPHETS.

III. ISAIAH.

THE complicated processes of Isaiah-criticism are here, of course, to be dealt with in so far only as they show the influence of the modern theory. The change which the last years have wrought in this field cannot be better appreciated than by comparing the chapter on Isaiah in the second edition of Kuenen's *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek* with the conclusions of the triumvirate of most advanced Isaiah-critics, Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne. Kuenen, in his day a far from conservative critic, yet recognized the large sections i-xi. 10, xvii-xx, xxviii-xxxi, with minor exceptions, as substantially Isaianic. If now we inquire to what extent this result is antiquated by the three critics mentioned above, we find that a large number of prophecies are denied to Isaiah within the limits of what Kuenen considered genuine. These are chiefly i. 27, 28 (Duhm and Cheyne); iii. 18-23, 25, 26 (Duhm and Cheyne); iv. 2-6 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); ix. 1-6 (Hackmann, Cheyne doubtful); x. 20-27 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); xi. 1-9 (Hackmann, Cheyne doubtful); xix. 1-15, 16-25 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); xxviii. 5, 6 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne), 23-29 (Hackmann doubtful, Cheyne); xxix. 16-24 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); xxx. 18-26 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne), 27-33 (Hackmann and Cheyne); xxxi. 5-9 (Duhm, and Hackmann in part; Cheyne). Besides this a tendency is perceptible to bring down to a later postexilic period such sections as had already been denied to Isaiah by Kuenen and older critics. This is the case with reference to xi. 10-xii (Kuenen, exilic period; Duhm, close of second century B. C. at the earliest; Cheyne, Syrian period); xxiv-xxvii (Kuenen, Persian period; Cheyne, in part, time of Alexander the Great; Duhm, Maccabean period); xxxii. 1-8, 9-20 (Kuenen, pre-exilic; Cheyne, postexilic); xxxiii (Kuenen, possibly reign of Josiah; Cheyne, second half of Persian period; Duhm, 162 B.C.); xxxiv, xxxv (Kuenen, between 536 and 458; Cheyne, about 400, possibly

later; Duhm, Maccabean* period.) Further, the drift of this newest criticism is toward a division of the larger sections hitherto considered coherent into a number of small fragments believed to have been patched together by a redactor. A typical example is chap. iii. 1-15, on which Cheyne comments as follows: 1^a and 1^b may be genuine, 1^c is a gloss, 2, 3 may have an Isaianic basis, 4 is undoubtedly Isaiah's, 5 has points of contact with genuine passages, 6, 7 betray the editor's hand, 8-15 are Isaiah's, in which, however, 10 and 11 take the place of four lines become illegible in the editor's time. Consequently the share of Isaiah in the production of the book passing under his name is reduced to a minimum. Even with the collection and arrangement of the smaller groups of prophecies distinguished by the critics he had nothing to do. As a literary author he has almost entirely evaporated.

Each of the three above-mentioned tendencies finds its ultimate explanation in the fact that it facilitates the adjustment of the contents of Isaiah's book to the scheme of development. How the first and second subserve such purpose need not be pointed out. As to the third, the division of a larger context into a number of fragments and the implied denial of the prophet's literary activity tend to deprive the sections under attack from the natural protection which their coherence with undoubtedly genuine prophecies affords them.

The full significance of the conclusions reached by the critics can be perceived only in the field of Biblical theology. After the elimination from his work of so many important prophecies the prophet's face assumes features quite distinct from those with which students have been so long familiar. A new estimate must be placed upon his contribution to the progress of Old Testament religion if these latest results are correct. It would be useless to deny that the old Isaiah with his wealth and grandeur of thought was a far more illustrious figure among the prophets than the new Isaiah now in process of construction. Cheyne, who never loses an opportunity to glory in the modern view for the enrichment it brings to our appreciation of the spiritual greatness of the prophets, half-mournfully admits that we must divest Isaiah and his ministry of that luminous splendor which in the old conception of his work was so warming to the heart and uplifting to the imagination. Broadly speaking, the outcome may be characterized as the restriction of the prophet's teaching within the limits drawn for Amos and Hosea, which we have already found

* Duhm's partiality for the Maccabean period seems to spring from the desire to point out a definite historical situation for each prophecy. The second century B.C. offers the best opportunities for the satisfaction of this desire.

to be artificial in their case but the inadequacy of which is still more palpable as regards Isaiah. The pronounced Universalism, the highly developed Messianic ideal, the sweet rich note of promise so peculiarly alternating with the harsh tones of judgment, the sublime faith in the sacrosanct character of Jerusalem and Zion in the Assyrian crisis, all that has hitherto been counted specifically Isaianic, must be given up; and what we keep is a stern preacher of righteousness and national destruction, the chief exponent of that cold, supremely ethical spirit which is supposed to mark the highest development of prophetism. In so far the results of the newest Isaiah-criticism seem to fall in with and to confirm the general interpretation placed by the modern hypothesis upon the prophetic movement in the eighth century. On the old view Isaiah's teaching soared high above the possibilities of evolutionary construction: now it moves within the terms of this construction. But the force of the argument that might be derived from this will be immediately broken if we inquire how the critical results in question have been obtained. The conformity of the new Isaiah to what a prophet ought to be under the modern hypothesis arises from the fact that the critics have been guided by their *à priori* idea of the true prophet in fixing the criteria for what is genuine and not genuine in Isaiah's book. The agreement with the postulates of the hypothesis appears in the conclusion for no other reason than that it has been made the major premise in the critical syllogism.

Chap. ii. 2-4 is the first important passage on whose postexilic origin Hackmann and Cheyne are agreed.* Before them Stade had already reached a similar conclusion.† It is unnecessary for our present purpose to enter upon a discussion of the difficult problem which of the two versions in which we possess the prophecy, that in Isaiah or that in Micah, is the original, or whether perhaps both borrowed from some older prophet.‡ The only question to be considered is whether there are valid reasons in its ideas or forms of expression to discard the three just-mentioned possibilities for a fourth view, viz., that the prophecy is entirely out of place in the eighth century, that it must be assigned to a much later period, and was consequently worked into the books of Isaiah and Micah at a still later date. The objections raised

* Here, as also in regard to chaps. ix. 1-6, xi. 1-8, xxxii. 1-5, 15-20 Duhm is more conservative than his companion critics; though with some hesitation, he yet in the end declares himself in favor of the Isaianic origin of these pieces.

† *Z. A. W.*, i, 165; iv, 292.

‡ Cf. on this question, Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha*, 218-224.

against the origin of these verses in the age of Isaiah and Micah are the following. Stade takes exception to the pronounced universalism here expressing itself. "The piece shows the most striking affinity with the ideas of Joel; to speak more particularly, with the ideas of those late writers who lived on the work of Ezekiel, one of whom has been pointed out in Deutero-Zechariah—it possesses no affinity whatever with the prophecy of the Assyrian period. The many peoples which come to Jerusalem to worship appear nowhere before Isa. lxvi. 23, Zech. xiv. 16–19. The thought of Jerusalem's external elevation is a gross perversion of the Isaianic idea of her spiritual significance; the pilgrimage of the peoples finds its parallel in Isa. lx, with this distinction, that in the latter prophecy everything proceeds naturally, whilst here a miracle takes place: this must be of secondary origin."* In addition to this, Hackmann points out the fact that no inward transformation of Israel seems to be required by the writer. The holy mountain and the house of Jehovah occupy too prominent a place; the former represents the people of Jehovah and its exaltation is symbolic of the self-exaltation of Israel over the heathen, a specifically Jewish trait. The nations come to the *sanctuary* to obtain Thora; this must be understood of priestly Thora exclusively, for the prophet could give Thora in every place. Finally the intense longing for eternal peace here expressed is not in agreement with the temper of Isaiah, to whom Jehovah was still essentially a God of war, breaking Israel and the nations to pieces with elemental power. The sentiment of ii. 4 reflects the experience of the later Jews, for whom war meant no longer victory but affliction.† Cheyne repeats some of these arguments and adds, among others, that "in the light of Jehovah" (ver. 5) is a poetic equivalent for "in the Thora of Jehovah."‡

Our criticism of this long array of arguments may be compressed into the statement that in so far as these features are made to resemble the physiognomy of later Judaism they are misconstrued and grossly overdrawn, and that, when reduced to their true proportions, there is absolutely nothing to be said against their Isaianic origin that does not ultimately resolve itself into some form of the general charge of incompatibility with the critical hypothesis. To begin with the physical interpretation of ver. 2^a, even if we render in the most realistic manner, "the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established *on the top* of the mountains," the context requires us to understand this as a mere figure of the preëminence which the religion of Jehovah will in the latter days be recognized

* Z. A. W., i, 166.

† *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 123–130, 146–148.

‡ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 9–15.

to possess over all other cults. Even in postexilic times no Jew could have possibly anticipated such a physical elevation of Mount Zion as to make the latter visible to the most distant peoples. The exaltation referred to is one that will attract the nations and therefore must be conceived of as spiritual in kind. All that remains, then, of the charge of grossness in the conception can at the utmost strike the figurative embodiment of the idea, not the idea itself; and it would be unfair to deny the Isaianic origin of a prophecy for no other reason than that its poetic expression seems to fall short of a certain standard. If we divest the thought of its symbolic garb, it will be seen to express a universalism of the most ideal type, having no affinity whatsoever with the offensive traits that but too often disfigure the later Jewish expectations.* Not the exaltation of Israel but Jehovah's is symbolized by the exalted site of the temple mountain and represented as that which attracts the distant nations. Of subjection of the heathen to Israel the prophecy contains not a word. Hackmann's whole contention on this point would have to rest on the single phrase, "the house of the God of Jacob," which will sustain no such weight. Equally inaccurate is it to say that the Thora for which the nations flow to Jerusalem is priestly Thora *exclusively*. This is not implied in their resorting to the temple, for the latter comes under consideration as the dwelling-place of Jehovah, who supplies all Thora whether by priest or by prophet, so that of the *mediate* source of the Thora nothing is said here. How the importance attributed to the temple can be out of place in the work of a prophet who wrote ch. vi it is difficult to understand.† The charge that no inward transformation is here required of Israel is entirely unwarranted. If the peoples who come to Jerusalem inwardly appropriate the word and Thora of Jehovah to such an extent as to forego war and submit to Him all their disputes, the same must be *à fortiori* assumed of Israel. Besides, this charge has been rendered possible only by the violent severance of vers. 2-4 from the following context. Obviously the prophecy has been placed where it stands for the purpose of contrasting the ideal religious and moral condition of Israel with their actual state in the present. The invitation, "O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of Jehovah," is of itself a sufficient reminder that as yet even the chosen people do not appreciate the uniqueness of their religion.

* Cornill, *Z. A. W.*, iv, 88, well remarks against Stade that our prophecy presents rather a naive way of formulating the thought of the inviolable character and central significance of Mount Zion, than a gross perversion of this thought.

† Cf. PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, viii, 459. Isaiah's own first message came from the temple.

But if all these alleged difficulties vanish before an impartial exegesis, what must be thought of the assertion that the two main ideas of the prophecy, those of the conversion of the heathen nations and of perpetual peace, are foreign to Isaiah's mind and lie far beyond his horizon, so that where they occur his authorship is excluded? For there can be no doubt as to the actual presence of these two ideas here in their maturest form. Duhm's attempt to weaken the meaning by comparing what is here predicted with the occasional consultation of foreign oracles in the pagan world, whereby, of course, no abandonment of the national cult was intended, fails to do justice to the words. As Hackmann rightly insists, the phrase, "to walk in the paths" of a God, cannot mean less than to adopt the service of that God; and, whatever may be one's preference between the readings, "all nations," "many peoples" (Isaiah) and "peoples," "many nations" (Micah), the absolute universality of Jehovah's influence over the heathen world is implied in the assurance that peace will prevail, for if some nations were excluded from this sphere of influence, these might again make war necessary.* How, then, can we prove the possibility of such advanced ideas in the age of Isaiah? As for the idea of the many peoples assembling themselves against Israel, apart from the thought of their conversion, the Isaianic character of this is vouched for by chap. viii. 9, 10, xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, in all of which passages the strong expressions, "far countries," "the whole earth," "all the nations," "many peoples," are used. It may be further argued that Isaiah is familiar with the thought of the future conversion of such nations as had in his time interposed in the history of Israel (chap. xi. 10, xviii. 7, xix. 19-25), and that consequently the idea of a universal conversion of the peoples may well have developed itself out of the expectation of a widespread attack upon Jerusalem expressed in the three passages just quoted. The critics have attempted to break the force of this argument in a twofold manner. First, they have interpreted the apparently universalistic terms of chap. viii. 9, 10, xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14 in a less comprehensive sense as applying to the various elements of which the Assyrian army was composed, so that after all Isaiah would have had only one distinct nation in view as the assailant of Israel, and Hosea x. 10 might be quoted as a parallel passage. And, secondly, it has been denied that Isaiah speaks in any of the undoubtedly genuine prophecies of the conversion of a foreign nation. In regard to the former of these assertions, it must be admitted that the context of the three passages speaks of the Assyrian attack upon Judah or

* *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 128.

Ephraim. Nevertheless, the expressions employed seem to me too absolute to be exhausted by such a reference. For the prophet speaks of the nations *taking counsel together*, and the specific intention of Jehovah in reference to the Assyrian to break him in His land and tread him under foot upon His mountains (xiv. 25) is subsequently generalized to a purpose concerning "the whole earth" (ver. 26). In view of this the conclusion is justified that Isaiah beheld in the predicted frustration of the Assyrian attack upon Jerusalem a pledge of the ultimate and permanent salvation of Israel from the world power in its largest sense. It is not impossible that even the statement in Hosea bears this meaning,* although this cannot be asserted with any degree of certainty. The critics themselves have begun to perceive the precariousness of their weakening interpretation; for the newest representatives of the school, Hackmann, Stade, Nowack,† now resort to declaring the passages in question suspicious, and that not on any serious objective grounds, but for the simple reason of their reference to "many nations," so that obviously here a degree of *à priori*sm has been reached which precludes all further discussion. The matter at issue was the Isaianic character of the conception of a world attack upon Israel. In the course of the debate oracles are adduced of hitherto unquestioned genuineness in which this conception appears. At first the position is taken that these oracles speak only of the Assyrian army. Then, when this is felt to be an unnatural exegesis, their Isaianic origin is boldly denied or represented as doubtful, because they contain the idea of a world attack upon Israel. All the "weak, flimsy arguments"‡ advanced to lend some sort of external justification to this proceeding cannot conceal the fact that criticism is here moving in a circle.§ The second assertion opposed to the argument formulated above is that Isaiah nowhere mentions the conversion of a Gentile nation to the religion of Israel. Here again the passages which speak unambiguously are ruled out, and where a weaker interpretation seems at all possible this is eagerly seized upon. The former applies to chap. xi. 10, xix. 19-25, the latter to chap. xviii. 7. We shall not contend here about chap. xix, because the question

* Cf. Nowack's *Handkommentar*, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 64, which denies the verse to the prophet on account of this universalistic implication.

† *Handkommentar*, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 64.

‡ The words are applied to Stade's reasoning by none less than Kuenen, *Hist. Krit. Ond.*, ii, 40.

§ We have left chap. xxix. 7 and xxxiii. 3 out of consideration here, the former because its genuineness is to be discussed later on, the latter because it stands in a context denied to Isaiah before the present movement in the criticism of the prophets.

of its genuineness had become a debated one, apart from its universalistic content, on a purely historical basis. Chap. xi. 10 is connected with the Messianic prophecy xi. 1-9, presently to be considered, and stands or falls with the latter. But a word should be said regarding chap. xviii. 7. Duhm and Cheyne reject this verse, the latter, it would seem, primarily for the reason that it represents Jerusalem as "the centre of an empire to which the neighboring peoples will hasten to pay tribute." But it is undeniable that after its amputation the discourse of vers. 1-6 breaks off abruptly, and some conclusion is felt to be wanting. Nor is it easy to see why the content of ver. 7 should be classified with "the eschatological inventory of the later period" (Duhm). The sense most naturally put upon the words is that under the figure of a tribute brought to the temple they speak of the worship which the Ethiopians will offer to Jehovah. So understood they do not presuppose, as Cheyne thinks, a Messiahless Israelitish empire. It should also be observed that, altogether apart from ver. 7, the body of the prophecy itself contains these very significant words (ver. 3): "All ye inhabitants of the world, and ye dwellers on the earth, when an ensign is lifted up on the mountains, see ye; and when the trumpet is blown, hear ye!" Would it not be rash to assert that the prophet who thus recognized the interest of all the world in Jehovah's dealing with the Assyrian cannot have conceived the thought of universalism?*

The other feature deemed unnatural in a prophecy of the eighth century is the intense longing for peace to which Isaiah ii. 4, Micah iv. 3, 4 give expression. With the temper also of Isaiah in particular this has been pronounced inconsistent. If the latter reasoning is to have any meaning, we must attribute to the prophet a desire for continual war and a positive aversion to the thought of peace, because so only could Jehovah reveal his martial character. Somewhat more plausible appears the suggestion that the value here ascribed to peace and the sentimental delight taken in its blessings are best explained from the bitter experience and war-weary spirit of postexilic Israel. But such an explanation could lay claim to acceptance only if all points of contact for a similar feeling in the conditions of Isaiah's time were lacking. This is of course far from being the case. Isaiah would have had to be altogether void of pity, if in prospect of the distress to be wrought by the repeated Assyrian invasions and deportations he could have failed to develop an eager desire for peace. In point of fact, there are utterances in Isaiah's prophecies which reflect precisely such a

* Another thought in chap. xviii. 7 objected to as un-Isaianic will receive attention afterwards.

state of mind, born from compassion with his distressed and ravaged people. It is sufficient to quote chap. xxviii. 12, where the burden of the prophet's message is summed up in the words, "Give ye rest to the weary." But this longing for peace is so little exclusive of delight in the war-like deeds of Jehovah that in both chap. ix and xi the Messiah appears in the twofold character of a victorious warrior and a prince of peace. If the later writers could harmonize these two aspects why not Isaiah? We have here, besides, the older evidence from Hosea, which we do not have in regard to the thought of universalism. Hosea predicts that in the future the bow and the sword and the battle shall be broken out of the land and Israel lie down in safety (ii. 20).*

The literary evidence collected for the late origin of chap. ii. 2-4 may be passed by in silence, for Cheyne himself admits that from the style of this passage no definite conclusion can be drawn.

Next in order comes chap. iv. 2-6, a passage in rejecting which Duhm, Cheyne and Hackmann are unanimous. The grounds on which this verdict rests have been best summarized by the last-mentioned critic. That the remnant in Zion shall be called holy is said to belong to the trains of thought growing out of the post-Ezekielian legislation; the idea of being written into life finds its parallel in Mal. iii. 16, Apoc. xiii. 8; the representation of the cloud by day and the fire-illuminated smoke by night to symbolize the presence of Jehovah betrays a mind fond of Hexateuch tradition, perhaps presupposes definite eschatological theories based on study of the Hexateuch; on Zion there will be in the future festal assemblies of the blessed saints, while Isaiah only once makes reference to a מִקְרָא and that with disapprobation; delight in such assemblies is characteristic of the postexilic legislation; the presence of Jehovah in the cloud is to protect from heat and rain; this belongs to the later expectation of miraculous workings of nature in the realm of glory (Isa. xxv. 4, xxx. 26; Joel iii; Zech. xiv.)†

It will be seen at a glance that all these arguments derive their entire force either from the assumption that the priestly laws and

* To be sure, this passage also has been recently denied to Hosea by Volz, *Die vor-exilische Jahveprophetie und der Messias*, and by Nowack in his *Handkommentar, Die kleinen Propheten*, 23. Nowack's book did not come to hand until the article published in the April number had gone to press. In this place I can only enumerate the passages rejected in this newest contribution to the subject, so far as they had not fallen under the condemnation of the earlier critics and were therefore not touched upon in my article. These are: ii. 4^b, 6, 8, 9, 10^c, 12, 16-18, 20-25; iv. 6, 11, 14^b, 15^a; v. 3^b; vii. 4; viii. 5^b; ix. 9^b; x. 3, 5^c, 10, 13, 14^b; xi. 9^a, 10^b, 11; xii. 4^b-7, 13, 14. Thus the critical process moves steadily onward. Volz goes so far as to speak of a Proto- and Deutero-Hosea.

† *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 20, 21.

narratives are of late origin or from the obvious fallacy that ideas prominent in certain periods must therefore be confined to such periods and cannot have their roots in earlier writings. Conservative scholars will gladly accept the testimony thus borne to the presence of legal ideas, of the signs of Hexateuch study, of Messianic expectations with a strong supernaturalistic color, in a prophecy against whose Isaianic origin not a single objection of any weight of a historical or literary character can be raised, and which both by its position and contents authenticates itself as the appropriate conclusion of the undoubtedly genuine discourses in chaps. ii and iii. Chap. iv. 1 cannot well have been the end of the preceding prophecy, so that the critical view necessitates the assumption that the genuine conclusion has been lost. All the ideas of the disputed verses stand, furthermore, in vital connection with the innermost spirit of Isaiah's theology, as has been pointed out by us elsewhere.* The prospect that the restored people will glory in the simple product of the soil forms a contrast to the luxury of the women depicted in iii. 16-iv. 1, and embodies the thought that Jehovah and His direct gifts alone ought to be the pride of Israel (cf. xxviii. 5). The conception of the remnant in ver. 3 is Isaianic, and as to this remnant being called "holy," even if this be understood in a ceremonial sense, there is no reason to press the idea to such a formalistic extreme as to make it inconsistent with the prophet's ethical teaching, as, *e. g.*, Duhm does, who thinks that Isaiah could not have thought a permanent state of holiness for each individual possible or desirable, because he looked forward to a Messianic era in which there would be room for agriculture. And this notwithstanding the fact that in this very prophecy the blessings of agriculture are given the foremost place in the eschatological picture (ver. 2). Evidently the writer had a more reasonable conception of holiness than is imputed to him. What he thinks of is ethically conditioned for it results only after Jehovah has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and purged the blood of Jerusalem (ver. 4). The manner also in which this purifying process is conceived of, *viz.*, by extirpation of the evil elements "by the blast of judgment and the blast of burning," is entirely in harmony with the usual representations of Isaiah. Besides this the idea of the holiness of the remnant is vouched for by the closing words of chap. vi, "the holy seed is the stock thereof," the excision of which by the critics is a wholly arbitrary proceeding. In general, chap. vi reveals sufficient interest for the external embodiment of the worship of Jehovah to cover every single feature of chap. iv. This

* PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, viii, 460, 461.

applies also to ver. 6, which even Dillmann would reject on the ground that the pavilion against heat and storm and rain which Zion affords cannot be meant in a literal sense, because in this there would be nothing new, and that an allegorical allusion to the various troubles to which man is exposed in the present world would not be after the manner of Isaiah. But the thought is poetically and figuratively expressed without being an allegory, and involves deliverance from such discomforts of life only as interfere with the continual worship of Jehovah. Chap. xxviii. 2, xxxii. 2, prove how natural the use of the image of storm and rain comes to Isaiah. Finally, the idea of the predestination of the remnant to life is not without points of analogy in Isaiah's general outlook, for if it be the determined purpose of Jehovah to cut away the majority once and again in repeated judgment (vi. 13), it is but the reverse side of this that the number of those who are to remain till the end has been definitely fixed in his counsel. Of the offense taken by the critics at the prominence of the miraculous factor in the Messianic prophecies of the book of Isaiah, we shall have occasion to speak presently.

The linguistic evidence adduced against the Isaianic authorship of this prophecy consists in the words **חֹפֶה** in ver. 5, "canopy;" **בָּרָא** in ver. 5, "to create;" **מִסְתּוֹר** in ver. 6 "a covert." Of these words the first not only stands alone in the prophecies of Isaiah, but occurs only once besides in the entire prophetic literature (Joel ii. 16). If unique in "reproductive prophecy," why should any suspicion attach to it as a *hapax legomenon* in Isaiah? **בָּרָא** in the Qal species is protected by Am. iv. 13, which, as we have seen, there is no reason to consider late. It is entirely unnecessary to substitute **בָּא** and to render "Jehovah will come" on the authority of the Septuagint.* **מִסְתּוֹר** finally is an unobjectionable formation; that Isaiah always uses **סִתָּר** in the same sense is true, if always may mean once or twice;† leaving aside xxxii. 2 (rejected by Hackmann and Cheyne), the two words are equally frequent; as to its form, **מִסְתּוֹר** stands on a line with **מִחְסֶה** certainly used by Isaiah, and it is here specially appropriate because suggested by the immediately preceding use of the latter.

A further example of prophecies shifted under the influence of the modern hypothesis from the eighth century to postexilic

* So Duhm, Wellhausen and apparently Stade (*Z. A. W.*, iv. 149-151). The latter finds the idea implied that Jehovah has previously left Zion, and, assuming that this idea first arose during the exile with Ezekiel, infers from it the postexilic origin of vers. 5, 6. But Hosea v. 15 alone proves the much earlier origin of this thought and shows how it might naturally associate itself in the mind of any prophet with that of the future captivity.

† Chap. xxviii. 27.

times is furnished by the recent treatment of chap. viii. 23-ix. 6; xi. 1-9. This introduces a subject which more than any other promises to become in the immediate future the *question brûlante* of the Biblico-theological discussion of prophecy. How the Messianic prediction in its wide impersonal sense can no longer find room in the reconstructed Amos and Hosea has been shown in our previous article. This very fact, however, seemed at first but calculated to increase in the critical estimate Isaiah's share in the development of Messianic prophecy, inasmuch as now not only the remarkable personal definiteness assumed by it in his book, but the very first conception of the Messianic ideal itself had to be attributed to him. Perhaps the strain thus put on the productivity of one writer was too great to be borne; for the elimination of this element from Amos and Hosea had been scarcely completed when voices began to be heard in defense of the thesis that in Isaiah also the Messiah is not original, but the creature of those unknown later writers whose work has become so curiously interwoven with the genuine discourses of the eighth-century prophet. Smend, while not yet going to the extreme of denying the genuineness of viii. 23-ix. 6 and xi. 1-9, had already been compelled to minimize the importance of these passages and of the Messianic idea for Isaiah's teaching, and to explain the partial disappearance of the Messiah's figure from later prophecy on the ground of its accidental and temporary significance.* It could easily be foreseen that what was thus declared accidental would soon be judged foreign to the prophet's mind; and this position has been actually taken by Hackmann and Cheyne, although by the latter with some hesitancy. Marti, in adopting Hackmann's conclusions, has gone so far as to declare that the prophets until the time of Deutero-Isaiah (*i. e.*, toward the close of the exile) knew nothing of a Messiah. And last of all we have a monograph of Volz on the subject of *Preëxilic Jahwe-prophecy and the Messiah in their Mutual Relations* (1897), in which an attempt is made to prove the following three theses: (1) that the Messianic idea is foreign to the spirit of preëxilic prophetism; (2) that in the writings of the preëxilic prophets from Amos until Ezekiel (exclusive) there is not a single Messianic passage; (3) that the Messianic expectation as found in Ezekiel is not the natural product of preëxilic prophecy in its original purity, but the offspring of a union upon which the latter has entered with a totally heterogeneous tendency.†

In reviewing the arguments by which the elimination of an

* *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 222.

† Volz's treatise is known to me only from its review by Krætzschmar in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 26, 1897.

element hitherto considered of so great importance in the theology of Isaiah is defended, we shall again have to distinguish between the *à priori* ones and those derived from the historical or literary phenomena of the prophecies themselves. The former need only to be stated and to have their true character and tendency pointed out; the latter require examination in detail.

The *à priori* Biblico-theological attack upon the Messianic prophecies proceeds along two lines, the one represented by Hackmann, the other by Volz. Hackmann has devoted an extensive discussion to the three passages, ii. 2-4, viii. 23-ix. 6; xi. 1-9, which he groups together by reason of their internal resemblance. He condenses his estimate of them into the statement that they are "absolute delineations of the future," meaning thereby that they appear detached from the historical basis of Isaiah's present and move in a distant time as in a newly discovered fabulous country.* Though this is incorrect if taken as a denial of every point of contact between these prophecies and the historical situation in Isaiah's time, yet it not inaptly characterizes what is at once the most striking feature of the passages in question and the ground of their rejection by Hackmann and his fellow-critics. It is with the element of the supernatural in its most developed form that the critical theory comes into conflict here. The prophets are supposed to be bounded by the horizon of their own age and environment; the personal Messiah, as depicted by Isaiah, transcends these limits and moves upon the field of history against a background of eternity. Still further to the modern school the prophets stand for righteousness and conversion by acts of free will; the personal Messiah is felt to stand for the realization of a new order of things by miraculous subethical acts and processes. It is plain that, apart from the general anti-supernaturalistic animus, the one-sidedly ethical conception of prophetism in general and of Isaiah in particular here biases the critical judgment. The prophet, as the moderns delight to paint him, is so entirely absorbed in the one idea of righteousness, his great discovery and gift to the world, that it must be impossible for him not only to describe the future from any other motive than that of making it the embodiment of his ethical aspirations, but likewise to expect the realization of such a future in any other way than as brought about by the voluntary conversion of Israel. Hence it is not enough that Isa. ix. 6 makes provision for the upholding of David's kingdom with judgment and righteousness, or Isa. xi. 3-5 for the righteous treatment of the poor and weak of the land: in order to accredit themselves as genuine Isaianic oracles these

* *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 126.

prophecies would have to guarantee expressly that ethical processes only will be used to accomplish this end. Righteousness and judgment as supernatural gifts conferred upon the Messiah by the Spirit and miraculously established by Him—this is the central thought of these passages and precisely this it is that the advanced critics find inconsistent with the “genuinely ethical conception of Isaiah.” The modern hypothesis has been charged with making the prophets preach the doctrine of salvation by works. It might perhaps be added that it represents them as Pelagians in their conception of free will. If some of its representations are correct, the prophet belonged to those who consider regeneration an immoral process.* And yet, looked at from a purely historical standpoint, what was more natural than that one so deeply convinced as Isaiah of the inefficacy of the mere moral suasion of the divine Word should have expected from a mysterious miraculous power the transformation of present conditions? To be sure, Hackmann and Cheyne try to make a distinction between the preternatural and the supernatural, and think that the conditions described in xi. 6-9 belong to the former category. But the distinction is obviously a modern and subjective one. Whether such things as the peace established between the wolf and the lamb, and the straw-eating of the ox, and the playing of the child with the asp and basilisk be considered preternatural or the restoration of nature to its normal original state, depends of course on the theological or philosophical premises from which the question is approached. Isaiah’s views on this point must have differed greatly from those of a believer in the modern doctrine of evolution.

Along a different line, though* not from a different point of departure, Volz makes his attack upon preëxilic Messianic prophecy. Its political externalism, particularistic national character, and the manner in which it places the human king in the foreground, constitute to his view so many aspects in which it is in direct antagonism to the true spirit of original prophetism. The Messiah is, he claims, in the extant Messianic prophecies, a purely political and scarcely at all a religious factor, his function being the twofold one of upholding internal order among Israel and of representing the nation externally in victorious war. Preëxilic prophecy, on the other hand, is almost exclusively a prophecy of judgment; and if occasionally, a better future is held in prospect, not its external side but its ethical and religious blessings are dwelt upon. Further, the Messianic idea nowhere enters into an organic union with the thought of universalism; neither among Israel

* Cf. Smend, *Allg. Religionsgeschichte*, 307.

nor among the nations does the Messiah appear as the Mediator of the one true religion; whereas ancient prophecy tended by its very nature toward ethico-religious universalism. Finally, the prophets condemned not merely the empirical kingdom as it existed in their day, but opposed the institution of the kingdom on principle. This renders it improbable that they should have looked forward to a final political organization of Israel with a king at its head, the more so since the figure of the earthly king was bound to force Jehovah into the background in the popular consciousness.*

Severe strictures can be made on the accuracy of this characterization of the Messiah and of His work as a part of the prophetic eschatology. He is by no means a political and external factor after the manner here represented. Both the religious character of His official equipment and the religious spirit in which He discharges His functions are strongly emphasized in chap. xi. 2, 3. The spirit of the fear of Jehovah will rest upon him and his delight shall be in the fear of Jehovah. And when it is said in ver. 9 that all hurting and destroying shall cease on God's holy mountain, because the land shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, the prophet evidently thinks of the Messiah as the one who by His activity brings about this perfect state of affairs. It is far from true, therefore, that no more is ascribed to Him than the maintenance of internal order among Israel and the victorious leadership of the people in war; He is as much the embodiment and Mediator of the prophetic ideal of religion as He is the representative of the prophetic ideal of righteousness. In regard to the alleged absence of connection between the Messiah's work and the extension of the true religion to the Gentiles, it must be admitted that in chap. viii. 23-ix. 6, owing to the concrete events from which the prophecy is by way of contrast developed (viii. 23), the thought of universalism does not stand in the foreground. But even here the spirit of the discourse as a whole is rather favorable than indifferent to this idea. The increase of the Messiah's government and the peace without end present, to say the least, a side of the prophecy to which a further development of the Messianic hope in a universalistic direction might easily attach itself. As to the companion prophecy in chap. xi. 1-9, even if the verse immediately following did not supplement its statements by the most explicit promise that the root of Jesse will stand for an ensign to the peoples and be sought by the nations, it is scarcely

* This last point is mentioned by Cheyne also: "The divine king in his glory so filled the thoughts and imagination of Isaiah that there seems no room for any earthly king."

conceivable that the author intended to confine the regeneration of the world of nature and of men here depicted to the land of Israel. What would internal peace in both respects signify if from the outside the danger of invasion continued to threaten? The whole description suggests a change of conditions on a cosmical scale, although, of course, the prophet's main interest centres in his own land, Jehovah's holy mountain. And what value after all can be attached to this argument from the absence of a pronounced universalism, if we observe that from one quarter chap. ii. 2-4 are declared out of place in the eighth century chiefly on account of its universalistic content, whilst from another quarter of the same camp all the Messianic prophecies are declared out of place in that early period for the precisely opposite reason that they lack the spirit of universalism? Surely here the critics are divided against themselves. The suggestion finally that the attitude of prophecy toward the kingdom in general, and the prominence of the kingship of Jehovah in Isaiah's mind in particular, render such an idealization of the human kingship as these passages contain improbable,* is entirely unwarranted. Hosea is the only prophet to whom with any show of evidence an unfavorable opinion of the kingdom as such could be attributed, and even in his case we have found it necessary to exclude from this judgment the kingdom of David. In the other prophets, however often individual kings may be attacked, there is no trace of polemic against the institution of the kingdom. As to Isaiah, chap. i. 21, 26, prove that for him the Davidic reign constitutes the ideal past in which the human kingship was the approximately perfect instrument of Jehovah's rule, and this is further confirmed by the honorable conception of the Davidic kingdom in its relation to the sanctuary which finds expression in chap. xxix. 1, no matter whether we accept the ordinary rendering, "city where David encamped," or that of the Septuagint, πόλις ἣν ἐπολέμησε Δαυὶδ, a question to which shall we have occasion to return later.† In no wise could Isaiah have feared that his picture of the Messianic king would force Jehovah into the background. The Messiah of these prophecies is lifted so high above ordinary earthly limitations, is himself so much a figure of supernatural appearance and is represented as so absolutely under the control of Jehovah's Spirit, that every thought of his supplanting Jehovah is from the outset excluded.

Notwithstanding these restrictions, however, there is a sense in

* Stade thinks differently on this point *Z. A. W.*, i, 95, Note.

† Cf. also chap. xxxii. 1, although the genuineness of this prophecy is doubted by many critics.

which the Messiah remains a thoroughly national figure, and in so far the critics are guided by a correct instinct in denying him a place in their interpretation of the early prophets. Radical as the opinions of Hackmann and Volz may seem, those who have intelligently watched the principles and tendencies of modern criticism will not be greatly startled at their avowal. The wonder is rather that they have not found expression and adherence before. From the beginning the new conception of prophetism has borne within itself an unsolved antinomy. In behalf of the theory of development, the ethical teaching of the eighth-century prophets had to be differentiated as much as possible from the preceding stage of Jahvism. The point of difference was accordingly found in this, that Amos and Hosea, by announcing the destruction of Israel for its sins, sacrificed the national element in the ancient religion, which had hitherto been supreme, to the ethical element, which from its formerly subordinate place was now raised to a central commanding position. Together with the anticipated dissolution of the state, the old Jehovah with His morally indifferent favoritism for one people is believed to have disappeared, and a new Jehovah with the one attribute of strict righteousness exercised without partiality to have taken His place. Now it is easy to see that on such a view of the divine nature as is here ascribed to the evolving prophetic consciousness, no room remains for any vigorous national hopes or aspirations. Had the representatives of the new prophecy continued to be ardent patriots and to expect special favors for their own people, they would by doing so have denied their newly acquired conviction of Jehovah's exclusively ethical character. The latter had been born out of the surrender of the national idea, and therefore could not be naively associated with it any longer. It is true the first advocates of the new hypothesis went on in the old manner and placed the two elements of nationalism and ethical absolutism side by side in their interpretation of the prophetic teaching; but they did not explain their consistency.* And it was unavoidable that in course of time the inner disharmony of the two should make itself felt to the critics, and that, once felt, its removal should be attempted by toning down those features that bear witness to the intensely national spirit of the prophetic faith. Some of these features might be possibly accounted for by the lingering influence of the old popular Jahvism, from which even the prophets had not entirely emancipated themselves. In view of the assumed evolution of the ethical idea of God, in sharp antithesis to the national claims of Israel on Jehovah, even this will scarcely seem plausible.

* *e. g.*, Kuenen, *National Religions and Universal Religions*, 113 *seq.*

But how much greater becomes the difficulty if, far from being such a mere relic of an outgrown stage of belief, the national element in the prophetic consciousness proves to have been vigorous enough to create the entirely new figure of a personal Messiah with all the wealth of patriotic hopes it stands for. It is this that renders the conflict between the Messianic expectation and the modern view of prophetism acute, and leaves no other escape open for the latter than the bold denial of the genuineness of all personal Messianic passages in the præilic prophets.

While the presence of the Messianic element in the eighth-century prophets is driving the critics into these revolutionary methods, it may furnish us with the basis for a strong argument in defense of the old position. The prophecies of Isaiah and Micah show the national Messianic expectations and the ethical ideal closely wedded. This justifies the conclusion that these are not, as the new hypothesis represents it, two mutually exclusive principles, marking by their successive ascendancy two distinct stages of religious evolution among Israel. If in the prophetic mind they existed side by side without detriment to the high ethical tone of its teaching, there is no valid reason for denying that such was the case in the preprophetic period also. The prevalence of the idea of a special bond between Jehovah and Israel in the ancient times no longer proves the non-existence of belief in his absolute righteousness. The ethical Jahvism forms no antithesis to the national Jahvism, and its birth cannot be explained from the death of the latter.

We now proceed to examine the historical and contextual arguments which are said to favor the excision of chaps. viii. 23-ix. 6 and xi. 1-9 from the genuine work of Isaiah. Both prophecies, it is claimed, lack the necessary contact with the historical situation in the prophet's time, such as is found in all critically unsuspected pieces. This, of course, cannot mean that the two prophecies in question, simply because they have for their background the captivity and the fall of the Davidic house lie beyond Isaiah's historical horizon. For even Hackmann, while believing that in the earliest discourses of our prophet no destruction of Judah is anticipated, yet admits that soon after the Syro-Ephraimitic war a thoroughgoing judgment was threatened by Isaiah against the southern kingdom. Now, in so far as the fall of the royal house was necessarily involved in the general catastrophe, there is by common consent not a single element here wherewith the prophet was not perfectly familiar. What is meant is rather this, that in the prophecies before us the writer fails to approach these facts of the overthrow of David's kingdom, of a protracted foreign oppression

and the subsequent restoration in the manner in which Isaiah is accustomed to do this, viz., starting from a definite basis of concrete contemporary events; that oblivious of the present he plunges into the future, and by so doing betrays his later standpoint. Strangely enough it would seem to the ordinary reader as if quite the opposite were true. In chap. viii. 23^b, the prophecy opens with a reference to the affliction of the northeastern regions of Palestine by Tiglath-Pileser, than which no other event can have made a deeper impression on Isaiah's mind during the earlier half of his ministry. In chap. xi. 1, the point of departure is furnished by the contrast between the mighty forest of the Assyrian army, whose trees Jehovah will hew down, and the shoot that is to come forth from the stock of Jesse; so that the vision of the future would again seem to unfold itself with perfect naturalness from the conditions of the immediate present. How then is it possible for the critics to speak of prophecies detached from Isaiah's historical situation? The solution lies in this, that Hackmann and Cheyne both consider viii. 23^b and x. 33, 34, editorial insertions prefixed to the Messianic passages to produce an artificial adjustment of the latter to Isaiah's standpoint. In other words, these critics first themselves create by their divisive treatment of the text that lack of historic connection with Isaiah's time on which they afterwards rely to prove the late origin of our prophecies. It is true, Hackmann endeavors at length to justify this proceeding by contending that viii. 23^b does not fit into the terms of ix. 1-6, because the regions there mentioned belong to northern Israel, whereas the expected hero is to sit on the throne of David, and because the thought of a reunion of the two kingdoms could not be so simply presupposed. In his view, then, a connection indeed exists, but it is too clumsy to be thought of for a moment as made by Isaiah. On the soundness of this judgment ultimately rests the whole weight of Hackmann's argument and in its last analysis it appears to be a judgment based not on historical but on logical or æsthetic grounds. Are we then so thoroughly familiar, it may be asked, with the mental processes of these ancient seers that we may determine off-hand that their thought cannot have moved in this or that manner, because to us it appears a fanciful or mysterious manner? Are the prophets to be modernized altogether in their mode of thinking as well as in their ethical teaching? Would it not be better to form in an inductive way our opinion as to what the prophetic consciousness is capable of in the matter of combination or perspective? If the discourse here in one bold leap projects itself from the first stage of the Assyrian judgment into the final deliverance of the Messianic era without touching ground at

any intermediate point, and if analogies for such a movement can be adduced from other prophecies, ought we not to think twice before deciding that this transition of thought is a psychological impossibility? Chaps. viii. 1-10, xvii. 1-8, 9-14 and xxviii. 1-6 are of essentially the same character, and the belief that in each of these cases Isaiah himself is responsible for the combination keeps in closer touch with the facts than the view that he cannot have executed such a *tour de force*, and that therefore a redactor must shoulder the responsibility. Nor need we entirely despair of making the process more or less intelligible to ourselves. Isaiah, it should be remembered, even before the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, viewed the coming judgment as an organic whole, the successive phases of which were to grow one out of the other. A perspective of this kind must have considerably facilitated the linking together of the two extreme parts of the whole process. In the calamities that befell the northeastern regions the prophet undoubtedly beheld the first installment of a judgment that would not stop until all but a few had been consumed, the beginning as it were of the end. In point of fact, the whole preceding context represents Ephraim and Judah as equally involved in what is impending, Jehovah becoming a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel (viii. 14). It required no large stretch of the imagination, therefore, to pass from the vision of the depopulated and ravaged "district of the nations" to the more comprehensive scene of the entire people walking in darkness and dwelling in the land of the shadow of death.* We cannot require that the prophet should have explicitly mentioned the destruction of the remainder of Ephraim and the destruction of Judah, for these two he had not yet witnessed in their concreteness; it was natural for him to mention only those three items of which the first was given as a matter of experience, the second as the goal of the judgment, the third as the ultimate object of faith. And if it should be further asked, why viii. 23^b confines the dawning of the great light to the regions mentioned, whilst the darkness spoken of in ix. 1 covers the whole people, our answer is that this must be explained from the strongly imaginative character of the discourse. The prophet, seeing the vision of the people restored and victorious rise in contrast with the scene of

* Hackmann rightly maintains that the words of ver. 1, "to walk in darkness," "to sit in the land of the shadow of death," must refer to a more protracted oppression than either the Syro-Ephraimitic attack or the campaign of Sennacherib can have occasioned to the Judeans. It is most natural to understand them of the captivity, but then of such a captivity as was associated in thought with one country. From the later post-exilic standpoint when the Jews were widely dispersed in several countries the expressions would be less natural.

desolation that had just swept by,* first fastens his eye on those parts of northeastern Palestine on which the first stroke of judgment had descended and which it was but natural should be thought of as first witnessing the reversal of Israel's fortunes. There is no need to say with Dillmann that these sections of the country are representative of the whole, for obviously the prophecy is not conceived in the fixed forms of sober reflection; it partakes throughout of the nature of a veritable vision in which the attention is first held by a single point and then takes in a wider compass. The difficulty that the reunion of the two kingdoms was too important a thought to be incidentally presupposed is solved on the same principle. From Isaiah's historical standpoint as occupied at the opening of the prophecy this thought would indeed have required explicit assertion, for to it Ephraim and Judah were still separately existing. But the idea of their reunion under the one Messianic king is not introduced until the prophet's imagination has advanced to where the exiled people of the two kingdoms stand before him, no longer divided, but united in their common misery. Admitting that such a prospect was possible to Isaiah, and that he expected a restoration beyond it, who will assert that he cannot have simply taken the healing of the old breach for granted without expending a word upon it? A silent assumption of the fact was the most natural thing under the circumstances. Besides, if Hosea ii. 1-3, iii. 5, are genuine, which we have found no sufficient reason to doubt, the idea of a reunited Israel must have been familiar to both the prophet and his hearers.

The argument for the detached character of xi. 1-9 is even less conclusive than the one just examined. To be sure, we must again agree with Hackmann in his interpretation of the phrase *וְיָשׁוּב* as implying the cessation of the Davidic dynasty, and in his general view that the deliverance wrought by the Messiah comes after a protracted period of oppression and not in a momentary crisis of Judah's history. There is no place for the things here described in Isaiah's immediate present; the prophecy is not "*zeitgeschichtlich*" in this sense. But we must disagree when Hackmann proceeds to build upon this the further opinion that thus understood the vision loses all contact with con-

* It cannot be denied that the meaning of viii. 21, 22, 23^a is rather obscure, but in itself this furnishes no reason for denying the connection between these verses and viii. 23^b and ix. 1-6. All that the critics have been able to do is to make viii. 21-23,^a some of them including 20^b, a *torso* lacking both beginning and end. This is an easy but purely arbitrary manner of removing the difficulty. Inasmuch as the figure of the darkness and light in ix. 1 seems to point back to the use of the same figure in viii. 22, it is safer, notwithstanding the obscurity of the text, to assume the continuity of the discourse.

temporary history, ceases to be "*zeitgeschichtlich*" as to its point of departure. True, if xi. 1-9 are taken by themselves, it must seem strange that the prophet should suddenly confront us, and that by mere implication, with the momentous fact of the fall of the Davidic dynasty, an event not predicted on any previous occasion except in so far as it was included in the general judgment on Judah. But this difficulty arises wholly from the unwillingness of Hackmann and others to read xi. 1-9 continuously with x. 28-34. The obvious connection of these two passages explains what suggested to Isaiah the figure of "the stock of Jesse," and why it is introduced without the preparatory statement that the tree of David's dynasty will be hewn down. The insertion of every such intermediate thought would have spoiled the highly effective contrast between the lopping off of the boughs of the Assyrian forest and the raising of the new shoot from the stock of Jesse. Considering that the idea of the fall of the Davidic house is admitted by all to have lain in the background of Isaiah's consciousness, the only question is whether for rhetorical reasons he could for once let it enter his discourse in this indirect manner and overlook the fact of his having never formally announced it before. This question we venture to answer in the affirmative. It may be further asked, however, whether the rhetorical contrast in question is logically conceivable, whether the thought of the humiliation of Assyria's pride can have been connected in the prophet's mind with the idea of a Messianic restoration separated from the latter by a long interval of continuous judgment. It may be claimed and has been claimed, that if Isaiah foresaw the destruction of Assyria he cannot at the same time have expected the ruin of Judah and *vice versa*.* To this we answer that the prophet need not have

* The limits of this article do not permit us to discuss the modern notion of varying and in important respects even contradictory "*Zukunftsbilder*" in the prophecies of Isaiah. Guthe distinguishes two of these, Giesebrecht even three. According to the former of these critics, Isaiah first expected the destruction of both Ephraim and Judah, the fall of the kingdom, a long period of captivity and after that the Messianic deliverance. This eschatological programme is believed to date from about 734, the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war. Later, after about 724, the prophet was led by the course of events to modify his expectations in two particulars: 1. He now believed that the judgment would stop short of the fall of Jerusalem and that the Assyrian while besieging the city would be destroyed by Jehovah. 2. He placed the new era immediately after this deliverance in consequence of which the figure of the Messiah dropped out of his programme, because, if the present dynasty remained, there was no need for a new ruler and the work first ascribed to him. Giesebrecht inserts between these two programmes an intermediate one in which he assumes the prophet to have expected the conversion of Judah entire after the judgment on Samaria and which he finds represented in such utterances as x. 20, 21, xxviii. 1-6, where "the remnant" = Judah. Hackmann, while successfully refuting the schemes of Guthe and Giesebrecht, proposes

thought of the defeat of Assyria as precluding further punishment of Judah. The analogy of other prophecies in which, as already observed, he passes from the contemplation of one particular stage of the judgment to the ultimate restoration, overleaping all intermediate events, leads us to conclude that in this case also he could regard the provisional deliverance connected with God's punishment of the Assyrian as a prophecy and pledge of the final Messianic salvation, though fully aware all the time that new and repeated judgments issuing into a prolonged captivity would intervene. There is no difficulty inherent in the thought, therefore, which would compel us to modify our belief in the continuity of the discourse, so far as chap. x. 33-xi. 9 are concerned. But Cheyne thinks he has a valid reason in what precedes for dismembering the context. He considers such the incongruity of the two figures of the Assyrian army advancing against Jerusalem and spreading terror everywhere, and of the lopping down of the forest by Jehovah. "Can Isaiah have imagined an army planting itself on a sudden like trees?" he asks; and, answering this in the negative, concludes that x. 28-32 is Isaiah's, 33, 34 the redactor's, xi. 1-9 postexilic. It is impossible to meet this argument because it is based entirely on a subjective opinion in regard to certain canons of taste to which the prophet is required to conform in the choice and combination of his figures. We are convinced that the application of modern artistic standards to the work of Hebrew prophets is an unhistorical and therefore critically unsafe proceeding. It may be questioned whether the use of metaphor in the passage before us is essentially bolder than that in the undoubtedly genuine prophecy of chap. xviii. 3-6, where first Jehovah appears making martial preparations against the Assyrian, then the latter's destruction is represented under the figure of the lopping off of branches and tendrils, and lastly the fallen enemies are pictured as being eaten by wild beasts.

a new one of his own in which he makes out a rectilinear development of the prophet's expectations. But the consistency of Hackmann's scheme is obtained by two radical measures: 1. The reference of Isaiah's early prophecies of judgment to the northern kingdom exclusively. 2. The denial of the genuineness of every prophecy which bases on the defeat of the Assyrian hopes for the salvation of Judah. Both positions seem to me untenable, as I hope to show in detail on a future occasion. Guthe and Giesebrecht do not deny the genuineness of the Messianic prophecy in chap. xi, but only the possibility of its contemporaneity with the outlook of chap. x. Nevertheless their detachment of chap. xi. 1-9 from what precedes seriously weakens the defense of its Isaianic origin against such critics as Hackmann and Cheyne, because it favors the contention of the latter that the prophecy lacks contact with Isaiah's historical situation. For this reason it was necessary to point out briefly how in our view the consistency and contemporaneity of the two view-points in chaps. x and xi respectively can be maintained.

There would seem to be the less reason for Hackmann to deny the possibility of connection between chap. x and xi. 1-9, since he makes chap. x. or, speaking more accurately, those parts of it which he considers genuine (vers. 5-19, 28-32) refer to a destruction of the Assyrian army which was to follow the conquest of Judah and Jerusalem, so that nothing is implied which would interfere with the full execution of the judgment threatened against the southern kingdom. We do not believe this exegesis to be correct; indeed, we consider it one of the most vulnerable points in Hackmann's entire construction. But assuming it to be correct, vers. 33, 34 must on this view be admitted to harmonize perfectly with the genuine parts of the chapter, because they convey no intimation that Assyria's defeat will involve any direct favorable consequences for Judah. And, still further, on this interpretation, Isaiah could, even more easily than on our view, have linked together the cutting down of the Assyrian forest and the coming forth of the shoot from the stock of Jesse, because no other events were expected to come between, the sequence being: (1) Destruction of Judah and Jerusalem with the cessation of David's kingdom; (2) defeat of the Assyrian power; (3) Messianic restoration.*

Hackmann still further claims that the tenor of these prophecies does not agree with Isaiah's outlook into the future as known from chap. i. 26 and xxxii. 15-20. These passages, he thinks, prove that the programme of what was to come after the judgment was extremely simple; in fact, involved nothing more than the two items of a purified people and a state of society in which righteousness and judgment would be firmly established. There is, however, nothing in chaps. ix and xi inconsistent with this simpler hope; nay, its realization is expressly guaranteed by the character of the Messiah's rule. Nor is it advisable to determine from one set of passages the limits beyond which other passages should not go in elaborateness of description. If one were to judge from the majority of what Hackmann calls "the historically fixed prophecies," *i. e.*, those that can be assigned to a definite date and occasion, he might easily infer that Isaiah's horizon was bounded by the judgment and did not include any better future at all. Such a conclusion would be equally justified as the conclusion that the wonderful pictures of chaps. ix and xi cannot be by the same hand that drew the bare outlines of chap. i. 26.

Two more considerations adduced by Hackmann must briefly

*Cheyne is non-committal in regard to the question whether vers. 28-32 are intended to lead up to the climax that Jerusalem will be taken or to the anti-climax that the invader will be laid low. The whole structure of the description seems to us to speak in favor of the latter view, and is so far in favor of the Isaianic authorship also of vers. 33, 34.

be noted here. The alleged absence of the Messianic figure in the later prophecies of Isaiah is made to tell against its Isaianic origin in chaps. ix and xi. This brings us face to face with the question already touched upon above, whether there actually was a continuous later period during which Isaiah dropped the personal Messiah, if not from his personal expectations, at least from his public expression of the same, and if so, wherein lies the explanation of this fact. This question is greatly complicated by its interdependence with the chronological problems of Isaiah-criticism. Several views may be held on the subject: (1) It is possible to assign chap. xi. 1-9, together with the whole context of which it forms part (chaps. x. 5-xii. 6), to about the same date as the later eschatological prophecies in chaps. xxviii-xxxi. In this case the two would be mutually supplementary; chap. xi. 1-9 would be to the Sanherib discourses what viii. 23-ix. 1-6 are for those connected with the Syro-Ephraimitic war, and in both the figure of the Messiah would be equally prominent (so Driver, *Introd.*, p. 200). (2) Dillmann places chaps. xxviii-xxxi in the years 726-722, and chap. xi. 1-9 in the first years of Sargon (until 716-715). If this could be accepted it would yield direct evidence that the prophet did not mean to abandon by the discourses of chap. xxviii-xxxi the idea of a personal Messiah, since he reaffirmed it several years later. But the trend of modern opinion is against such an early date for the prophecies of chaps. xxviii-xxxi. And, apart from this, the problem would remain how Isaiah could preserve silence during this long interval of almost twenty years on this important feature, especially when meanwhile uttering discourses so vitally connected with it as those in chaps. xxviii-xxxi. (3) Placing chaps. xxviii-xxxi about the year 702, and the prophecies in chaps. ix and xi at a much earlier date in the prophet's ministry, we may seek an explanation for the disappearance of the Messiah from those later discourses. The explanation usually offered is that the Messianic descendant of David of chaps. ix and xi stood for Isaiah in contrast with Ahaz, the unworthy occupant of David's throne, hence is made prominent in the prophecies belonging to the reign of this king, but recedes into the background during the reign of Hezekiah. It has been observed that the denunciatory discourses of chaps. xxviii-xxxi are not directed against the king, but against the Judean grandees and politicians, and this may be interpreted as reflecting a favorable opinion on Hezekiah, and in so far as confirmatory of the above explanation. With Guthe and others this view forms a part of the theory above stated, ascribing a second "*Zukunftsbild*" to Isaiah. But even apart from its connection with this theory, which is not

essential to it, serious objections arise. As we have seen, chap. xi. 1-9 cannot be separated from chap. x, and chap. x. 11 carries us beyond 722. How then can we bring xi. 1-9 to the reign of Ahaz, unless we adopt the view that Hezekiah's accession did not occur until 715? Furthermore there are two passages certainly belonging to the reign of Hezekiah in which the Messiah is after all introduced again. These are xxxii. 1 and xxxiii. 17. Some would make the expressions, "a king," "princes" (anarthrous) refer to the future magistrates in the abstract, but the personal Messianic sense seems more natural. The pros and contras of the various views stated cannot, of course, be exhaustively discussed here. Driver's opinion seems to us to have most in its favor and to be least open to objections. All we aim at is to show how little weight can be attached, in view of so many opposing possibilities, to Hackmann's claim that the contents of the later discourses are unfavorable to the genuineness of the Messianic prophecies in chaps. ix and xi.

The alleged silence of later prophecy until the time of Ezra, by which Hackmann finds his conclusions confirmed, cannot count for much. Even if proven there would be nothing more strange in this than there must be from the critical standpoint in the diversity of Messianic expectations, some with, some without a personal Messiah, ascribed to postexilic writers. Why, if the author or authors of chap. ix. 1-6 and xi. 1-9 wrote before the date of the so-called Trito-Isaiah as Hackmann assumes, is there no trace of their Davidic Messiah in Joel or Isa. xxiv-xxvii? Slavish adherence to older models can on neither view be attributed to the prophetic writers, whether we place them before or after the exile. Even within the limits of the same prophet there is freedom in the choice of forms under which the Messianic future is depicted.* In point of fact, however, there are unmistakable references in later preëxilic prophets to Isaiah's Messiah. Jeremiah xxiii. 5, promises the raising up of a righteous branch unto David who will execute judgment and justice in the land, and the term "branch" cannot be understood here, as Hackmann thinks, in a collective sense.† The allusion to Isa. ix. 6 is plain. Ezek. xxi. 32, xxxiv. 23 *seq.*, xxxvii. 24, must be judged of similarly. This much only is true, that in Jeremiah and Ezekiel the Messianic king does not occupy the central place in their prophecies of the restoration which he occupies in Isaiah. The reason for this is possibly to be sought in the insignificance of the later kings

* Cf. Jer. iii. 15 and xxiii. 4 with xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15.

† Cf. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, *in loco*; of the other passage, xxxiii. 15, the genuineness is denied by several critics.

after Josiah as factors in the historical development, as has been pointed out by Riehm.*

The linguistic indications of a late origin found by Hackmann in the two prophecies are confined to ten words. Cheyne himself, however, while repeating and supplementing this list, gives warning to proceed cautiously and questions the conclusive character of five out of the ten. No doubt the list might be sifted still further. Over against such doubtful phenomena, one may well urge the unplausibility of crediting some unknown author of the postexilic period with what has been universally and justly regarded as the highest flight of prophetic eloquence.†

PRINCETON.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

* *Die Messianische Weissagung* (2d ed.), 138-140.

† The occurrence of an isolated Aramaic loan-word, especially of a military term like ܦܕܝܐ, "soldier's boot," is easily explained in view of Isa. xxxvi. 11. Cf. also Cheyne in the Introduction to Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel* (new ed.), p. xxxviii: "All the comfort that I can offer is that, though, so far as the contents are concerned, the composition of these two prophecies can most easily be understood in the postexilic age, yet the phraseological data are not on the whole markedly inconsistent with the authorship of Isaiah."