

“The Modern Hypothesis and Recent Criticism of the Early Prophets”
The Presbyterian and Reformed Review 9:214-238, 411-437, 610-636. [1898]

The study of the early prophetic writings has become invested with a threefold interest through the rise of the Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis. Externally looked at, the reversal of the customary sequence, Law-Prophets, seemed to form the distinctive feature of this hypothesis, and around this point accordingly the battle between its defenders and opponents was at first concentrated. It appeared obvious that for the decision of the controversy everything depended on the literary and historical testimony of the earliest prophets. The question was one of verifying whether any, or how much, of the material, legislative and narrative, embedded in the Law existed in written form in ancient times. Apart from a few poetic compositions of smaller size,¹ and some historical documents, which are, however, held to have been incorporated in and adjusted to works of much later date and whose original form can therefore no longer be precisely determined,² the Prophets were the only writings in regard to whose date and genuineness in the main both sides were still agreed. All else appeared unsettled and involved in the great critical upheaval: here at least a common basis for argument had remained. But this reveals only one side of the importance to which the prophetic books suddenly attained. It was soon realized that much more was at stake than the relative age of certain writings, and that the shifting of dates on so broad a scale had taken place in the interest of a philosophical theory regarding the development of Israel's religion. Hence the discussion was pushed into the wider field of the history of revelation or religion, into the midst of the living movement of events, where research bids fair to be rewarded not by discovery of the external sequence of writings alone, but by insight into the causal connection of the forces that have shaped the development of which the writings are mere precipitates or products. If the new hypothesis was right, then Prophecy, coming before the Law, claimed all the interest attaching to records which stand nearest to the mysterious but fascinating beginning of things. The removal of the Pentateuch from its place before the Prophets had created a clear field for that form of naturalistic theorizing to which hitherto the Law with its sharply defined supernaturalistic signature had always formed an insuperable barrier the question had now become open, What is it that lies back of Prophecy, evolution or revelation, the physical or the ethical, the imperfect or the perfect?³ But, contemporary records failing unless the constructions attempted in answer to this question were to be wholly baseless and subjective, a process of backward reasoning, taking its point of departure from the earliest ascertainable data, had to be resorted to; and these data were furnished by the eighth-century prophets, who were thus made to bear witness direct or indirect to the stage of religious development preceding their own times. Even this, however, does not exhaust the significance of the early prophetic writings as a factor in the critical controversy. They appear not as mere literary or historical witnesses, but as independent actors in the drama of development constructed by the critics. Even on the old view, Prophetism at its rise marks an epoch in sacred history. The modern hypothesis, however, having reduced everything in the oldest period to a naturalistic level, is bound to make this epoch a creative one; to it the prophets are the originators of the unique ethical and religious teaching Israel has given to the world, whereas according to the traditional view the prophets simply enforced and applied and developed what was already contained, germinally at least, in the Mosaic revelation.

Neither side was slow to perceive the strategic value possessed by the prophetic writings in each of these three respects. First of all, from the conservative side the claim was upheld that the high antiquity of both the narrative and legislative material in the Pentateuch in all its parts was placed

beyond attack by the testimony of the earliest prophets. Over against this the adherents of the modern view attempted to show that the prophets of the eighth century, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, contain no traces of the existence of the Deuteronomic and priestly documents, whereas references to the Jahvist and Elohist are clearly found in them; that the prophets of the seventh century, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, show, beside traces of JE, points of comparison or marks of actual acquaintance with Deuteronomy; that Ezekiel, the prophet of the exile, reveals great similarity in his ideas and manner of expression with the oldest of the priestly sections of the Law; that finally, the late writers, Malachi and Daniel, offer parallels with all parts of the Thora, and speak of the latter as an organic whole attributed to Moses. All this in entire harmony with the main contentions of the critical hypothesis.

With equal eagerness the prophetic testimony in regard to Israel's past religious development was seized upon by both parties to the controversy, although it must be admitted that here the critics were at a serious disadvantage. The defenders of the traditional view maintained, and evidently on strong grounds, that the unanimous voices of Prophecy pronounced the corrupt state of popular religion among Israel the result of an habitual declension from the higher and purer faith once delivered to the fathers by Moses; that the antithesis between prophets and people was to be explained, in agreement with the explicit declarations of the prophets to this effect, as the natural opposition of the few faithful upholders of Israel's best traditions to the degeneracy of the apostate mass. The critics could not deny that on the whole this was a fair statement of what appeared from their writings to have been the prophets' own convictions on this point. But, in spite of this, they asserted that the data of the prophetic literature, when rightly interpreted, favored not the conservative, but the modern construction of history. And the assertion was made plausible by the demand that a correct interpretation of the past in the light of Prophecy should begin not with accepting the Prophetic judgment as historical evidence, but with explaining it, together with a number of other facts, on philosophical and psychological principles. If the prophets characterize the popular religion as apostasy, it is not so much as a piece of credible testimony that this has interest for us, but as an unconscious revelation on their part that in the course of evolution they had risen above the majority, and were so naively and intuitively convinced of the truth of their higher views as to be unable to think of them as not having been known and valid since the first beginning of Israel's history.

But the main trial of strength between the two contending views was reserved for the interpretation of the Prophetic movement itself, and its contribution to the development of Old Testament religion. The critics had to show, and endeavored to show, that the historical constellation under which their hypothesis placed the birth of Prophecy was not only consistent with but favorable to the intensely productive power ascribed to it. Given the antecedents and the environment supplied by the reconstruction of the older period, it was said, and the work of the Prophets stood out upon the background of their age luminous and intelligible; the mystery and darkness which had hitherto enveloped the genesis of the loftiest teaching of the Old Testament were at once dispelled. The antiquated notion of objective supernatural revelation could now be discarded and the modern idea of development take its place. It was easy to trace the psychological processes in which the distinctive doctrines of the Prophetic theology were evolved. Part fitted into part, and for each truth there was a place and function in the growing organism. The ethical idealism, the monotheism, the spiritual conception of the nature and service of Jehovah, the universalism, the Messianic predictions of the prophets, all these were furnished with a rational explanation and exhibited in their mutual

dependence. The veil was lifted from the reading of the old covenant and the history of its ideas almost wrote itself. In a word, it was claimed that the new hypothesis found its chief commendation and celebrated its highest triumph in the brilliant simplicity with which it solved the riddles and swept away the problems of Old Testament science.

On the other hand, those who were convinced of the correctness of the older views did not hesitate to take up the challenge thus thrown out to them. If anywhere, then here was the point where the critical theory was to be met aggressively and to be subjected to criticism in its turn. In this particular field it undertook to be positive and constructive, and its exploits were so daring and comprehensive, covering such a wide range of evidence upon which it must either plainly approve or discredit itself, that no possibility seemed left for a *non liquet* in the end. And not only did a critical examination of the hypothesis on this point seem to promise definite results, it offered the further advantage of testing the same, not in some subordinate feature, but in the center of its life on which all other parts are dependent. Should it fail to substantiate its claims here, it must break down entirely, for its own assumptions have led it to place at this point the main problem of Old Testament history, for the sake of solving which it exists. In so far as the hypothesis could lay claim to being the most ingenious and best-balanced scheme yet devised for a purely naturalistic explanation of the phenomena of Prophecy, it was justly deemed to involve in its success or defeat the general cause of anti-supernaturalism as regards the Old Testament. Under the influence of so much that invited and stimulated criticism, it is no wonder that the evolutionary scheme was rigorously tried by the stern facts of the history of Prophetism and all its weakness exposed. It was shown without difficulty that it misconstrues the evidence on which it pretends to rest, that it fails to explain the most important elements of the prophetic consciousness and teaching, that its reasoning is more specious than logical, that in its psychological constructions it makes the Old Testament writers think in modern terms, that its assumed development stands in chronological conflict with the data of history, that it is too narrow to subsume under its categories the doctrinal wealth of prophetic revelation and its broad outlook into the future.

In that first flush of enthusiasm which is wont to attend every new discovery, whether real or imagined, the entire contents of the prophetic literature were claimed by the critics as in full harmony with their position. There was no inclination to admit that any part of the evidence appeared inconclusive or suggested problems as yet unsolved. With amazing unconsciousness of the mysteries of prophecy, the defenders of the modern view proceeded to argue their case. When hard pressed by some of the conservative representations recourse was had to an exegesis which more or less plausibly explained away the evidence of the religious vitality of the Law in the prophetic consciousness, or pointed out subtle differences between the early Prophetic and the later Deuteronomic philosophy of history, or reduced the most marvelous Messianic predictions to the level above which mere preachers of righteousness should not rise. Holiness in the Prophets was claimed to be a totally different conception from holiness in the Pentateuch. References to the Thora were interpreted either of the Prophetic instruction itself even where the context seemed to favor no such sense, or else, if the allusion to priestly Thora could not be denied, the reader was carefully warned against a possible confusion between the written Thora of a later age and the oral Thora supplied by the priests in individual instances. With so much assurance was this method of dealing with the inconvenient parts of the evidence at first applied, that for a considerable time no necessity was felt to propose the question, whether some of the prophecies in which these phenomena occurred might not be

of a later date, so that protection against them ought to be sought in critical excision rather than in exegetical makeshifts. The well-nigh universal denial of the genuineness of such sections as Isa. 24-27 and 40-66, and the late dating by many of the prophecy of Joel had, besides, removed the most serious difficulties in advance.

In the course of time, however, a great change came over the critics in their attitude toward the prophetic writings. They began to be more thoughtful and less eager to claim that their conception of Israel's history and the testimony of the Prophets in their present shape were in perfect agreement. It was perceived that the hypothesis did not find as smooth sailing in the often-disturbed waters of prophetic revelation as was at first anticipated. Difficulty was experienced in reconciling the realistic content of many an oracle with the highly idealistic character in which the critics were accustomed to conceive the prophet. But these doubts and misgivings were not signs of any inclination on the part of the critics to retrace their steps. On the contrary, they indicated a more than ever assured conviction of the substantial truth of their conclusions. The precipitancy with which the champions of the new views had in the beginning thrown themselves upon the available evidence to press every part of it with equal ardor into the service of their cause, wore off in the same proportion as the hypothesis was believed to have been placed on a secure basis, so as to be no longer dependent on single data for its support. A calmer tone and temper took its place, which enabled the critics to observe more accurately and to recognize more readily the real nature of the facts, than was possible before. Still more influential, however, in bringing about this change was a second cause. The criticism of the Hexateuch had run its course and been carried to that point of minuteness and perfection of detail where little attractive original labor remained to be done. New fields were to be opened up in which the critical faculty could exert the powers acquired in its employment upon the Mosaic writings. The fact that difficulties had to be admitted in squaring the modern theory with the prophetic books naturally turned the attention of the critics in this direction. So it came about that a vigorous movement for the reconstruction of the criticism of the Prophets set in, in which, so far as the situation allowed, the performances of Pentateuch criticism were reenacted, and the first canon applied was the probably late, in most cases post-exilic, origin of all such prophecies as did not harmonize in their traditional place with the evolutionary program of the history of religious ideas.

It is assumed by the pioneers in this field that the prophetic literature has been subjected to a systematic redaction guided by religious or theological view-points and involving important excisions, additions and alterations. This process reached its height during the Persian period, after the writings of the prophets had for some time possessed a certain degree of sacredness, which could not be maintained unless their contents were made to agree with the then prevailing beliefs.⁴ An extensive literary activity is believed to have developed which, in close dependence upon the older models and largely anonymous, adapted the ancient prophecies to the historical circumstances of the period; and the products of this activity, it is said, have been incorporated into the writings of the earlier prophets, so that, in the latter, compositions of widely distant ages and of entirely distinct stages of religious development are now agglutinated. The Prophetic books are composite in a sense somewhat analogous to that in which the Legal literature is held to consist of various layers. Among German critics Stade and Wellhausen have been chiefly identified with the advocacy of this view, the former by his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*⁵ and a number of articles in the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, the latter by his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*⁶ and the new translation with accompanying notes of the Minor Prophets which forms Part 5 of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. To the

criticism of Isaiah the principle has been applied with great boldness by Duhm's *Kommentar*, and also by Hackmann's treatise on *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*: most painstakingly and comprehensively, however, by Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*. The last-mentioned critic has likewise espoused the results of the recent criticism of the Minor Prophets from this point of view, in the Introduction written by him for the new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*.

It will be at once apparent that by this new departure the significance of the prophetic writings for the questions at issue has been essentially modified. It can be of no use any longer to appeal to traces in the early prophets of the Legal organization and spirit or of the Thora as an organic whole, or of any of the alleged products of post-exilic Judaism; for these very features have now become the criteria by which, without appeal, the late origin of every prophecy wherein they occur is established. To carry on the debate on the basis of what remains, after the critical expurgation has been accomplished, would be a wholly fruitless undertaking. The standpoint represented by the assumed post-exilic writers or redactors is in most cases identical with the conservative standpoint. Hence to rule out their testimony would be a begging of the question on a grand scale, something resembling a judicial process in which the desired verdict were used beforehand by one party as the test for admitting and excluding evidence. A critical comparison of the old and new views, as far as the Prophetic books are concerned, was possible only while the critics were yet in a position to admit the testimony of these books in their entirety.⁷ But this period has now begun to belong to the past. The adherents of the modern hypothesis, at least the progressive ones among them, are fully aware of this, as appears from the fact that without controversial regard for their conservative opponents they proceed to manipulate and distribute the prophecies to their own satisfaction. When sometimes from the apologetic side complaints are still heard, that the critics cannot be reasoned with, because no sooner is any passage quoted from the prophetic writings making against their assumptions than they declare it of later origin, such complaints are in one sense hardly justified. In point of fact, the critics are no longer engaged in demonstrating or defending their hypothesis; they are at work in applying it.

But if, in the old sense, the apologetic significance of the early prophetic writings has for the time being been neutralized, in other respects their study with a view to the pending issues has acquired new interest. Altogether apart from the question as to the correctness of results, it cannot be concealed that a large part of the arguments once used in defense of the critical hypothesis has been by this recent move entirely discredited. The present attitude of the critics themselves is a practical confession to this effect. At a time not so very far removed they contended hotly that the prophetic evidence submitted by the apologists in favor of the high antiquity of the Mosaic writings and institutions was imaginary, distorted, unworthy of serious attention. And, behold, at present the critics of the same school, sometimes the very same men, are making use of these identical arguments to prove the identical proposition, viz., that when these prophecies were penned, the Thora and its religious organization were supreme factors in religious life. A more complete *volte face* is scarcely conceivable. That the conclusion to be established was in the minds of the conservatives associated with the Mosaic origin of the Law, and in the mind of the present-day critics with the post-exilic date of the prophecies, is a mere accidental feature, which ought, of course, not to affect the estimate placed upon the quality of the reasoning itself. Either, the apologetic arguments were as worthless as they were branded by their opponents—and then what value can be attached to them when employed in the critical cause?—or, they are sound and conclusive now,—in which case the apologists

have been splendidly vindicated and ought to receive an apology from those who once scorned their conclusions and now silently appropriate the substance of them.

After all, however, this is a mere matter of historical justice, which, while apt to reflect unfavorably upon the methods of the critics in general, need not be fatal to the correctness of their main thesis. Insufficient caution and limited insight have often made it necessary to defend one truth by controverting another, because at the time it was not seen how the two could be reconciled. The apologists may have rightly pointed out traces of the existence of the Thora in the Prophets, and yet the Thora as an organic whole may be post-exilic. In the abstract the two alternatives, that the Law is pre-Prophetic or that the prophecies in question are late interpolations, come before us with an equal show of logical possibility, and we cannot refuse to consider the solution now proposed by the critics. The reconstruction of the data of Prophecy on the lines of the modern hypothesis may be *a prioristic*, and we may regret that it confiscates the last common territory on which the disputed questions could be brought to a decision; it need not for these reasons be false. There is one right, however, which no amount of *a priori* treatment of the prophetic books can take from us—the right to subject the proposed manipulation of these writings to the test of the principles which are immanent in the writings themselves. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that the critics have now finally escaped from the control of objective facts as far as the Prophetic literature is concerned. Even in applying their theory it will not do for them merely to postulate that such and such a prophecy must be post-exilic, because the ideas contained in it are according to the modern view the specific products of that late period. They will be justly expected to show that in each individual case internal indications of a literary and contextual nature, if they do not directly require, at least favor the excision made in obedience to the claims of the hypothesis. In this sense the use of a theory as a working principle and the demonstration of its scientific character go hand in hand. The most crucial test to which every hypothesis must submit consists in its application to the widest possible range of phenomena, in distinction from the narrower circle of facts to account for which it has been constructed; and its plausibility increases or decreases proportionately to the ease or difficulty with which it subsumes under itself the phenomena beyond the horizon of its original field. For this reason it may be said that, in the critical manipulation of the prophetic writings which it is at present pursuing, the modern hypothesis is putting itself on trial. Devised for the immediate necessities of Pentateuch criticism, it must now prove itself capable of assimilating the facts of Prophecy without resorting to revolutionary methods. It must show that the two lines of argument, the one proceeding from considerations external to the prophetic books, the other from internal evidence supplied by the latter, do actually converge. If, in attempting this, it should be compelled to displace a large amount of material from its traditional environment, or to resort, for the dissection deemed necessary, to violent means both will have to be counted as serious instances against its probability. It seems to us that this is the point on which conservative scholars should, in the present situation, concentrate their efforts to expose the weakness of the hypothesis as regards the prophetic portion of the Old Testament. It should be shown not merely that the ideas in question are there, but are rightly there; and that they themselves, as well as the passages in which they occur, cannot be expunged without doing injury to the inner organism of the prophetic teaching and the prophetic books.

It must be confessed that from this point of view the representatives of the newest phase of prophetic criticism have made very light of their obligations. Little or no objective evidence is adduced to show that the assumed redaction or expansion of the ancient prophecies actually took place. Too often

the excisions from the prophetic text are not justified, nor is their justification seriously attempted, on internal grounds. The utmost that can be said is that the critical reasoning here and there finds some apparent support in the darkness of the prophetic style or the corrupt state of the text, which makes it easy to assert lack of connection or detect seams of redaction at numerous points. The treatment of the prophetic word which is fast growing fashionable may be aptly characterized as *exegetis by means of criticism under the forced application of certain literary canons concerning the lucidity, straightforwardness and general perfection of the prophetic style*. If a passage presents exegetical difficulties or cannot be interpreted except at a sacrifice of that transparency we are accustomed to expect in modern literature, straightway the knife is inserted. Duhm's *Commentary on Isaiah* offers numerous examples of curtailment of the genuine text on no other ground than that the style or diction are thought unworthy of the prophet. Even less satisfactory is Wellhausen's manner, who, as a rule, simply *ex cathedra* decrees the spurious or late origin of a section omitted in his translation, whether from lack of other grounds than his general critical instinct or from aristocratic disdain to state them, it is hard to tell. Cheyne not uncharitably calls this "the conciseness" of Wellhausen's argument. Whatever value may be placed on this part of his work, it must be acknowledged that Cheyne has, at least, given himself the trouble of working out the literary side of the critical case in reference to Isaiah. As a rule, however, the critics openly profess that in their estimation the literary or contextual arguments are merely secondary, and that the Biblico-theological criteria are the really decisive ones in determining the date of a prophetic passage. Cheyne himself admits that the phraseological section of his argument is on the whole not so decisive as in Hexateuch criticism, and assigns to the literary phenomena the last place among the marks of late origin of a prophecy.⁸ Still further than this goes Hackmann, who says that, although in Hexateuch criticism far more abundant literary data were available, nevertheless even in that department no progress was made until the religious spirit and tendency of the documents became the subject of investigation; and that to a still greater extent this method will have to be pursued in the criticism of the Prophetic literature.⁹ This is an admission that in Hexateuch criticism *a priori* principles derived from the idea of evolution, in Prophetic criticism principles derived from the evolutionary interpretation of the Hexateuch, are to be the chief canons—that in neither the literary evidence is of an independently conclusive character, and in the prophets less so than in the Hexateuch.

The necessity for these general concessions can be easily demonstrated in detail. In the following pages we endeavor to give a survey of the more important material affected by this new method of critical procedure. The examination confines itself to the prophets whose work and writings are by common consent contemporaneous with the crisis in the assumed evolution of ethical monotheism. These are the prophets of the eighth century, in chronological order—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah. We leave Joel out of the discussion, for although the critical views concerning the development of religion furnish the chief arguments for assigning him to a post-exilic date and the contents of his book are of great importance for establishing the high antiquity of the priestly organization, yet his case is unique because here not isolated sections but the whole prophecy is transferred to the later period, and our special purpose for the present is to examine the right of the critics to detach single passages from a context which claims for them a place in the work of the early prophets. Joel raises no such direct claim for itself, and, besides, the trend of critical opinion toward a late date for this prophet is of earlier origin than the general reconstructive movement in prophetic criticism with which we are now concerned.

I. Amos

We begin our review with the Book of Amos. The first passage that comes under consideration is chap. 1:2: "Jehovah roars from Zion and utters his voice from Jerusalem." The prominence here given to Zion and Jerusalem is obnoxious to the critics, because, on their hypothesis, the temple did not obtain its prerogative of being the central sanctuary and the one dwelling-place of Jehovah until after the Deuteronomic reform. Hence the verse is suspected by some,¹⁰ while others attempt to put upon it a weakening interpretation. Wellhausen thinks that, as a Judean, Amos would naturally select Zion as the place from which Jehovah's judgment proceeds. From the standpoint of the critics themselves there is a serious objection to this. If, as is continually asserted, the temple on Zion was the seat of a cult not essentially different from nor better than that practiced at such shrines as Bethel, Gilgal, Dan, Beersheba and against which Amos so sharply polemicizes, it must have been simply impossible for the prophet to identify Jehovah in any way with this center of idolatry.¹¹ For, according to v. 5, Jehovah is not to be found at Bethel, Gilgal and Beersheba. For this reason no other interpretation will suit than that which finds in the words a reference to Zion, not as one among the many high places of the land, but as the divinely chosen sanctuary, whence the foreign nations, and even the northern Israelites, had to expect the advent of Jehovah for judgment.¹² It cannot be denied, therefore, that the passage is a stumbling-block to the critical theory, and Cheyne may well express surprise at Wellhausen's accepting it in 1892 without question. But it is equally impossible to eliminate the verse as it is to weaken the sense, for the suffix in **אֱשִׁיבְנֵהוּ**, wherever it occurs in the subsequent verses, would then remain without antecedent.¹³ Besides this from the later standpoint the contents and form of the statement are too innocent for an intentional interpolation.

Greater unanimity prevails among the critics in regard to the late insertion of chap. 2:4, 5, the indictment of Judah. This passage has been thrown out by Duhm,¹⁴ Oort,¹⁵ Stade,¹⁶ Cornill,¹⁷ Wellhausen,¹⁸ Cheyne.¹⁹ The case is a highly instructive one, because more openly than elsewhere the motives of the excision are here professed by the critics. Oort says: "Of the Thorath Jahwe, not in the sense of Jahwe's *instruction* but of his *law*, no mention can have been made until after Deuteronomy, and Khezabhim, 'lies,' did not acquire the sense of 'idols,' until after monotheism had become prevalent. . . . The expression has no meaning until after the exile." Here then are two facts at variance with the modern hypothesis,—a reference to the Thora as the recognized rule of national life, and a reference to polytheism in language which clearly implies that the unreality of all gods besides Jehovah was no longer a novel perception in Amos' day. It might be said, perhaps, that in regard to the former of these the newest critics are somewhat oversensitive, for it is quite possible, although not natural, to limit the sense of Thora here to "ordinances of civil righteousness," as Robertson Smith does,²⁰ or to prophetic instruction, as others propose, and so to reconcile the genuineness of the passage with the modern view. Kuenen even admits that the words are most naturally understood of a written Thora, and yet professes to find no reason for denying them to Amos.²¹ This might be a tenable position if the prophet did not explicitly refer to the Thora as the rule of Judah's national life, from which the fathers already had departed; for the two clauses of his indictment are obviously parallel. There is surely no place in the critical hypothesis for the recognition of so ancient a written law, with such unqualified claims on national obedience. And, as regards the second phrase, "the lies after which their fathers did walk," it is inadmissible to give this the sense of "deceitful superstitions in general," as Robertson Smith again is inclined to do; for the expression "to walk after" is regularly used of the service either of the true or of foreign gods,²² and "lies" is synonymous with **שׁוֹא**, **הַבֵּל**,

אל יל, תהו, all designations of idols expressive of their unreality. It should be observed that the prophet employs the term without explanation, evidently expecting it to be understood of itself, which excludes his having coined it for the first time; and terms of this sort do not as a rule become common property until the conception they express has been thoroughly assimilated by the popular consciousness. There is no denying, then, that in regard to this passage also those critics who reject it are the most consistent and clearly in the right within the limits of the hypothesis. Its most plausible interpretation is such that the modern view will not bear it. And yet it is equally undeniable that these verses are not only in their place here, but cannot be removed without disturbing the context. The meaning of Amos' introductory discourse is that Jehovah will punish Israel more than the heathen, according to chap. 3:2. This applies both to Judah and Ephraim, but, as between these two, Judah is the relatively less sinful, and, therefore, fitly receives its place in the indictment between the heathen nations and northern Israel, for which latter the climax of the charge is reserved. It was impossible for the prophet in this connection to pass over Judah entirely, for Oort's view that its condemnation was implied in that of Ephraim and needed no separate mention is rendered improbable by chap. 3: 1, 6:1, 2, 9:11,—passages of which the two former at least are critically beyond suspicion. Finally, not a single reason of any weight, literary or otherwise, has been produced, except the above-stated *a priori* ones, to impugn the genuineness of the passage. Wellhausen, to be sure, thinks that a rejection of the Thora of Jehovah is not a sufficiently concrete sin to be referred to in connection with the phrase, "three transgressions or four." But it is self-understood that the rejection of the Thora involved a series of single acts of transgression.

The passages 4:13, 5:8, 9, 9:5, 6, are of one nature and together fall under the critical judgment. They are excised for Biblico-theological reasons connected with the development hypothesis, by all the critics quoted above as rejecting 2:4, 5. That these verses break the connection between what precedes and follows is true in so far only as they might be omitted without causing a perceptible gap; but the same is true of a great number of passages whose genuineness is doubted by none. In all three places they serve to lend force to the prediction of judgment by declaring the transcendent greatness of him whose the judgment is.²³ It may be said that 5:8, 9, from this point of view, form the climax of ver. 6, from which they are now separated by ver. 7. Even if this were conceded, a simple transposition of vers. 7 and 8, 9, or the excision of ver. 7²⁴ would have to be preferred to the removal of vers. 8, 9. But closely looked at, the case does not call for any of these remedies. The participle **ההפכים** in ver. 7 belongs as descriptive enlargement to the object **ל בית אל** of ver. 6 and is naturally immediately subjoined to the latter, like unto the connection between 2:6 and 7, whereupon the subject of ver. 6, **יהוה** receives a similar descriptive enlargement in vers. 8, 9, the whole forming in this way a chiasmic construction.²⁵ The real ground of the exception taken to these passages lies in their advanced doctrine of the nature and attributes of Jehovah, which presupposes a fully-matured and long-established monotheism, thus upsetting the critical notion that the monotheism of the prophets was evolved out of their ethical idealism. Here Jehovah appears as the Creator and Ruler of nature, the omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God, conceptions which are not supposed to emerge until the exile in Deutero-Isaiah or at the earliest in Jeremiah. The editor, says Cheyne, "had the same conceptions of the divine nature . . . as the later writers in general."²⁶

The phrase, "sin of Samaria," in chap. 8:14,²⁷ is declared a later correction by Wellhausen,²⁸ whom Cheyne follows.²⁹ "The sin of Samaria," says the former of these critics, must mean the calf of Bethel. But Samaria, he reflects further, never stands with Amos for Israel. Consequently the prophet cannot

have written it. The whole difficulty vanishes if we consider that the cult of Bethel was in a special sense the cult of the royal dynasty and, in so far, of the capital Samaria. This is required by Amos 7: 13, and receives confirmation from Hosea 10:5. What actually determines Wellhausen in rejecting the phrase is its inconsistency with his opinion that Amos condemns the sacrificial cult *in toto*. If this be so, then the prophet cannot have called a single feature, such as the calf-worship, sinful. Would it not be better to reason in the opposite direction, that, since Amos disapproves of this particular part of the cult, he did not oppose it on principle or as a whole?

The conclusion of the Book of Amos is the largest and most important section that has fallen under the condemnation of the newest criticism. Some would remove vers. 11-13;³⁰ others include in the post-exilic addition vers. 8-10 and 14, 15.³¹ The grounds for this opinion are without exception drawn from the critical hypothesis. They are as follows: (a) The restoration of Judah and the Davidic dynasty is here predicted, and in ver. 8 "the sinful kingdom" (= Ephraim) is by implication contrasted with the better kingdom (= Judah). Wellhausen pronounces this "a plump Judaism." The clash with the modern theory arises from this: that the latter makes the comparative estimate placed upon Israel as apostate and upon Judah as in possession of the legitimate cult a product of later historical development, beginning with the Deuteronomic reform, to impute which to Amos would involve from its standpoint a gross anachronism. But, if we place ourselves upon the standpoint of the historical Amos as reflected in his prophecy, there is nothing abnormal in such a comparative judgment. As has been shown, the structure of the introduction to his book likewise presupposes that Judah is less sinful than Israel, and indirectly this is confirmed by the fact that there is no trace in ver. 5, or 8:14, of any polemic against the cult and sanctuary of Jerusalem, which is even mentioned in 1:2 as Jehovah's dwelling-place. The whole matter, therefore, simply resolves itself into the question whether the religious and Messianic difference between Israel and Judah is entirely a Judaistic fiction by which the outcome of history was later artificially accounted for, or has a substantial basis in pre-exilic history itself? So long as no other evidence for the late origin of this prophecy is forthcoming, Amos must remain a witness for the latter view and, in so far, against the critical hypothesis.³² (b) The chief Biblico-theological reason for the attack on these verses is their incompatibility with the conception of Jehovah's righteousness attributed to Amos by the modern theory and said to be found in other portions of his book. The specifically new thing in Amos' prophecy, we are reminded, was his sacrificing the national to the ethical element in Israel's religion. He is believed to have preached for the first time that Israel must perish because Jehovah is supremely righteous. Now in the passage before us the national element, thought to have been discarded, asserts itself with great vigor. Amos, the critics conclude, cannot have thus stultified himself;³³ cannot, to speak with Wellhausen, have made milk and honey flow from the cup of Jehovah's wrath. Obviously, this reasoning has force only if we assume that Amos' conception of Jehovah was so one-sidedly ethical as to leave no room for the exercise of grace beyond the judgment. It would be easy to show that a number of passages, whose genuineness has not been hitherto disputed, bear witness to the contrary. This Amos of absolute logical consistency, to whom grace and righteousness not only cannot go together but cannot even succeed one the other, is a pure philosophical abstraction, and not a psychological reality. There is only this much truth in the critical contention that Amos so exclusively views the judgment as righteous retribution as to lose sight of it almost entirely in its reformatory aspect. Consequently, while fully aware of its limits and unable to close his prophecy without giving an outlook into the better future, he does not bring into causal connection the judgment and the restoration. Righteousness and grace are cleanly separated, whereas with Hosea they interpenetrate,

the judgment becoming the instrument of discipline. This is the psychological explanation of the fact that no allusion is found in vers. 11-15 to the conversion of Israel. (c) Another feature which has been supposed to indicate the late origin of this section is the individualism expressed in vers. 9, 10, in the distinction between the righteous and sinners and in ver. 15 in the phrase "thy God."³⁴ According to the critics, all pre-exilic prophets consider the nation and not the individual the subject of religion. But this trait is fully protected by other passages in Amos,³⁵ to which no critic has as yet taken exception, so that in order to eliminate all individualism the expurgation would have to be much more thorough. Its occurrence simply proves that the real Amos does not fit into the critical scheme of development.

II. Hosea

The Book of Hosea is thought to have been even more extensively interpolated than that of Amos. This was to be expected in advance, since this prophet is more versatile and many-sided than his Judean companion, and it is proportionately more difficult to adjust him to any preconceived program of teaching. In Amos there is at least the undisputed sway of one idea forcing everything else into the background, rendering it possible for the critics to claim this idea as the sole content of his prophetic consciousness, to throw upon it an emphasis exclusive of all other truth, and to remove by a few excisions what little may crop out of a different nature. Nothing of the kind is possible in Hosea. Even after all the manipulation to which the latter's prophecy has been subjected, the critics are compelled to admit that it anticipates trains of thought on the whole identified with a later stage of development. Another feature of Hosea to be remembered in this connection is the abruptness of his style. This abruptness of style, says Cheyne, "made it easy for editors to work in fresh passages;" but he seems to forget that such a characteristic may as easily become a temptation for our present-day critics to scent insertions where there are none, as it is supposed to have been for the editors to work in the same.

The center of attack is the Messianic prophecy 2:1-3 in connection with 1:7; 3:4, 5 in part,³⁶ 4:15, 8:14, all of which contain references to Judah, and reveal more or less partiality for the southern kingdom and the Davidic dynasty, a feature already observed in Amos, but especially noteworthy in a prophet from Ephraim. The natural explanation of these statements lies in the Messianic promises given to David (2 Sam. 7) and in the prerogative of Judah as possessed of the true sanctuary and relatively less apostate than the northern kingdom. But for these two facts, as has been shown already in connection with Amos, there is no place in the modern hypothesis. Belief in the special election of Judah and the Davidic dynasty is assumed to have sprung from the events under Hezekiah, the destruction of Samaria and the salvation of Jerusalem as predicted by Isaiah, and still more from the Deuteronomic reform a century later. Hosea, on the other hand, is said to have rejected on principle every form of the kingdom, the Davidic dynasty included, as apostasy from Jehovah. Because later readers found his expectations of the future on this point out of harmony with the type of Messianic prophecy which dates back from Isaiah, they supplied the deficiency by interpolations. The abrupt transition from threatening to promise in 1:9, 2:1, is held to be a sure sign of such editorial expansion of an original prophecy. As this canon is quite generally applied, we shall have to inquire more fully into its merits, which may be best done in connection with certain prophecies of Isaiah, included among the later additions to that prophet's work almost on the strength of it alone. In reference to this concrete case in Hosea, we observe that the presence of chap. 2:1-3 where they stand is required

by the symmetrical structure of the first part of the book, which consists of three divisions each, beginning with the prediction of judgment and ending with promise.³⁷ It is true that chap. 1-2:3, differ in this respect from the two other sections—that the disciplinary purpose of the exile does not here appear as the mediating thought between threatening and promise; but there was no need at the opening of the prophet's book to explain immediately the inner nexus of these two broad aspects of his message; it was sufficient to introduce them side by side by way of prelude, the sharp contrast serving admirably to bring out in strong relief the distinct features of each. Elsewhere also Hosea startles the reader by the suddenness and boldness of his transitions (cf. 11:7, 8; 12:3, 4, 5). On this view it is unnecessary to look for any other connection.³⁸ Some critics think that 2:1-3 anticipate the ideas of the latter half of chap. 2, that the reference to "the day of Jezreel" can be understood only on the basis of the etymology given in ver. 25, that the change of Lo-Ammi to Ammi and of Lo-Ruhamah to Ruhamah in ver. 1 renders the similar change in the ver. 25 superfluous,—all of which are said to be indications of the secondary character of the suspected passage.³⁹ On a closer view of the matter it will be seen that these points are not well taken. The thoughts of 2:1-3 remain entirely within the terms of the first chapter, in which the *political* aspect of the judgment stands in the foreground. Here the prophet's oldest son symbolizes, by his name Jezreel, the place where *the kingdom of the house of Israel* is to cease and *the bow of Israel* is to be broken (vers. 4, 5). To this corresponds in 2:3 "the day of Jezreel" as a day of national victory and conquest, the day of battle in which the reunited Israelites and Judeans meet their foes. Everything in the context is subordinate to this theme and should be interpreted in accordance with it. Jehovah's having no mercy upon the house of Israel and his having mercy upon the house of Judah, His being Judah's God and no longer Israel's God, have their primary reference to the gift or withdrawal of the divine saving help in war. Consequently ver. 7, referring to the salvation of the southern kingdom in the Assyrian crisis, is entirely in place here.⁴⁰ To the same cause must be ascribed the indirect way in which the captivity is introduced, simply as the background for the national restoration, so entirely different from the manner in which it is treated in 2:4-25 and in chap. 3. The marvelous increase of the children of Israel also is preparatory to their organization into the great army which ver. 2 represents as marching up from the hand to fight the day of Jezreel.⁴¹ Even the future king is not defined any further than in this military capacity, as "the head" which the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall appoint themselves. Finally, this is the point of view from which the prophecy mentions the reunion of the two kingdoms. The "for" of ver. 2 indicates that all these various features are dwelt upon to produce some adequate idea of the greatness of "the day of Jezreel." In so far as the same thoughts reappear in the sequel of chap. 2, they assume an altogether different color from the central idea of the second discourse, that of the religious and ethical marriage between Jehovah and Israel. Hence the symbolism of Jezreel is changed from that of "the day of battle" to that of the people *sown unto Jehovah in the land*, their increase being viewed not so much as a means to swell the Messianic army, but rather as a result of the mystical union between Jehovah and Israel. In agreement with this the reversal of the names obtains here a far more profound and tender meaning than was the case in 2:1-3.

The favorable opinion of the Davidic house expressed in some of these passages is said to be irreconcilable with Hosea's attitude elsewhere toward the kingdom in general. The places where the kingdom is referred to in condemnatory terms are 1:4, 7:3-7, 8:4, 10:3, 7, 13:10, 11.⁴² Of these the first is primarily directed against the house of Jehu, but the cessation of the kingdom is at the same time a punishment for the house of Israel, no doubt because, on a principle elsewhere also recognized by Hosea, the judgment strikes first those institutions which have been to Israel the chief instruments

of sinning; this is confirmed by the juxtaposition of the kingdom, the idols, the high places in 8:4 and 10:7, 8. In 8:4, the words, "they have set up kings, but not by me, princes and I knew it not," are most naturally understood of the entire succession of kings in the northern realm, from Jeroboam onwards, because of the obviously close connection in the prophet's mind between the self-willed making of kings and the making of idols. Chap. 13:10, 11, favor the same view, for the repeated "taking away" of a king given in the divine anger must refer to the frequent removal of dynasties and individual princes, which was one of the chief sources of weakness in the kingdom of the ten tribes. So far, then, nothing indicates that Hosea extended his condemnation beyond the kingdom of Jeroboam and his successors. Whether he went further than this and included the kingdom of Saul depends on the view taken of chap. 9:9 and 10:9: "They have deeply corrupted themselves as in the days of Gibeah;" "O Israel, thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah." The context of the latter passage is so obscure (and possibly corrupt) that its reference can hardly be ascertained, and the former, though standing in a perfectly clear connection, leaves us equally in doubt concerning the events it alludes to. What little light there is to go by would seem to fall on these passages from the history related in Judges 19-21. But even if Wellhausen and Smend should be correct in rejecting this interpretation and in understanding "the days of Gibeah" of the days of Saul's appointment to the royal office, this could create no prejudice against the kingdom of David, whose origin was altogether different. The rejection of the whole northern kingdom together with the kingdom of Saul is rather favorable toward the recognition of David's house as legitimate. On this point Hosea is in entire harmony with the judgment of the historical books which the critics are accustomed to represent as colored by Deuteronomistic ideas. Consistency would require not the excision of such clauses merely as favor the Davidic house, but the removal of all disparaging references to the kingdom of Saul as well as to that of Jeroboam and his successors, on the ground of affinity with the Deuteronomistic philosophy of history. From our standpoint we consider it remarkable that while the condemnation of the Ephraimitic kings (and possibly of Saul) is explicit, no passage can be quoted from Hosea in which the Judean kingdom is referred to in similar terms.

No argument against the passages favorable to Judah can be drawn from those that coordinate it with Israel as equally sinful. The statements of this character appear in the second division of the book, so as to justify the inference that the prophet changed his opinion owing to a change for the worse in Judah's religious condition under the reign of Ahaz. And it is to be observed that in the later chapters no commendations of Judah occur, so that with the exception of this one change the judgment expressed is a perfectly consistent one.⁴³ The interpolator who is supposed to have inserted the favorable passages did not feel any discrepancy between them and the other series, else he would not have stopped short of expunging everything to Judah's discredit. Why then should Hosea have been unable to express both opinions in successive periods? There is, moreover, one statement in favor of Judah which is entirely above suspicion so far as the context is concerned, and for the insertion of which precisely at that place no imaginable reason can be assigned—chap. 4:15. The only things breathed against it are that Judah ought to have been addressed (Wellhausen),⁴⁴ or that the style is weak (Cheyne),—the former an arbitrary restriction upon the prophet's rhetorical license, the latter wholly a matter of taste.⁴⁵

Another passage here to be considered is chap. 5:15-6:4. Commenting on it, Cheyne says that the ordinary view, according to which these words are dramatically put by Hosea into the mouth of Israel as expressive of a superficial conversion, is unsatisfactory. They are rather an earnest expression of

faith and zeal, and were inserted by a late writer who was thinking of his own times, not of Hosea's, and failed to realize what was natural and possible in the latter. This is but a variation on the well-known theme that an eighth-century prophet cannot express ideas or speak in a tone considered by the critics characteristic of a later development. The difficulty is all the greater since in this case the prophet speaks not in his own person, but impersonates his people. Now it is certainly true that, if the words were "an earnest expression of faith and zeal," it would be hard to understand how Hosea could put them upon the lips of the degraded and apostate people so vividly portrayed on every page of his book. But this difficulty is wholly of the critic's own making. The explanation which understands these verses as the confession of Israel *only superficially converted* by the first blow of Jehovah's withdrawal, is the only one that suits the context. Although a certain earnestness is not to be denied in them, there are other features which fully justify the charge of superficiality (actually made by Jehovah in ver. 4): the Israelites expect the return of Jehovah too soon, "after two days," "on the third day," and too confidently, "his going forth is sure as the morning;" ver. 3 still reflects the fatal influence of the naturalistic conceptions, Jehovah's return being compared to the processes of nature in point of necessity. The connection with ver. 5, which Cheyne finds imperfect, leaves nothing to be desired. The Perfects are historical and describe how Jehovah has responded to similar premature and transitory conversions in the past by severer judgments.⁴⁶ Now, taking for granted that the conversion of which the words are the expression lacks depth and permanency, and is not psychologically inconceivable in such a people as the Israel described by Hosea, so that on this score we have no reason to doubt the genuineness of the passage,⁴⁷ it should none the less be urged that in a formal point of view it presents great difficulty to the critical conception of the character and the historical antecedents of popular religion among Israel in Hosea's time. The state of mind revealed in this confession no doubt is deficient in true spirituality, but the language in which the sentiments are clothed reflects a relatively high degree of religious culture and maturity such as points back to something quite different from the primitive religion of Israel as described by the critics. Long ago it had been urged from the conservative side that such a religious past could not have produced the forms of expression of which the early prophets avail themselves and which must have been intelligible to the people. The force of the argument is now indirectly acknowledged as often as an attempt is made, like the present one, to get rid, on the plea of interpolation, of modes of thought and language deemed unnatural and impossible at thus early a period.

Hosea shares with Amos the fate that his prophecy is left without a conclusion by the newest criticism. Wellhausen and Cheyne both deny the genuineness of chap. 14:2-10. The latter finds these verses akin to the writings of the age which begins with Jeremiah; the spirituality of the tone is surprising; to understand Hosea we must omit them; to have added to the stern warning in 14:1 would have robbed it of half its force. Against this *a priori* reasoning it should be sufficient to call attention to the numerous points of contact between the suspected verses and the main body of Hosea's book. Ver. 2 reflects the prophet's well-known judgment on the worthlessness of external sacrifice; ver. 3 contains a reference to the two principal forms of sin against which elsewhere his polemic is directed, political pride and idolatry, and besides expresses together with ver. 4 the principle of Jehovah's free forgiving grace; while in vers. 5-8 the nature blessings so long abused by Israel to the injury of true religion are represented as mere symbols and instruments through which Jehovah's personal love is communicated to Israel,—all Hoseanic ideas to the very core. The whole piece is so entirely in the most characteristic vein of Hosea, so clearly the outgrowth of his fundamental conceptions, so absolutely required to round off his book harmoniously, that the later redactor would have had to

possess not only a literary skill greater than that of the prophet himself to compose it, but also an unusual degree of historical sense to reproduce so well a remote situation.

A number of minor interpolations have been assumed by individual critics, the most important of which are 8:1b, 12, 14, 12:1b. The first of these deserves attention because the words it is proposed to strike out contain the significant combination of covenant and Thora, and the second because it is attempted to eliminate the reference to the Thora as existing in written form. In both cases the critical excision strikes at elements obnoxious to the development hypothesis.⁴⁸

The degree of reliability of the critical judgment in some of these instances may be inferred from the widely distant periods to which the Judaistic interpolations are assigned by the various critics. Oort thinks that the redactor belonged to the reign of King Josiah and that the purpose of his new edition of the prophecy was to induce the northern Israelites to reform their religion in the spirit of Deuteronomy and to recognize the Judean authority. Giesebrecht assumes that the interpolations were written towards the close of the exile. Still others make them post-exilic.

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 1-11:10; 17-20; 28-31, 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 1:27, 28 (Duhm and Cheyne); 3:18-23, 25, 26 (Duhm and Cheyne); 4:2-6 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); 9:1-6 (Hackmann, Cheyne doubtful); 10:20-27 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); 11:1-9 (Hackmann, Cheyne doubtful); 19:1-15, 16-25 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); 28:5, 6 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne), 23-29 (Hackmann doubtful, Cheyne); 29:16-24 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne); 30:18-26 (Duhm, Hackmann and Cheyne), 27-33 (Hackmann and Cheyne); 31:5-9 (Duhm, and Hackmann in part; Cheyne). Besides this a tendency is perceptible to bring down to a later post-exilic period such sections as had already been denied to Isaiah by Kuenen and older critics. This is the case with reference to 11:10-12 (Kuenen, exilic period; Duhm, close of second century B.C. at the earliest; Cheyne, Syrian period); 24-27 (Kuenen, Persian period; Cheyne, in part, time of Alexander the Great; Maccabean period); 32:1-8, 9-20 (Kuenen, pre-exilic; Cheyne, post-exilic); 33 (Kuenen, possibly reign of Josiah; Cheyne, second half of Persian period; Duhm, 162 B.C.); 34, 35 (Kuenen, between 536 and 458; Cheyne, about 400, possibly later; Duhm, Maccabean⁴⁹ 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. 3:1-15, on which Cheyne comments as follows 1a and 1b may be genuine, 1c 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 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 *a 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. 2:2-4 is the first important passage on whose post-exilic origin Hackmann and Cheyne are agreed.⁵⁰ Before them Stade had already reached a similar conclusion.⁵¹ 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.⁵² 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 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. 66:23, Zech. 14:16-19. 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. 60, with this distinction, that in the latter prophecy everything proceeds naturally, whilst here a miracle takes place: this must be of secondary origin."⁵³ 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 2:4 reflects the experience of the later Jews, for whom war meant no longer victory but affliction.⁵⁴ 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."⁵⁵

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. 2a, 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 preeminence which the religion of Jehovah will in the latter days be recognized to possess over all other cults. Even in post-exilic 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.⁵⁶ 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. 6 it is difficult to understand.⁵⁷ 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 *a 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.

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.⁵⁸ 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. 8:9, 10, 14:24-27, 17:12-14, 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. 11:10, 18:7, 19:19-25), 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. 8:9, 10, 14:24-27, 17:12-14 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 10:10 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 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 (14:25) 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,⁵⁹ 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,⁶⁰ 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 *a priorism* 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”⁶¹ advanced to lend some sort of external justification to this proceeding cannot conceal the fact that criticism is here moving in a circle.⁶² 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. 11:10, 19:19-25, the latter to chap. 18:7. We shall not contend here about chap. 19, because the question of its genuineness had become a debated one, apart from its universalistic content, on a purely historical basis. Chap. 11:10 is connected with the Messianic prophecy 11:1-9, presently to be considered, and stands or falls with the latter. But a word should be said regarding chap. 18:7. Duhm and Cheyne reject this verse, the latter, it would seem, primarily for the reason that it represents Jerusalem as “the center 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?⁶³

The other feature deemed unnatural in a prophecy of the eighth century is the intense longing for peace to which Isaiah 2:4, Micah 4:3, 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 post-exilic 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 state of mind, born from compassion with his distressed and ravaged people. It is sufficient to quote chap. 28:12, where the burden of the prophet's message is summed up in the words, "Give ye rest to this weary." But this longing for peace is so little exclusive of delight in the warlike deeds of Jehovah that in both chap. 9 and 11 the Messiah appears in this 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 this thought of universalism. Hosea predicts that in the future the bow and the sword and the battle shall be broken out of this land and Israel lie down in safety (2:20).⁶⁴

The literary evidence collected for the late origin of chap. 2:2-4 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. 4:2-6, 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. 3:16, Rev. 13:8; 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 post-exilic 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. 25:4, 30:26; Joel 3; Zech. 14).⁶⁵

It will be seen at a glance that all these arguments derive their entire force either from the assumption that the priestly laws and 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. 2 and 3. Chap. 4:1 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.⁶⁶ 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 3:16-4:1, and embodies the thought that Jehovah and His direct gifts alone ought to be the pride of Israel (cf. 28:5). 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. 6, “the holy seed is the stock thereof,” the excision of which by the critics is a wholly arbitrary proceeding. In general, chap. 6 reveals sufficient interest for the external embodiment of the worship of Jehovah to cover every single feature of chap. 4. This 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 revolves deliverance from such discomforts of life only as interfere with the continual worship of Jehovah. Chap. 28:2, 32:2, 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 (6:13), 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 **הַפֶּה** in ver. 5, “canopy;” **בָּרָא** in ver. 5, “to create;” **מִסְתוֹר**, 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 2:16). 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 Amos 4:13, 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.⁶⁷ **מִסְתוֹר** finally is an unobjectionable formation; that Isaiah always uses **סִתַּר** in the same sense is true, if always may mean once or twice;⁶⁸ leaving aside 32:2 (rejected by Hackmann and Cheyne), the two words are equally frequent; as to its form, **מִסְתוֹר** stands on a line with **מַחֲסֵה** 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 post-exilic times is furnished by the recent treatment of chap. 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9. 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 8:23-9:6 and 11:1-9, 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.⁶⁹ 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 *Pre-exilic 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 pre-exilic prophetism; (2) that in the writings of the pre-exilic 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 pre-exilic prophecy in its original purity, but the offspring of a union upon which the latter has entered with a totally heterogeneous tendency.⁷⁰

In reviewing the arguments by which the elimination of an element hitherto considered of so great importance in the theology of Isaiah is defended, we shall again have to distinguish between the *a 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 *a 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, 2:2-4, 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9, 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.⁷¹ 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 sub-ethical 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. 9:6 makes provision for the upholding of David's kingdom with judgment and righteousness, or Isa. 11:3-5 for the righteous treatment of the poor and weak of the land: in order to accredit themselves as genuine Isaianic oracles these 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.⁷² 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 11:6-9 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 pre-exilic 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. Pre-exilic 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 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.⁷³

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. 11:2, 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. 8:23-9:6, owing to the concrete events from which the prophecy is by way of contrast developed (8:23), 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. 11:1-9, 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 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 centers 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. 2:2-4 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,⁷⁴ 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. 1:21, 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. 29:1, no matter whether we accept the ordinary rendering, "city where David encamped," or that of the Septuagint, *πολις ην επολεμησε Δαυιδ*, a question to which shall we have occasion to return later.⁷⁵ 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 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.⁷⁶ 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. 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 pre-exilic 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 pre-prophetic 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. 8:23-9:6 and 11:1-9 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. 8:23b, 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. 11:1, 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 8:23b and 10:33, 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 8:23b does not fit into the terms of 9:1-6, 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 aesthetic grounds. Are we then so thoroughly familiar, it may be asked, with the mental processes of these ancient seers that we may determine offhand 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. 8:1-10, 17:1-8, 9:14 and 28:1-6 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 (8:14). 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.⁷⁷ 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 8:23b confines the dawning of the great light to the regions mentioned, whilst the darkness spoken of in 9:1 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 desolation that had just swept by,⁷⁸ 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 2:1-3, 3:5, 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 11:1-9 is even less conclusive than the one just examined. To be sure, we must again agree with Hackmann in his interpretation of the phrase *גֹּזַע שׁ* 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 contemporary history

ceases to be “*zeitgeschichtlich*” as to its point of departure. True, if 11:1-9 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 11:1-9 continuously with 10:28-34. 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*.⁷⁹ To this we answer that the prophet need not have 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. 10:33-11:9 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 10:28-32 is Isaiah’s, 33, 34 the redactor’s, 11:1-9 post-exilic. 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. 18:3-6, 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.

There would seem to be the less reason for Hackmann to deny the possibility of connection between chap. 10 and 11:1-9, since he makes chap. 10, 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.⁸⁰

Hackmann still further claims that the tenor of these prophecies does not agree with Isaiah's outlook into the future as known from chap. 1:26 and 32:15-20. These passages, he thinks, prove that the program 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. 9 and 11 inconsistent with this similar 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. 9 and 11 cannot be by the same hand that drew the bare outlines of chap. 1:26.

Two more considerations adduced by Hackmann must briefly 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. 9 and 11. 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. 11:1-9, together with the whole context of which it forms part (chaps. 10:5-12:6), to about the same date as the later eschatological prophecies in chaps. 28-31. In this case the two would be mutually supplementary; chap. 11:1-9 would be to the Sanherib discourses what 8:23-9:1-6 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. 28-31 in the years 726-722, and chap. 11:1-9 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. 28-31 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. 28-31. 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. 28-31. (3) Placing chaps. 28-31 about the year 702, and the prophecies in chaps. 9 and 11 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. 9 and 11 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. 28-31 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. 11:1-9 cannot be separated from chap. 10, and chap. 10:11 carries us beyond 722. How then can we bring 11:1-9 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 32:1 and 33:17. 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. 9 and 11.

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 post-exilic writers. Why, if the author or authors of chap. 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 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. 24-27? 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.⁸¹ In point of fact, however, there are unmistakable references in later pre-exilic prophets to Isaiah's Messiah. Jeremiah 23:5, 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.⁸² The allusion to Isa. 9:6 is plain. Ezek. 21:32, 34:23 *seq.*, 37:24, 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 after Josiah as factors in the historical development, as has been pointed out by Riehm.⁸³

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 post-exilic period with what has been universally and justly regarded as the highest flight of prophetic eloquence.⁸⁴

Chaps. 19:16-25 and 23:15-18 are assigned to a post-exilic date somewhere between 275 (Cheyne)

and 150 B.C. (Duhm) for reasons drawn from the development hypothesis, such as the bold universalism expressed in the hope of the conversion of Egypt and Assyria, the high respect with which the altar, the mazzabah, the sacrifice and oblation are mentioned in 19:19, and the servants of the sanctuary in 23:18, all of which is deemed inconsistent with the prophetic attitude toward the cult. Inasmuch, however, as both sections are obviously appendices to the preceding oracles on Egypt and Tyre, and the latter have long been attacked by modern critics on historical grounds,⁸⁵ it cannot be claimed that the denial of Isaiah's authorship is in this case primarily due to the exigencies of the evolutionary scheme. It is interesting to observe how the critical interpretation of chap. 19: 19 has veered around in response to the change of opinion regarding the date of the prophecy. As long as the chapter was believed to be Isaianic, ver. 19 was made much of as an argument for the nonexistence of the Deuteronomic law in Isaiah's time. It had to render service also to discredit the historical character of Hezekiah's reform. When the apologetes answered that the altar in the strange land and the mazzabah were intended by the prophet as mere symbols, this was waived aside as a shallow subterfuge. Now that vers. 16-25 are declared to be late, it devolves upon the critics themselves to explain how the late writer reconciled this statement with the plain prohibition of the law, and behold the reasoning of the apologetes leaps at once into favor. Cheyne's remarks on the subject sound precisely as if they came from one of the old defenders of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.⁸⁶

The case of chaps. 24-27 is similar to that of the sections just quoted. The genuineness of this prophecy also had been long denied before the modern reconstruction of the history of doctrine created a new necessity for such denial, and even at present the arguments adduced against the Isaianic authorship are to some extent of a historical and literary character. Besides, although the critical analysis is applied to these chapters, it is not for the purpose of separating Isaianic material from later accretions, but to disentangle two elements both alleged to be post-exilic. For these reasons the subject does not fall within the scope of our present discussion. Nevertheless it may be remarked in passing that these chapters possess great interest from a Biblico-theological point of view. Those who are persuaded with us that no valid reasons have been brought forward against their genuineness will find much material here for refutation of the critical hypothesis. Duhm says of what he calls "the apocalypse" contained in chaps. 24, 25:6-8, 26:20-27:1, 12, 13, that it makes use of the Priest Code after a fully-developed dogmatic fashion. Priests and people appear in 24:12 as distinct social categories. In the same chapter (ver. 5), "the laws," "the ordinance," "the everlasting covenant," refer to Gen. 9:1-7, a section assigned to P. "The righteous" for whom glory is destined in ver. 16 are the people of the Thora. "The windows on high" of ver. 18 point back to Gen. 7:11, 8:2 (both in P). "The righteous nation which keepeth truth" of 26:2 are the people faithful in observance of the law. "The name" and "the memorial of Jehovah" in ver. 8 refer to the temple cult; cf. also 27:13. "Righteousness" in vers. 9 and 10 means conformity to the law; "the land of uprightness" is the land where the Thora rules. Chap. 27:9 presupposes the law enjoining unity of sanctuary and prohibiting Asherim and Hammanim. In a word, no Old Testament Scripture exhibits more fully the vital connection between Messianic prophecy (in the wider sense) and the legal basis of Israel's life. The Messianic judgment is here throughout represented as resulting from transgression of the Thora, and as ushering in a new state of things, of which observance of the Thora will be the chief characteristic. It is no wonder then that recent critics have placed the component parts of Isa. 24-27 at a sufficiently late date to account for this lively interest in the Thora. Duhm dates "the apocalypse" from about 130 B.C., and makes most of the other fragments still later. Cheyne thinks "the apocalypse" as well

as the remainder belong to the time of Alexander the Great. And both freely confess that in going down to so late a period they are determined by the features mentioned above, together with some other advanced doctrines concerning angels and the resurrection, and in general the apocalyptic character of the entire prophecy. But, although the trend of critical opinion toward these extreme dates is clearly due to the prevailing theory of development, it might be said that, inasmuch as apart from and prior to the influence of this theory similar conclusions had already been reached, the argument from the doctrinal phenomena simply lends confirmation to these and is not *a priori*.

No such excuse, however, can be offered for the rejection of the single verse, chap. 18:7, for wholly theological reasons. One of these, the implied universalism, has been noticed already. Another is derived from the phrase, "the place of the name of Jehovah of Hosts," used as an equivalent to "Mount Zion." The expression reminds of Deut. 12:5, 11, and, as in 26:8, "name" signifies the specific presence of Jehovah in the temple, perhaps, as Guthe points out, in connection with the ark. Its use by Isaiah is important for three reasons: first, because it reveals the prophet's agreement with the Deuteronomic principle of unity of sanctuary; secondly, because it proves his attitude toward the temple cult in the abstract to have been one of appreciation and not of hostility; and, thirdly, because together with similar utterances⁸⁷ it furnishes the basis for the subsequent enunciation by the prophet of the sacrosanct character of Zion, and in so far shows what little right the critics have to eliminate the latter on the ground of its incompatibility with Isaiah's general teaching.⁸⁸

The material next requiring our attention consists of chaps. 28-33. Modern doubt concerning the genuineness of this part of the book first fastened on chap. 33, which Ewald assigned to a disciple of the prophet, a view defended since by Dillmann. Ewald's criticism, however, was not founded on the religious tone and ideas of the prophecy, but entirely on its literary character. Stade, attaching himself to Ewald, included within the line of attack chap. 32, and boldly placed the doctrinal arguments suggested by the development theory in the foreground.⁸⁹ It should be noticed that his discussion not only left the genuineness of the preceding chaps. 28-31 intact, but made the assumption of their Isaianic origin a vantage-ground for denying that of chaps. 32-33. And, inasmuch as Stade accepted the one group of discourses and rejected the other, both in their entirety, his treatment of the subject was still free from the divisive method which plays so prominent a role in the present phase of the criticism of these chapters. Nevertheless the similarity of ideas between chaps. 32 and 33 on the one hand, and certain sections of chaps. 28-31 on the other hand, is so close that the rejection of the former was equivalent to the insertion of the analytical wedge into the latter. Sørensen first intimated that chaps. 28-31 might be composite. He called attention to the strange effect produced in chap. 28 by vers. 5 and 6 between 4 and 7, by 16b, 17a between 16a and 17b; in chap. 29 by vers. 5-8 between 4 and 9, and vers. 17-24 after ver. 16; in chap. 30 by the peculiar transition in ver. 18; in chap. 31 by the almost unintelligible ver. 5; especially in chap. 32 by the open contradiction between vers. 14 and 15.⁹⁰ From the last-mentioned passage Sørensen draws the conclusion that shortly before the crisis of the Sennacherib-campaign Isaiah predicted the impending conquest and destruction of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, but that possibly after the fearful affliction of his people together with the blasphemous attitude of the invader had changed the prophet's mood and the issue of events had failed to verify his original forecast, he may have subjected the discourses previously uttered to a revision introducing the element of hope into a once purely threatening context. The year 701, as Sørensen himself remarks, would thus become the birth-year of the Messianic hope.⁹¹ Here, then, the theory of the composite character of chaps. 28-31 is tentatively proposed, but no inferences are drawn from it detrimental to

the genuineness of any part of the material.⁹² A further step in the disintegration process is marked by Duhm's commentary (1892). Duhm finds in chaps. 28-31 considerable sections of post-exilic origin clumsily interwoven with the original Isaianic discourse. The characteristic feature of these interpolated pieces he recognizes in their promissory eschatological import. But even he retains enough of the old view to assume that in the genuine prophecies themselves there must have been a definite promise of Jerusalem's deliverance from the Assyrians, to which this later more luxuriant development could attach itself. Plainly this was a mediating position such as could only partly satisfy the critical instinct, now feeling its way toward elimination of the element of promise on principle and not merely in its most pronounced form. Hackmann is the critic who has done away with this last remnant of the old interpretation of Isaiah. He claims to have established on the basis of a thorough analysis of chaps. 28-31, that the real message of the prophet during the Sennacherib-crisis was not one of encouragement and hope mixed with threatening, as is traditionally assumed, but a message of judgment pure and simple. Hackmann's partition of the text, with some modifications, as well as the conclusion based on it regarding Isaiah's attitude at this juncture, have been adopted by Cheyne in his *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895). The latest discussion of the subject from the advanced critical standpoint is by Brückner, who in some instances coincides with Cheyne where the latter goes beyond his predecessor Hackmann.⁹³

It is safe to say that these operations bring us face to face with a question second in importance to none within the whole range of prophetic criticism, the question whether Isaiah predicted the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem from the Assyrians. In this question, the fundamental principles now struggling for supremacy in the interpretation of the Old Testament in general, and of prophetism in particular, are focused and brought to a sharply defined issue. The modern hypothesis is bound to move toward a negative answer of this question along three of its basal lines of thought. The first of these may be indicated by the antithesis of works and grace. It is easy to perceive how the excision of the promissory parts of chaps. 28-33 strikes at those very elements in which the Church from ancient times has recognized the most precious part of Isaiah's message, and which have won for him the name of the evangelist among the prophets. The undeserved salvation of the city accomplished by Jehovah, in spite of her own sinfulness, for the purpose of manifesting His free love for Zion,⁹⁴ forms one of the three great historic embodiments of the gospel of grace in the Old Testament; and its inspired interpretation by the prince of the prophets has been ever valued correspondingly. In more than one Isaianic passage it is linked backward to the deliverance of the exodus: it furnishes the prelude to the hymn wherewith the prophet in the second part of his book celebrates in advance the return from exile, and so occupies a central place in the history of the Old Testament doctrine of redemption. The unfolding of the idea of faith also is inseparably connected with it. On the other hand, it will be as readily perceived that the prediction of such a sovereign gracious deliverance fits badly into the critical construction of the prophetic consciousness. For according to the latter the new prophecy had its very root in the discovery that Jehovah does not and cannot deal with Israel according to grace, but exclusively according to works; and it is impossible to charge Isaiah, the foremost of its representatives, with a fall from the height of this idea. It is in entire fidelity to its principle, therefore, when the modern hypothesis, after a period of hesitation, begins now more and more confidently to assert not only that Isaiah did not expect or foretell, but also that he could not have expected or foretold the event in question. Wherever such a prediction appears in the genuine parts of his book, it must be construed in the sense of a conditional promise made dependent for its fulfillment on the people's conversion, instead of being intended by its

fulfillment to produce such conversion, as is clearly the implication of the rejected passages. With the elimination of the idea of grace the conception of faith must undergo considerable modification. It is interesting to observe how with several writers the center of gravity in this characteristic Isaianic idea is being shifted from the element of trust to that of obedience or conformity to the prophetic standard of righteousness. Says Hackmann, in paraphrase of the classical passage chap. 28:15: "You have made the Egyptian alliance your refuge in which you think yourselves secure. . . . Jahve, on the contrary, makes the foundation reliance on himself to be exercised in righteousness and judgment, honest adherence to your obligations (as tributary to Assyria) until Jahve's providence brings deliverance."⁹⁵ Similarly Cheyne, commenting on chap. 7:9, remarks: "Trust the prophetic word, and ye shall never have to *give way* (28:16). Of course, Isaiah does not mean merely the word of promise; he implies all those moral conditions which he has expressed in chaps. 2-5."⁹⁶ Now it may certainly be said that the proposed analysis does not result in the removal of these important elements from the body of Scripture, but simply in their transfer to a later period of Jewish history; and that a truth valuable in itself ought to claim our acceptance equally when the product of the Maccabean age as when emerging in the time of Isaiah. But this reasoning, whatever may be its force in other instances, is entirely unsatisfactory in the present case. For, in the first place, the distinction between the pre-exilic prophetic and the post-exilic Judaistic periods is from the critical standpoint itself far more than a mere matter of chronology. It has connected with it a certain estimate of the religious character and value of these two periods; and though the critics can of course no longer subscribe to the once current opinion about the spiritual barrenness and unproductiveness of the post-exilic age, yet even with them the judgment stands that, compared with the era of the great prophets, its piety is of a lower, less healthy type.⁹⁷ Consequently it makes an immense difference whether the doctrine of Zion's gracious deliverance is to pass under the name of Isaiah or to be relegated with so much other material to the time of Judaism. But even apart from this inevitably resulting difference in valuation, it must be remembered in the second place that the intrinsic character of the doctrine is completely changed by its detachment from the historical basis of Isaiah's day. The view hitherto taken was that the prophet by inspiration knew and foretold the event, and that it came to pass according to his word. The modern view is that Isaiah did not predict the event, that it did not occur in the form in which in his book the prediction is put in his mouth, but in a quite different, much less supernatural form; that this slight basis of fact gave rise to a legend in which the true proportion of things was altogether lost; that finally out of this mixture of legend and history, with the former preponderating, grew the prophecies of promise now contained in chaps. 28-33 with their far-reaching eschatological implications. Granting, therefore, that the evangelical element is preserved, it is preserved in a shape which renders it well-nigh valueless. The truth of salvation preached by an accredited prophet in close connection with supernatural facts—this is what the healthy realism of the Church has always believed in and judged essential to its faith; to cease insisting upon this and deem the bare idea of salvation, as developed in the fancy of some post-exilic writer, and lacking all adequate historical basis, sufficient, is nothing else than Rationalism and Pelagianism in principle.⁹⁸

The second reason which has made the denial of the genuineness of our prophecies attractive to the critics is connected with the view taken by them of the prophetic attitude toward the temple cult. In several passages of the disputed sections the promised preservation of Jerusalem is associated with the fact of Mount Zion being Jehovah's dwelling-place, where He is acceptably worshiped, whose conquest by the Assyrians might therefore be construed as evidence of the impotence of Israel's God, while for the same reason an act of salvation proceeding from that center could not

but be interpreted as in an eminent sense the work of Jehovah alone. By themselves, of course, these utterances of Isaiah do not prove that the public service of Jehovah was regulated by law, and this law recognized by the prophets. The regard here shown for the temple and its ceremonies might be explained in other ways than by supposing that the writer found it invested with the rank of the only legitimate sanctuary in a Mosaic law code. On that score no suspicion need have attached to the statements in question. At the same time there is something in their tone and spirit which, while on the one hand it betrays a certain affinity with the nomistic views, seems on the other hand positively inconsistent with the critical hypothesis. For according to the latter the early prophets were not merely indifferent but actually hostile to the sacrificial cult in which they rightly recognized the pagan, anti-ethical element in Israel's religion, and over against which they placed the demand of a purely spiritual service of Jehovah consisting in obedience. Thus the popular religion of the cult and the prophetic religion of righteousness are said to have formed an absolute antithesis; and it becomes exceedingly difficult to explain how in Isaiah the demands of the latter can have been sufficiently abated to permit his cherishing this extreme reverence for the temple. It is true, the critics do not think a compromise between the two principles in the abstract impossible, and even believe that later, in the time of King Josiah, one was actually entered upon by the formation of the Deuteronomic law book. But how antagonistic the two tendencies in reality were is proven by the very fact that in their opinion this step proved fatal to the true life of prophetism, because it broke the strength inherent in its previous uncompromising attitude.⁹⁹ Besides, this was almost a full century later than the time of Isaiah and after the prophetic movement had passed the zenith of its power. It is a totally different thing to find Isaiah, in whom the prophetic spirit is supposed to have attained its purest and most vigorous expression, assuming an attitude toward the temple in which not only there is absolutely no trace of antagonism, but which approaches very closely to the reverence for Zion usually deemed in critical circles characteristic of the later ritualistic period. Thus the modern theory was reduced to the uncomfortable position of having to recognize in the greatest of the prophets the father of a principle diametrically opposed to what in its view was the vital principle of prophetism. Isaiah by proclaiming that Jehovah's fire and furnace are in Zion became sponsor for the idea of Jerusalem's inviolability, and was in all likelihood the authority to whom those appealed who attacked Jeremiah because he dared to predict the destruction of the holy city. The conception of Zion as the one legal sanctuary in its first beginnings had to be dated from him. Considering all this, there seemed to be almost as much justification for placing Isaiah at the head of the subsequent development in which the essential truth of prophecy was obscured, as for considering him the highest exponent of this truth. In a word the most fundamental antithesis by the aid of which the modern theory explains the evolution of Old Testament religion threatened to elude the critics' grasp. Now it has begun to be realized that this whole difficulty may be swept away at one stroke if it should appear possible to deny to Isaiah the sections in which this peculiar favoritism for Zion and the temple crops out, and to assign them to a post-exilic date. Our prophet could then take his place with Amos and Hosea in the ascending line of the development of the ethical idea, and the excised passages can take theirs with the other nomistic portions of the Old Testament to which they bear such a marked similarity in tone and spirit.

We believe, however, that there is still a third and even more powerful motive at work in the present attempts to divide these chapters. The prediction of the sudden deliverance of Jerusalem in a crisis fraught with the gravest danger is one of the most signal instances of supernatural disclosure of the future in the whole Old Testament. Its elimination as a factor to be considered undoubtedly would

make the naturalistic explanation of the facts of Isaiah's career a far more solvable problem than otherwise. Still it is not so much the desire to evade this one stubborn fact that prompts the critical analysis. As we shall have occasion to see later, even if the prediction be wiped out from chaps. 28-33, there are other unassailable passages which will continue to bear witness to its historicity. Besides, the modern view takes no serious offense at the presence of a certain naïve supernaturalism in the prophetic consciousness, not even if this on a single occasion should rise to the anticipation of a specific event and thus gain a semblance of objectivity.¹⁰⁰ But there is reflected in these chapters a supernaturalism of a more conscious and comprehensive type, such as the critics are wont to call eschatological and for which they have no place in their construction until after Ezekiel. Here speaks a prophet who knows himself the herald and interpreter of a divine plan carried out in Israel's history, who rises above the immediate present and boldly projects his interest into the future. The Messianic outlook, though lacking the personal definiteness of chaps. 9 and 11, is of the widest and farthest; it includes the transformation of nature, the reversal of all present conditions, and this to be effected by the pouring out of the Spirit from on high.¹⁰¹ A perfect society in which all sin is forgiven and from which all sickness has been banished stands at the goal.¹⁰² And these things are no mere by-play; they evidently engage the writer's enthusiasm by reason of their inherent importance. Now it is plain that such a frame of mind, call it eschatological or by any other name, is too remote from what the modern theory has learned to consider the central prophetic consciousness, for it to admit of natural psychological combination with the latter. It is detached from the issues of the immediate present, its horizon extends beyond the limitations within which the sober, stern moral sense of the early prophets must have confined their hopes, and it peoples this new world with images connected only by the slightest thread with the high ethical interests these teachers had supremely at heart.

Some individual doctrinal features, which by their weight help these more general considerations to turn the scale in favor of the partition of our chapters, will meet us in the discussion later on. We must now inquire what are the objective arguments used by the critics to justify what the postulates of their hypothesis thus *a priori* commend to them. The proposition to be established is that chaps. 28-33, or more strictly speaking chaps. 28-31, reveal to the critical eye two strata: one of a denunciatory character, possessing all the traits of genuine Isaianic prophecy; another, promising and consolatory in its tone, showing all the marks of a later supplementary deposit. The first argument adduced in support of this is a chronological one. Chap. 28:1-6 date from before the conquest of Samaria by the Assyrians,¹⁰³ whereas the subsequent sections clearly reveal their connection with the Sennacherib-crisis, the remainder of chap. 28 included, which latter has so many points in contact with chaps. 29 and 30 that it cannot possibly be separated from these. At the same time chap. 28:1-6 have obvious connection with ver. 7 *seq.*, the words וְגַם-אֱלֹהִים forming the connecting link. But, Hackmann reasons further, no plausible explanation has been given, nor can be given, of this combination of two prophecies of different dates on the view that it was made by Isaiah himself. Consequently it is to be regarded as one of the symptoms pointing toward the activity of a redactor who hardly confined himself to the mere arrangement of Isaianic material, but must have added from the later work of others or from his own.¹⁰⁴

It may be rightly questioned whether this difficulty is as insurmountable as Hackmann represents it. To be sure, we may agree with him in the opinion that Giesebrecht has not satisfactorily solved the problem. According to this critic, the oracle against Samaria dates from about 724. Those designated in it as "the residue" of Jehovah's people, were at that time in the prophet's intention the whole

Judean kingdom. The destruction of Samaria would have the salutary effect of radically converting the Judeans, thus ushering in the fulfillment of Isaiah's optimistic expectations: "In that day shall Jehovah of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty unto the residue of his people: and for a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment, and for strength to them that turn back the battle to the gate." Now, at a later date in the Sennacherib-period, having been compelled by the prevailing moral corruption to modify this favorable forecast of Judah's destiny, the prophet takes up again, Giesebrecht thinks, this original prophecy for the double purpose of publicly revoking the promise it contained and of holding up to the Jerusalemites the fate of Samaria, meanwhile realized, as a fearful warning of the catastrophe which was on the point of overtaking them.¹⁰⁵ To this Hackmann justly objects that the prophet cannot have taken so promising a view of Judah's prospects at the late date of 724, because the discourses belonging to the crisis of 734 prove him to have expected at that time already the judgment on the southern kingdom.¹⁰⁶ Isaiah's intention cannot have been, therefore, to revoke a promise once given to the Judeans in their collective capacity. But, granting this, an exposition remains which will account in a perfectly natural way for Isaiah's repetition of this earlier oracle by way of preface to the following Sennacherib prophecies. We may understand "the residue" of the purified Israel which the prophet everywhere places at the end of the era of judgment, including remnants of both the northern and southern kingdoms, and to which as the final result of the whole process appropriate reference could be made at each important crisis of its course.¹⁰⁷ In this case the oracle against Samaria serves as introduction to these later prophecies because it enunciates the basal principle of destruction of the mass and restoration of a remnant, according to which Jehovah conducts his dealings with the two houses of Israel, and as it were furnishes the text for what Isaiah had to say during the campaign of Sennacherib both in its threatening and in its promissory aspect.¹⁰⁸ The phrase "in that day" need not be pressed as strictly coinciding with the fall of Samaria, but may denote the period of the restoration in general. If the later writers can be credited with the loosest possible use of this phrase, why should a more general reference of it be denied to Isaiah? And the persons designated by **וְגַם אֲלֵהֶם** are not identical with "the residue" of ver. 5, but stand in parallelism with the drunkards of Ephraim in ver. 1, as well as in contrast with the wise counselors and brave warriors promised "the residue" in the future (ver. 6). They are the leaders at Jerusalem, whose revelry is described in vers. 7-22, the priests, prophets and politicians.¹⁰⁹

A second argument relied upon to show the composite character of these chapters consists in the remarkable dualism of the contents and the abrupt transition from the denunciatory to the promising sections. A number of cognate phenomena are pointed out as lending special significance to this fact. The threats and the promises are intermingled; those who hear the one hear the other likewise, so that the latter must have robbed the former of all force. And not only is there no indication that the widely different messages are intended for two different circles, but the contents of both are simply irreconcilable, inasmuch as in the one the destruction, in the other the deliverance of Jerusalem is predicted.

It must be granted at the outset that these observations more or less accurately describe the surface appearance of this part of the book of Isaiah. The difficulties suggested are not entirely of the critics' own making, but represent a real problem inherent in the discourses themselves. The only question is whether the hypothesis of the composite character of these chapters is the most natural way of explaining the peculiarities, and whether it does actually explain them. We have no right to resort

to this hypothesis so long as the possibility remains open that the extraordinary phenomena of the prophecy reflect an uncommon historical situation. Let us remember how apparently conflicting elements entered into the divine procedure with which the prophet was confronted and the confusing scenes of which were prefigured in the discourses. Jehovah's plan involved the defeat of Judah, the Egyptians and the Assyrians alike, and at the same time the deliverance of Jerusalem, yet again so that the corrupt leaders residing in the capital should fall and the remnant survive. Now it is to be expected *a priori* that in a prophetic forecast of this necessarily complicated process the various factors entering into its solution should likewise appear with a certain bewildering effect. Assuming that Sennacherib's campaign actually followed the course and had the issue which the Biblical records require us to believe it did, it cannot be denied that divine providence worked here in a mysterious way and brought into play for the achievement of its purpose the strangest possible contrasts. Why should not something of this mystery pertaining to the real drama that ensued, have clung to the shadow it threw before itself in the mind and words of Isaiah?¹¹⁰ To this must be added as a second consideration that some of the discourses in question are of a highly imaginative cast; indeed, show internal evidence of having been conceived by the prophet in the form of visions. Although nobody at the present day will be inclined to revive the theory of Hengstenberg, who found in the visionary state of the organ of revelation the key to the solution of all the riddles of prophecy, yet we are inclined to believe that the modern tendency is to err equally much in the opposite extreme, by entirely neglecting this element and making the prophet altogether a man of calm reasoning and sober reflection.¹¹¹ If this element had any share in the shaping of the prophecies before us, this would result in making them a more than ordinarily exact counterpart of the impending crisis itself with all its paradoxical mystifying features.¹¹²

As regards more particularly the sudden transition from threatening to promise, Giesebrecht has taken pains to show that this is not a characteristic of genuine pre-exilic prophecy, but a sign of later redaction.¹¹³ He admits, however, that in the application of this canon to the prophetic writings two exceptions should be allowed. It does not apply to the promissory conclusion a prophet may have appended to his book as a whole: because in this case there was evidently no danger of breaking the force of the previous announcement of calamity, which spoke strongly enough for itself; and because it was self-evident that the promise referred to a future generation. Giesebrecht himself makes this exception cover, among others, such passages as Amos 9:8, *seq.*, Hosea 14:2, *seq.*, which, as shown above, are excised by more radical critics.¹¹⁴ The consideration is obviously an important one to keep in mind in discussing the entire subject, and its bearing need perhaps not be restricted to the formal conclusion of a book or collection of prophecies. It will have to be admitted that, whereas in oral discourse a frequent unmediated transition from rebuke to promise might easily have destroyed the effect of the prophetic preaching, the situation became essentially different as soon as the prophet sat down to commit his message to writing. For this very act signified that no longer his contemporaries alone were addressed, but later readers likewise; and the danger that the present generation might take refuge from the threatening in the promise was comparatively remote. Still, so far as Isa. 28-31 are concerned, no mere appeal to a literary arrangement by the prophet in writing down his discourses will fully explain the phenomena.¹¹⁵ More perhaps than in any other section of Isaiah's book, what we read in these chapters impresses us not as a literary composition, but as a faithful reproduction of oral discourse delivered in the heat of the moment and still retaining all the vividness and directness that are apt to characterize oral speech. More applicable to the present case is a second restriction allowed by Giesebrecht. It relates to passages in which the change from a tone of denunciation to

one of promise is obviously intended to produce a specific rhetorical effect. Although the sudden contrasts of shade and light are undoubtedly due to the inward commotion, with its rapid alternation of opposite feelings, into which the vision of Jehovah's mysterious work threw the prophet's mind, yet this does not exclude that at the same time a distinct purpose embodied itself in the form thus assumed by his discourses. That such was actually the case seems to be implied by chap. 29:9-12. The opening words, "Be ye amazed and wonder," are most naturally understood of the effect produced by the preceding Ariel-discourse with its paradoxical contents. The critics who eliminate from this Ariel-prophecy and from the surrounding discourses all references to the deliverance of Jerusalem, deprive themselves of the possibility of explaining how Isaiah's message, in such reconstructed form, could call forth the amazement here attributed to his hearers. Neither the announcement of calamity by itself, nor the promise of escape by itself was calculated to excite wonder, for both were sufficiently familiar, the former from Isaiah's own repeated declarations, the latter from their optimistic views of the future, in which the secret alliance with Egypt had confirmed them. But both elements combined and intermingled and submitted to them in bold antithesis—this could not fail to make them wonder and stare at the mysterious message.¹¹⁶ "The vision of the whole," the prophet significantly says with a fine allusion to the complex bewildering character of the scenes just depicted, "the vision of the whole has become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed." And to indicate that the judicial darkening of their minds cooperated with the inherent strangeness of the prophecy in mystifying them, the figure receives a new turn in ver. 12, where the vision is compared to a book that is delivered to him "that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned," i.e., unable to read.¹¹⁷

What has been said has perhaps in a measure prepared us to view the dualistic and uneven character of the discourses in question without prejudice to their possible unity. The critics, however, contend that the text as now constituted presents not merely bold contrasts and sudden transitions, but absolute contradictions. As this is a question of exegesis, it can only be determined by examining the passages somewhat in detail. The points where the prophecy suddenly leaps from threat into promise and where the critics accordingly locate the editorial seams, are, apart from chap. 28:5, already discussed, chap. 29:7 or 8, 16, 30:18, 31:5, whilst chaps. 32 and 33 present features assigning them a position by themselves. We propose to inquire with reference to each of these passages what verdict a cautious exegesis leads one to pronounce on the alleged composite character of their environment.

Chap. 29:1-8, then, is made by Hackmann and Cheyne, in its original Isaianic form, a prophecy of judgment, pure and simple, without the least gleam of hope of a final deliverance. As will be seen in the table appended below,¹¹⁸ Duhm's analysis leads to a different result, in which the element of promise is retained.¹¹⁹ When a critic of Duhm's boldness refrains from applying a principle recognized elsewhere by himself, the protest raised against it by the text must be more than ordinarily emphatic. An insuperable obstacle in the way of Hackmann's and Cheyne's division lies in ver. 6, "It shall be at an instant suddenly she shall be visited of Jehovah of hosts with thunder and with earthquake and great noise, with whirlwind and tempest and the flame of a devouring fire."¹²⁰ This verse, it should be observed, is thoroughly Isaianic, both in its general tone and in its single expressions, so that there can be no question about its belonging to the original discourse.¹²¹ Hackmann and Cheyne recognize this and leave it intact. But it is equally certain, though perhaps not so immediately apparent, that this verse will not bear any other than a promissory interpretation. The attempt to turn it *in malam partem* does violence to the words. The phrase, "in an instant suddenly," can only serve to introduce

a mysterious, supernatural interposition of Jehovah, something unexpected and unprepared for. How lame to apply this to the capture of the city and to make it characterize the latter as sudden, after all the concomitants of a lengthy siege have just been elaborately depicted!¹²² On the other hand, how striking and appropriate this same phrase, if intended to express the sudden miraculous reversal of Jehovah's attitude toward the city, first reducing her to that extremity of humiliation in which she shall speak out of the ground and her speech be low out of the dust, and then at once turning against his own instruments, her enemies, to make them as passing chaff, a vanishing dream and vision of the night (vers. 5, 7)! But not only is ver. 6 unambiguous, the preceding context also contains intimations that the siege of Jerusalem tends to a crisis not of destruction, but of wonderful deliverance. Not much weight can be attached, to be sure, to the interpretation of Ariel as "lion of God," on the basis of which many find even in vers. 1 and 2 the implied prediction that the besieged city will, by triumphant escape from her danger, approve herself God's lion. The objection to this is that the figure of the lion would assign an active share to the Jerusalemites themselves in the repulsion of the enemy, whereas the whole context emphasizes the exclusive agency of Jehovah in saving the city.¹²³ Much more to the point for our purpose is the fact that Jehovah compares the siege He is planning against Jerusalem to that once laid by David to the fortress of the Jebusites.¹²⁴ For, inasmuch as the latter did not result in the destruction of the city, but in her elevation to the seat of God's sanctuary and the capital of David's kingdom, so likewise the warfare of Jehovah against her will ultimately issue in the purification and glorification of Zion. The whole comparison rests on the profound thought that God must conquer Jerusalem anew because she has become His enemy: only this time His campaign is a more complicated one than that of David. Something higher than physical possession is aimed at and this explains why Jehovah's method involves the paradox of two apparently contradictory movements, of first bringing the Assyrian army before her walls, and then suddenly undoing His own work by the destruction of its instruments and the salvation of the city.

A further instance against the critical division of this prophecy is found in the discrepancy of the concrete results obtained by the various critics. Four partitions at least have been proposed. Leaving those of Duhm and Stade, who both adhere to the promissory interpretation of the section, out of account,¹²⁵ we still have Hackmann and Cheyne, who, while agreeing in the opinion that the passage bears the evidence of composite character on its very face by the presence of mutually destructive threatenings and promises, yet differ in important details as to which words belong to either category. It is in regard to vers. 6 and 8 only that these critics coincide, both regarding the former as a prediction of judgment, the latter as an editorial accretion of promissory import. In regard to vers. 5 and 7, they take directly opposite ground, Hackmann thinking it possible to save the Isaianic authorship of these verses by understanding them in an unfavorable sense as descriptive of the multitude of the besieging enemies, Cheyne judging this a forced and untenable exegesis (a point on which most will agree with him¹²⁶), and on this ground assigning both to the post-exilic writer. Where the judgment as to the most general meaning of the component parts of a prophecy is so uncertain, the verdict of irreconcilable dualism is scarcely calculated to inspire confidence.

We pass on to chap. 29:15-24. There the peculiar case presents itself that one single verse only of the original Isaianic prophecy has been permitted to stand by the supplementer. Everything after the words, "Woe unto them that seek deep to hide their counsel from Jehovah, and their works are in the dark, and they say, Who seeth us? and who knoweth us?" must be denied to the prophet, because it plainly implies the coming regeneration of things. Now no imaginable reason can be

discovered why the later writer, who elsewhere is supposed to have dealt quite fairly with Isaiah's material, sometimes to the extent of adopting it entirely and only adding an equal quantum of his own, and who carried through this method of saving as much as possible even at the cost of joining together palpable contradictions, should in this particular instance have cut short the original so as to leave scarcely more than its opening words. What followed in the genuine discourse, if this was a pure prediction of judgment, must have been equally suitable for preservation as 29:6 or 30:14, 17. And why, we may further ask, did the later writer, after first amputating well-nigh the whole body of this ominous message to substitute a more favorable one, mar the latter, contrary to his usual method, with new threatenings conceived by himself? It will be observed that vers. 21, 22, introduce a note entirely lacking in the other alleged appendices which are throughout of an exclusively consoling character. Hackmann seems to have felt this, for he maintains that the context requires the identification of "the tyrant" and "the scorner" with the foreign enemies of Israel, as also the identification of "the meek" and "the poor among men" with Israel as a whole.¹²⁷ A single glance at ver. 21 shows the impossibility of this, for those "that cause a man to sin in a cause, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just with a thing of nought" are undoubtedly transgressors within the circle of Israel.¹²⁸ That immediately afterwards Jacob as a whole is spoken of as sharing in the promise proves nothing to the contrary, for this is precisely the Israel from whose midst the scorner had ceased and all they that watch for iniquity have been cut off, the Israel of the remnant (cf. chap. 1:21-26).

But, it is said, everything from ver. 16 onward betrays its secondary character in that it does not fulfill the expectation of a severe arraignment of the Egyptophile politicians awakened by the preceding verse. "We expect to hear how Yahwe will bring to naught their counsel, and before all the world subject them to the deepest contumely. But no! it is of Israel's approaching regeneration that we are told, and this is apparently intended for an entirely different class of persons, viz., the oppressed and miserable" (Cheyne, p. 193). This representation, however, fails to do justice to the somewhat subtle but none the less real and profound connection of the prophet's thought. The foolish perversity of those who endeavored to hide their intriguing with Egypt from Jehovah (i.e., from Isaiah) finds a fitting rebuke in the figure of the clay denying understanding to the potter. The very ingenuity wherewith they try to deceive Jehovah is derived from Him, the Creator, who must therefore be all-knowing and all-wise Himself. So far the thought is characteristically Isaianic, as a comparison with chap. 31:1, 2, convincingly shows.¹²⁹ At all events, then, ver. 16 will have to be recognized as genuine, and this once given what follows in the subsequent verses attaches itself in a perfectly natural manner. What Isaiah condemns in the politicians is not merely the preposterous attempt to keep their secret scheming from the knowledge of Jehovah, but, as Ewald has strikingly observed, even more than this he condemns their pusillanimity and suspicion regarding Jehovah's power to bring the threatening crisis in Judah's fate to a successful issue. Deep-rooted unbelief made them scorn the prophet's counsel to seek their strength in quietness and confidence, instead of which they chose to rely on their own petty diplomacy. This underlying conceit of being better masters of the situation than Jehovah, more powerful than He to control the forces of history and guide them to the goal of Judah's deliverance, this, as the figure of the potter and the clay already intimates, constitutes for Isaiah the supreme folly of their line of action. What more effective exposure of the inherent smallness of such human policy could have suggested itself to the prophet's mind than to place it in vivid contrast with the all-embracing, world-renewing work of Jehovah, which is on the point of turning mountain-forests into fruitful fields and fruitful fields into mountain-forests, revolutionizing

all those present conditions they strive to manipulate, and by its mere prospect making all worldly politics appear pitiful in the extreme?¹³⁰ Thus it appears how unfounded the charge that ver. 16 *seq.*, turn aside from the course marked out for the prophecy by its opening words and in a disconnected way join to the announcement of woe the picture of regeneration. The latter is not in the first instance brought in for its own sake, but for the very purpose of effecting, what Cheyne professes to miss, the subjection of the wily politicians to the deepest contumely. Nor is the prediction of their approaching ruin entirely lacking in the sequel, for, as has been shown above, it is referred to in vers. 20, 21.

The section just considered is important also because it disposes effectually of the assertion that the discourses of chaps. 28-31 in their present form do not clearly distinguish between the subjects to whom the threats and those to whom the promises apply. Here such a distinction is drawn with the utmost clearness desirable, for, on the one hand, we have the scorers, those that watch for iniquity, that make man an offender in a cause, lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just with a thing of naught, and, on the other hand, the meek and the poor among men.

The next seam the critics locate between vers. 17 and 18 in chap. 30, the latter verse being drawn to the subsequent consoling prophecy, and in this way a sharp unmediated contrast between it and the foregoing made out. The proposed rendering is: "Therefore Jehovah is eagerly waiting that He may be gracious unto you, and is rising that He may have mercy upon you, for Jehovah is a God of judgment: blessed are all they that wait for Him." Duhm ridicules the attempts of commentators to force an opposite meaning upon the words. I cannot convince myself that the above interpretation is sufficiently free from objections to justify such an attitude. For on this view לִבְנֵי loses all connection with what precedes. Jehovah's determination to leave only the smallest of remnants (ver. 17) can never yield the ground for his impatience to show grace (ver. 18). It is hard to understand how the editor, who made the seam, could so stultify himself as to unite two direct opposites, after this naive fashion by a "therefore." Duhm has felt this, for he suggests that the writer intended the לִבְנֵי to connect with his own previous interpolation, chap. 29:16 *seq.* This surely is a desperate remedy, inasmuch as all the other alleged supplements are interlaced at the point of insertion with the Isaianic material, and have no such backward reference to a remote discourse. To this must be added that לִבְנֵי would make no natural connection with chap. 29:24. The question also arises whether יְהוָה and יְרוּם make a suitable parallelism when thus rendered. If Jehovah is eagerly waiting to show grace, He cannot at the same moment be rising to bestow mercy; the former presupposes a cause for delay, such as would prevent the instantaneous action expressed by the latter. Duhm, to be sure, translates יְהוָה by "is full of impatience" but this is too free a rendering in which the element of "waiting" is unduly obliterated. In view of all this, we may well fall back upon Dillmann's exegesis, which understands לִבְנֵי as coordinated with the same word in ver. 13 and with עַל-בְּנֵי in ver. 16, and renders: "Therefore (your iniquity being such) Jehovah will delay in being gracious to you, and will keep aloof from having mercy upon you: for Jehovah is a God of judgment; blessed are all they that wait for him." But if this be the most plausible interpretation, there can be no reason any longer to complain of abruptness in the transition; the thought that Jehovah's interposition will tarry naturally paves the way for the consoling reflection that ultimately it must come for such as wait for Him and convey the blessings enumerated in the sequel.

Some additional features in the prophecy, vers. 19-26, should be noted as bearing on the question

at issue. The conversion of the people in Zion and Jerusalem is distinctly made, in ver. 19, the concomitant of their gracious visitation by Jehovah, which meets the charge that nowhere a moral motive is supplied for the change from threatening to promise. The most obvious connection, further, prevails between vers. 20, 21, on the one hand, and vers. 10, 11, of the preceding, undoubtedly Isaianic, prophecy on the other hand. As there the people are accused of unwillingness to receive Thora and of a desire to banish Jehovah from their sight, so here the prophet describes a condition in which the people will have their eyes constantly fixed upon their Teacher (Sgl.) and listen attentively to his instructions.¹³¹

Chap. 31:1-9 is that part of the group of prophecies now under discussion to which the critics most confidently appeal in support of their theory. It is said to reveal evidence of the most clumsy mechanical composition even to the eye of the untrained reader. In vers. 1-3 the Egyptian alliance is denounced and its utter failure through the destruction of both Egyptians and Judeans predicted. Then follows the magnificently conceived figure of ver. 4, in which Jehovah is compared to a lion growling over his prey, undismayed at the shouting of the shepherds summoned against him, majestically, conscious that none can prevent him from seizing it. "So will Jehovah of hosts come down to fight *against* Mount Zion and *against* the hill thereof," unconcerned about what help the politicians may summon to save the country from the judgment He has determined to inflict through the Assyrians. Thus far all is of one tenor, threatening without qualification. "But at ver. 5," says Cheyne, "the scene is abruptly shifted. Like flying birds Yahwe will protect His city. Repent then, ye Israelites. For ye know that in that day men's idols will be useless. Yea, Assyria will fall by no human warrior's sword, or panic-stricken will take to flight. Thus saith the God who hath a fire in Zion. This may not be very consecutive, but so much at least is clear—that it accords with a passage which we have recognized as a later addition to the woe upon Ariel, viz., 29:7, 8. To the self-confident politicians it can have had no meaning; or, if it had, the meaning can only have served to lull them to sleep." In view of all which Cheyne concludes that the original woe was supplemented in post-exilic time by a late writer, whose work begins at ver. 5b. The words, "like fluttering birds," still belong to Isaiah and must have been originally followed by "so shall the inhabitants of Jerusalem fly" (or, flutter in anxiety).¹³²

The main question raised by these statements is whether the two figures of the lion seizing his prey and the sheltering birds are so absolutely discordant as to forbid our ascribing ver. 4 and ver. 5 to the same author. The former describes Jehovah's attitude toward Jerusalem as one of fierce anger, the latter as one of the most tender maternal solicitude and protection. At first sight the contrast seems indeed to amount to a plain contradiction. It is undoubtedly for the purpose of avoiding this that some expositors attempt to read into ver. 4 a favorable meaning instead of the ominous one which the import of the figure so obviously requires. It is proposed to render: "So shall Jehovah of hosts come down to fight *upon* (instead of *against*) Mount Zion," and to find in this the thought that He will no more allow his city to be taken from Him than a lion would give up a lamb that it had seized as its prey.¹³³ But how incongruous in this case the figure is to the idea intended to be conveyed by it! The lion growling over the lamb in the role of its defender! This difficulty is of course removed by making the Assyrian the prey to seize which Jehovah descended upon Mount Zion and which He will not permit the Egyptian or Judean armies to take from Him. Even so, however, the objection remains that **לְכָא עַל** means everywhere else "to fight against."¹³⁴ And, since on this view it was more important to state upon whom than from where Jehovah makes his attack, we would expect

the prophet to say: "So shall Jehovah of hosts come down to fight against the Assyrians." There is no escape then from the conclusion that ver. 4 speaks of a campaign of Jehovah to be conducted against Jerusalem,¹³⁵ in which the city is to be seized by Him as His prey. In so far the critical interpretation is undoubtedly correct. This, however, by no means proves the correctness of the further inference that the prophet in uttering these words meant to imply the fall of Jerusalem. We have no right to press the figure to the extent of making it say that, as the lion seizes the lamb to devour it, so Jehovah will take the city for the purpose of destroying it. The point of comparison is according to the context strictly limited to this, that Jehovah proceeds to inflict upon Jerusalem a judgment which will put her at His mercy, and that He will not let the Egyptian alliance interfere with this. Now it is plain that, thus understood, ver. 4 describes not the ultimate purpose or issue of the judgment, but only the first step in its execution, that of reducing the capital to the utmost extremity through the Assyrian army. Whether this first step is to be followed in the prophet's expectation by the fall of Jerusalem or her deliverance cannot be determined from ver. 4 alone, but must remain an open question to be answered by the context. Ver. 5 brings the answer by saying that after thus having reduced the city to the condition of a helpless victim, Jehovah will next proceed to protect, deliver, pass over and preserve it. Instead, then, of two contradictory statements, concerning the outcome of the judgment, we evidently have the description of two successive steps in the divine treatment of Jerusalem; and all we need do is to ask whether the prophet helps us to understand the adaptation of this twofold procedure to the final accomplishment of Jehovah's purpose. This we learn from vers. 6-8, where first the aim of the whole process of judgment is expressed in hortative language: "Turn ye unto him from whom ye have deeply revolted, O children of Israel," and next the two motives which may in the future be expected to induce this conversion are stated, viz., the recognition of the uselessness of idols and the acknowledgment of Jehovah's exclusive activity in salvation as manifested in the miraculous overthrow of the Assyrian: "For in that day every man shall cast away his idols of silver and his idols of gold. . . . Then shall the Assyrian fall with the sword not of man and the sword not of men shall devour him." It will further be observed that the two motives here brought into play correspond precisely to the two successive methods of the divine procedure described in vers. 4 and 5. The conviction of the vanity of the idols is to result from Jehovah's closing in upon Jerusalem after the failure of all foreign help. The acknowledgment of God's exclusive activity in salvation is to result from his sudden deliverance of the city at the last moment. It is clear, therefore, that the prophet conceives of the two sharply contrasted attitudes which Jehovah will assume toward Jerusalem as governed by a higher unity of design, and in so far not merely free from contradiction but carefully adjusted to one another with reference to the effect intended to be produced, the conversion of the people. The underlying thought is the same as in chap. 29:1-8: Jehovah is to wage war against Jerusalem, a war not of extermination, but of conquest, a war which will give Him possession of the city in the highest spiritual sense, and which must necessarily consist of two distinct movements, one destroying Israel's false confidence, the other disclosing to her the true source of security, the Assyrians to be in the former movement the instrument, in the latter the victims of the divine strategy.¹³⁶ Cheyne's observation that our passage resembles closely the second part of the Ariel prophecy is entirely correct. Only the cause of this resemblance is not to be sought in the supplementing of the two original woes by a late writer. The prophecies agree because they both apply to the reading of coming events the same profound knowledge of the principles on which the divine procedure is conducted. It is this inspired philosophy of history which enables Isaiah to discover and proclaim consistency of purpose where the critics find nothing but confusion and contradiction.

(Footnotes)

¹ The Song of Deborah (Judges 5), David's Song of the Bow (2 Sam. 1:19-27).

² The oldest material in Judges and Samuel and in the story of Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 13.

³ It is not accidental that the great evolutionary constructions of Israel's history date from the time when the posteriority of the Legal to the Prophetic period had become with the leading critics a settled conviction. Kuenen's *Religion of Israel* could not have been written before his espousal of the Grafian view between 1865 and 1869.

⁴ It is difficult to conceive of a mental attitude toward ancient prophecy sufficiently convinced on the one hand of its absolutely divine origin to conclude *a priori* that certain elements must be contained in it, and yet unscrupulous enough, on the other hand, to manipulate those divine oracles for the purpose of supplementing what was wanted. If we may believe the critics, the later scribes united these contradictory mental traits in themselves.

⁵ 1:14; 2:205-212; Z.A.W., 1:171.

⁶ pp. 155-157. Cf. further Kuenen, *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*, 2:21-25; Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 183; Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 187-220, and *Das Buch Jeremia* (who, however, rejects Stade's theory of a *systematic* redaction of the prophetic canon by the later scribes). Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, recently published in his *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, and Volz, *Die vorexilische Jahveprophetie und der Messias*, did not come to hand until after this article had been written.

⁷ It would be an entirely different matter, of course, if one were to eliminate from the discussion such sections of the prophetic books on whose date critical opinion departs from the traditional view independently of *a priori* considerations. The testimony of Isa. 40-66, for instance, might for argument's sake be excluded, without rendering further debate useless.

⁸ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, Prologue, xxi.

⁹ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 4.

¹⁰ Cheyne's Introduction to the new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xvi.

¹¹ Cf. Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja*, 22.

¹² Hoffmann, Z. A. W., 3:96, and Gunning, *De Godspraken van Amos*, 16, would have Amos think of Jerusalem as the Davidic residence in which the ideal unity of entire Israel had its center. But the judgment on the surrounding nations, and indeed on Judah itself, has no apparent connection with the political idea of Israel's unity.

¹³ Hoffmann's proposal (Z. A. W., 3:97), to take אֲשִׁיבֵנּוּ as Hiph. of שָׁב, "I will not allow it (i.e., the people) to dwell," is artificial and has found no acceptance.

¹⁴ *Theologie der Propheten*, 119.

¹⁵ *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 14:116; 25:125.

¹⁶ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1:571.

¹⁷ *Einleitung*, 176.

¹⁸ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 5:71.

¹⁹ Introduction to the new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xvi.

²⁰ *The Prophets of Israel* (new edition), 399.

²¹ *Hist. Krit. Onderzoek*, 1:174.

²² Cf. Isa. 2:3; 2 Chron. 17:3, 21:12, 22:3, 28:2.

²³ Robertson Smith well remarks: "In each case the appeal (to Jehovah's Lordship over nature) comes in to relieve the strain of intense feeling at a critical point in the argument" (*The Prophets of Israel*, new edition, 400). Cf. also Hoffmann (Z. A. W., 3:103): "[These passages] enable us to divine what the prophet saw before his eyes and is soon to mention by name." Wellhausen appeals to Hosea 13:4, where the Septuagint has a passage of similar character which is clearly an insertion. But it does not follow from this that the passages in Amos are to be placed on the same footing. For (1) that in Hosea fails in the Hebrew text; (2) it does not fit psychologically into the context as the verses in Amos do; (3) it may be easily explained as an imitation of the latter.

²⁴ Kuenen and others propose to throw out ver. 7 as an intrusion from 6:12. But the latter passage is only partly similar.

²⁵ König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 304. König observes that an interpolator would hardly have inserted the verses in a place apparently so inappropriate.

²⁶ Kuenen and Robertson Smith here also take a conservative position without fully realizing, it seems to me, the importance of the fact that such ideas were not merely natural to Amos himself, but that he could likewise assume familiarity with them on the part of his hearers. Kuenen compares Micah 1:2-4, but the expressions in Amos are stronger.

²⁷ The elimination of v. 26 by Wellhausen and Cheyne and that of 8:11, 12, by numerous critics, among these even König, is not directly connected with the development hypothesis. The former of these passages will be fully discussed in a later article.

²⁸ Wellhausen proposes to substitute "the sanctuary of Bethel."—*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 5:12.

²⁹ In Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, 401.

³⁰ Schwally, in *Z. A. W.*, 10:227.

³¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 5:94; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgesch.*, 183, 184; Cheyne, Introduction to the new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xv.

³² We pass by the argument that ver. 11 cannot be by Amos because it regards the Judean captivity as past. This is the customary denial of the possibility of supernatural prediction. Besides it overlooks the fact that "the breaches" represent the tabernacle of David as still partially standing. Cf. Cornill, *Einleitung*, 176, who here sides with Kuenen against the other critics.

³³ Wellhausen characterizes the contents of vers. 13-15 as "roses and lavender instead of blood and iron."

³⁴ Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 5:94; Smend, *Alltestam. Religionsgesch.*, 184.

³⁵ Cf. chap. 3:12; 5:3, 15.

³⁶ The words "and David their king" in ver. 5 are rejected by Wellhausen and Stade; the corresponding words in ver. 4, "without king and without prince," in addition by Cornill; the whole fifth verse by Oort (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 24:362).

³⁷ This symmetry is destroyed by Steiner's and Kuenen's proposal to take away the harshness of the transition by placing 2:1-3 after 2:25. There are other serious objections to this arrangement, chief among which is that in their new position the transposed verses would be a weak repetition of what immediately precedes. Cf. especially ver. 25 with ver. 1. See Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 215, whose five reasons, however, are not all equally convincing. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned proposal has the value of showing that to cautious criticism there is a wide difference between the recognition that a passage may have become displaced and the readiness to infer from every apparent want of connection that a strange hand must have been at work.

³⁸ Calvin and Hengstenberg assume a reference to Gen. 22:17, 32:13, as to promises which would in no wise fail of fulfillment, notwithstanding the casting off predicted in ver. 9. See the latter's *Christology of the O. T.*, 1:210.

³⁹ Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 215.

⁴⁰ Giesebrecht (*l. c.*) thinks that there is a conflict between 1:7, which promises the salvation, and 2:2, which presupposes the captivity of Judah. But unless "the land" in the latter passage be understood to mean the land of the exile (so Giesebrecht), there is no direct reference to the captivity of Judah at all. Besides this, is it not a fact that Isaiah also predicted both the final destruction of the southern kingdom with the exile of its inhabitants and the temporary deliverance of the same in the Assyrian crisis? If the two representations are inconsistent, why did not the interpolator consider them so? Or if they appeared harmonious later in view of what had actually come about, why should they not have appeared so beforehand in the prophetic vision of the future? Giesebrecht further objects to the clumsy phraseology of 1:7, "Jehovah will save Judah by Jehovah their God." But the disapproval of reliance upon the external instruments of war to the detriment of trust in Jehovah is a thoroughly Hoseanic thought and the peculiar phraseology simply serves to accentuate this idea.

⁴¹ The "going up" is here taken in the sense of Nahum 2:2; 1 Kings 15:17. The land is not that of the captivity,

but Canaan. See Nowack, *Der Prophet Hosea*, 14.

⁴² Chap. 3:4 might be supposed to reject the kingdom as such, on the view that the words “and David their king” are a late insertion, for in this case it might be claimed that all the things mentioned here, by being deprived of which Israel is to be punished—king-prince, sacrifice-mazzebah, ephod-teraphim—were to the prophet’s mind equally sinful. Even so, however, it would seem a straining of the point to make him reject these things in the abstract. No more could be safely inferred than that he considered them sinful in the form in which Israel used them. On the other hand, if the words “and David their king” are genuine, it follows immediately that Hosea expected the Davidic kingdom from his condemnation.

⁴³ Chap. 12:1 is the only apparent exception to this. But the text is very obscure and may be corrupt. Cornill, in *Z. A. W.*, 7:285-289, proposes to read instead of וְעַם קְדוּשִׁים נִצְמַד, and is faithful with the Holy One,” וְעַם קְדוּשִׁים נִצְמַד, “and is joined with Kedeshim.”

⁴⁴ There would be much more cause to expect that a late writer would address Judah, his only audience.

⁴⁵ Giesebrecht (*Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 214) tries to break the force of 4:15 by the suggestion that the statement may be a mere rhetorical one in the sense of “both need not have sinned; one could at least have obeyed; but both are equally condemnable.” But that the prophet means to be understood literally follows from the subjoined warning that Judah should not come to Gilgal neither go up to Beth-Aven.

⁴⁶ Giesebrecht seeks to save the depth and spirituality of the words by making them expressive of a wish of the prophet, a view which destroys the connection with what precedes and follows alike.

⁴⁷ For parallels cf. 2:9, 5:6, 7:16.

⁴⁸ Chap. 8:1 is called in question by Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (second edition) 443. In *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 5:17, the words are retained in the translation. It is also rejected by Krætzschmar (*Die Bundesvorstellung im A. T.*, 114). According to Oort (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 24:505), chap. 8:12 is possibly from the Deuteronomistic redactor.

⁴⁹ 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.

⁵⁰ Here, as also in regard to chaps. 9:1-6, 11:1-8, 32:1-5, 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.

⁵¹ *Z. A. W.*, 1:165; 4:292.

⁵² Cf. on this question, Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha*, 218-224.

⁵³ *Z. A. W.*, 1:166.

⁵⁴ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 128-130, 146-148.

⁵⁵ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 9-15.

⁵⁶ Cornill, *Z. A. W.*, 4:88, 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.

⁵⁷ Cf. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 8:459. Isaiah’s own first message came from the temple.

⁵⁸ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 128.

⁵⁹ Cf. Nowack’s Handkommentar, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 64, which denies the verse to the prophet on account of this universalistic conception.

⁶⁰ Handkommentar, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 64.

⁶¹ The words are applied to Stade’s reasoning by none less than Kuenen, *Hist. Krit. Ond.*, 2:40.

⁶² We have left chap. 29:7 and 33:3 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.

⁶³ Another thought in chap. 18:7 objected to as un-Isaianic will receive attention afterwards.

⁶⁴ To be sure, this passage also has been recently denied to Hosea by Volz, *Die vorexilische 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: 2:4b, 6, 8, 9, 10c, 12, 16-18, 20-25; 4:6, 11, 14b, 15a; 5:3b; 7:4; 8:5b; 9:9b; 10:3, 5c, 10, 13, 14b; 11:9a, 10b, 11; 12:4b-7, 13, 14. Thus the critical process moves steadily onward. Volz goes so far as to speak of a Proto- and Deutero-Hosea.

⁶⁵ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 20, 21.

⁶⁶ *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 8:460, 461.

⁶⁷ So Duhm, Wellhausen and apparently Stade (*Z. A. W.*, 4:149-151). 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 post-exilic origin of vers. 5, 6. But Hosea 5:15 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.

⁶⁸ Chap. 28:27.

⁶⁹ *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 222.

⁷⁰ Volz's treatise is known to me only from its review by Krätzschar in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 26, 1897.

⁷¹ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 126.

⁷² Cf. Smend, *Alt. Religionsgeschichte*, 307.

⁷³ 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."

⁷⁴ Stade thinks differently on this point *Z. A. W.*, 1:95, Note.

⁷⁵ Cf. also chap. 32:1, although the genuineness of this prophecy is doubted by many critics.

⁷⁶ E.g., Kuenen, *National Religions and Universal Religions*, 113 seq.

⁷⁷ 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.

⁷⁸ It cannot be denied that the meaning of 8:21, 22, 23a is rather obscure, but in itself this furnishes no reason for denying the connection between these verses and 8:23b and 9:1-6. All that the critics have been able to do is to make 8:21-23a, some of them including 20b, 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 9:1 seems to point back to the use of the same figure in 8:22, it is safer, notwithstanding the obscurity of the text, to assume the continuity of the discourse.

⁷⁹ 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 program 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 program, 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 programs 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 10:20, 21, 28:1-6, where "the remnant" = Judah. Hackmann, while successfully refuting the schemes of Guthe and Giesebrecht, proposes 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. 11, but only the possibility of its contemporaneousness with the outlook of chap. 10. Nevertheless their detachment of chap. 11:1-9 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 contemporaneousness of the two viewpoints in chaps. 10 and 11 respectively can be maintained.

⁸⁰ 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.

⁸¹ Cf. Jer. 3:15 and 23:4 with 23:5, 33:15.

⁸² Cf. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia, in loco*; of the other passage, 33:15, the genuineness is denied by several critics.

⁸³ *Die Messianische Weissagung* (2d ed.), 138-140.

⁸⁴ The occurrence of an isolated Aramaic loan-word, especially of a military term like סוּד, "soldier's boot," is easily explained in view of Isa. 36:11. 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 post-exilic age, yet the phraseological data are not on the whole markedly inconsistent with the authorship of Isaiah."

⁸⁵ Kuenen and Cornill still maintain the Isaianic authorship of chap. 19 as a whole.

⁸⁶ The literary evidence adduced in proof of the late origin of these sections has little weight. It consists partly of hapax legomena, partly of words occurring only once in Isaiah but vouched for by other ancient writings, partly of forms declared late on the ground of other disputed passages, one contingency being suspended on another. יְחִסֵּן, 23:18, is a hapax legomenon; so is עֵתִיק, *ibid.*; מִצְכָּה in 19:19 is the only example of the word in Isaiah, but it occurs twice in Hosea; the late character of הַנִּיחֵ יָד in 19:16 is supported by the late origin of 11:15, and *vice versa*. Similar lists might be gathered without difficulty from the undoubtedly genuine sections. There was nothing in Isaiah's style which forbade him the use of hapax legomena.

⁸⁷ Cf. chap. 8:18, and Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, 24, 25.

⁸⁸ That שׁ, "a present," must be late, because elsewhere occurring only in two Psalms alleged to be late, is certainly a rash inference. Nor is Cheyne justified in describing the rule of Jehovah which the Ethiopians will acknowledge by tribute as "a Messiahless, Israelitish empire;" even if this were correct it should not be counted as bearing against the Isaianic authorship, since Cheyne himself elsewhere makes the prominence of the kingship of Jehovah an instance against the genuineness of the Messianic prophecies in chaps. 9 and 11.

⁸⁹ *Z. A. W.*, 4:256-271.

⁹⁰ *Juda und die Assyrische Weltmacht in Programm der technischen Staatslehranstalten zu Chemnitz*, 1885, p. 13.

⁹¹ The same has been suggested by the late Prof. Kusters in *Theol. Tijdschrift*, May, 1898, p. 313.

⁹² Sørensen even upholds against Stade the genuineness of the larger part of chaps. 32 and 33.

⁹³ M. Brückner, *Die Komposition des Buches Jesaia*, Kap. 28-33, 1897.

⁹⁴ As chap. 37:35 expresses it, "For I will defend this city to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake."

⁹⁵ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, 101.

⁹⁶ "The Book of the Prophet Isaiah," in *The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments* ("Polychrome edition"), 141. Cf. also F.C. Porter in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 14, p. 29: "If he (Ahaz) believed in the prophetic word against Israel, he would not do what Israel did, play at politics and war, and he would fear, not an outward foe, but the God who judges righteously."

⁹⁷ It is, e.g., impossible that the comparative estimate of the religious value of the so-called Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah should not be affected by the former being assigned to the exilic, the latter to the post-exilic

period. Trito-Isaiah can never quite recover the reputation he had so long as his work was connected with chaps. 40-55.

⁹⁸ Cf. what Cheyne says in reference to the late version of the history of the Sennacherib-crisis contained in chaps. 36-37: "The alteration introduced into the portrait of Sennacherib by the Jewish writers is, for the historian, the most unfortunate of their inaccuracies. But who that rightly appreciates the spirit of the later Jews can seriously blame them? *The cultivation of a frame of mind out of which in due time evangelical religion might spring was of more consequence to them than historical exactness,*" (the italics are mine) (*Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 237).

⁹⁹ In accepting a fixed law as the expression of Jehovah's demands of Israel, prophetism is thought to have sacrificed the freedom which once had been the chief source of its power. By condescending to regulate the cult it succeeded, in part at least, in uprooting it from its original soil of naturalism and making it subservient to higher ethical aims: but the cult, however much purified, remained something external, in approving which the prophets relaxed their absolute insistence upon righteousness alone. If not yet in Jeremiah, in Ezekiel the new legal leaven so vigorously asserted itself as to modify essentially the prophetic spirit. The Deuteronomic reform laid the first foundation of Judaism. Cf. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 94-95; Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 279-291.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Hackmann, who remarks against Sörensen that Isaiah's energy of faith and political discernment suffice to account for the prophecy of chap. 18, and that it is not necessary to explain the prophet's confidence by his having heard of the approach of an army marching against the Assyrians (*Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 99).

¹⁰¹ Chap. 29:17; 32:15.

¹⁰² Chap. 33:14.

¹⁰³ Wellhausen's view, that vers. 1-4 do not relate to the real Samaria at all, but simply to Jerusalem ominously so called, and therefore date from the same period as the following sections, besides being too bold, does not account for אֲנִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל in ver. 7; for these words referring to the Jerusalemites show that the prophet distinguished between them and the inhabitants of Samaria.

¹⁰⁴ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 27-29.

¹⁰⁵ *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 53-69.

¹⁰⁶ We should go farther than this and say that not merely is there no place for such expectation as late as 724, but urge against Hackmann's own view that there is no place for it at any point of Isaiah's ministry, not even in the earliest period. The proof for this is chap. 6.

¹⁰⁷ So Dillmann, who, however, would confine "the residue" to those that will be left of the northern kingdom. But although Isaiah in his earlier prophecies clearly distinguishes between the judgment of Israel and that of Judah, he frequently represents the remnant as an organic unity proceeding from both. Cf. 8:23, 9:6, 10:20, 11:11-16, 17:6-8.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Meinhold in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1893, 746, who thinks that not only vers. 1-6 but chap. 28 as a whole dates from 724 and was prefixed by Isaiah to the later discourses of chaps. 29-31 as introduction.

¹⁰⁹ The figure of the hailstorm and tempest of 28:2 recurs more than once in chaps. 28-31. Cf. 28:17, 29:6, 30:30. This would seem to be an indication that Isaiah, in pronouncing or penning the Sennacherib-discourses, had in mind the oracle against Samaria delivered twenty years before, and furnishes an additional reason for believing that the prophet himself placed 28:1-6 at the head of the collection.

¹¹⁰ To a minor degree the same complexness of situation is already prefigured in the crisis of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (chap. 7). The deliverance of Judah is foretold and King Ahaz invited to exercise faith in it. He is rejected for his unbelief. Nevertheless the promise stands, and it is precisely the course determined upon by the unbelieving king which Jehovah uses to make true the predicted deliverance. But the deliverance itself again is double faced; while giving temporary relief it opens the door for the interposition of the Assyrians who will ultimately overwhelm Judah.

¹¹¹ Cf. Giesebrecht (*Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 188), who thinks that the admission of abruptness and unintelligibility in the prophetic discourse still shows the lingering influences of the Hengstenbergian view,

and directly contradicts the true character of prophecy. We on our part suspect that the one-sided emphasis thrown upon the ethical mission of prophetism and the modern form in which this is conceived of has more or less affected the psychology of prophetic revelation. Hence the seer is obscured by the preacher and popular orator. Of course the naturalistic tendency of the modern view works to the same effect, inasmuch as the visionary element in the prophetic experience marks most distinctly the direct contact with the supernatural.

¹¹² The suddenness in the succession of the events themselves is emphasized by Isaiah (cf. 29:5, 6).

¹¹³ *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 187-220.

¹¹⁴ He does not apply it to Hosea 2:1-3, but joins with other critics in declaring this passage an interpolation, on which see above.

¹¹⁵ Hackmann suggests that Ewald would probably have explained the intermingling of the two opposite elements from the literary revision and rearrangement to which Isaiah subjected his prophecies. He thinks, however, that such explanation is not only insufficient in this particular instance, but inadmissible in every case in the present state of Isaiah-criticism, because it is far from certain that Isaiah was a literary prophet at all. The traditional conception of him as a writer has been thoroughly discredited by the latest results of the analysis of the book bearing his name. One might well ask whether this consequence of the critical operations should not of itself suffice to compromise the latter in the eyes of all sober-minded people. Amos and Hosea, who were both plain men, are admitted to have written; how then can we believe that Isaiah, who moved in the highest circles of the capital, could have neglected the opportunity offered him to secure by this means a wider hearing and longer life for his prophecies? Then there is also the problem of accounting for the transmission of so many confessedly genuine prophecies in so pure and perfect a form. If Isaiah did not write himself, and if for their preservation we are indebted to his disciples, the character of their work is such that we shall have to assume some sort of supervision by the prophet himself and this brings us back again to a point not so very far removed from the old conception of the literary prophet.

¹¹⁶ Duhm and Cheyne both insist that vers. 9-12 lack all connection with the preceding oracle concerning Ariel. But neither of them is successful in his interpretation of the imperatives in ver. 9. Cheyne makes the verse mean "that the rulers are culpably insensible to the divine teaching in prophecy and history." Insensibility, however, is not synonymous with amazement. Cheyne's translation is: "Feign astonishment, and ye shall be astonished indeed; feign blindness, and ye shall be blind indeed;" this takes the second imperative in each pair as consecutive to the first, and understands the second of amazement and blindness produced by the events of the judgment when these come. Still the question remains why a prophecy of disaster from Isaiah should have made the rulers feign astonishment. And the thought that the reality of the judgment will *blind* the sinners is far from natural. The latter remark bears against Duhm also, who refers all four imperatives to the future effect of the judgment and speaks of a blindness resulting from contact with the supernatural.

¹¹⁷ **הַסֵּפֶר** in ver. 12 has the generic article. A different book from the one mentioned in ver. 11, not sealed but open, is meant. The above explanation seems to me more plausible than the application of the twofold form of the figure to the two classes of the educated leaders and the uneducated mass. There will be still another reference to the strange character of the prophet's discourses if we may follow up a suggestion of Meinhold in regard to the interpretation of chap. 28:9-13 (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1893, 26-30). Meinhold thinks that "the word of Jehovah" (ver. 13) characterized by the syllables *Zaw Lazaw Zaw Lazaw, Kaw Lakaw Kaw Lakaw* cannot, as the usual exposition takes it, consist in the *sermo realis* of the invading Assyrians with their strange tongue, because the construction with **לְמַעַן** shows that the speech referred to is to render ripe for judgment and consequently not identical with the judgment itself: "The word of Jehovah has become unto them *Zaw Lazaw, etc.*, in order that they might go and fall backward, etc." It must, therefore, be the speech of Jehovah through the prophet. But Isaiah intimates that this speech now assumes a mysterious form for the purpose of hardening and blinding the unbelievers. Interrupted in their debauch, they had mockingly described Isaiah's words of ver. 7 as *Zaw Lazaw Zaw Lazaw, Kaw Lakaw Kaw Lakaw*, i.e., as meaningless, stammering sounds such as are used to teach children, just weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts, the first rudiments of speech (cf. the form of ver. 7 in the original). The prophet accepts this charge of the mockers, but adds

that the dark, oracular sounds issuing from his mouth are intended to lead them on to destruction. There is much in favor of this interpretation. It is possible that expositors have been too hasty in inferring that ver. 13a must express the same thought as ver. 11. Isaiah may well have replied to the charge of the revelers in a twofold way: (1) that his childish language is but the preface to a more fearful strange tongue they will hear from Jehovah in the accents of the Assyrian conqueror (ver. 11); (2) that the very form of the prophetic address serves the purpose of judicially confirming them in their culpable inability to understand the truth (ver. 13). The common view according to which *Zaw Lazaw Kaw Lakaw* signifies “precept upon precept, line upon line,” or “level upon level, plumb-line upon plumb-line,” and is intended to ridicule the censoriousness of the prophet’s word with its everlasting admonitions, is not without difficulties. The appeal to ver. 17 in favor of it is not conclusive. True, *קו* occurs here in the sense of “measuring-line,” but if an allusion to vers. 10 and 13 had been in the prophet’s mind, he would have used *צו* in parallelism and not the different term of *משקלת*. If Meinhold’s exegesis were to be adopted it might be perhaps slightly modified by understanding *והיה* in ver. 13 as a consecutive perfect: “The word of Jehovah shall become,” referring not merely to what precedes, but also to the character of the following discourses. The whole matter, however, is uncertain, so that I have not made use of it in the discussion above.

¹¹⁸ (n.b. Vos’s table has been converted to sentence form. – J.K.)

¹¹⁹ The following shows which sections of chaps. 28-33 are retained as Isaianic by the various recent critics: Duhm: 28:1-4, 7-22, 23-29; 29:1-4a, 5c-7, 9-10, 13-14, 15; 30:1-5, 6-7, 8-17, 27-33; 31:1-4a, 5b-c, 8a, 9b; 32:1-5, 9-14, 15-18a, 20. Hackmann: 28:1-4, 7-22, 23-29 (?); 29:1-7, 9-12, 13-14, 15; 30:1-5, 6-7, 8-17; 31:1-4; 32:9-14 (?), 15-20 (?). Cheyne: 28:1-4, 7-13, 14-22; 29:1-4a, 6, 9-12 (9-10), 13-14, 15; 30:1-5, 6-7, 8-17; 31:1-5a.

¹²⁰ The words *והיה לפתע פתאם*, “it shall be at an instant suddenly,” ought to be read at the beginning of the sixth verse. So Duhm and Cheyne.

¹²¹ Cf. 5:28, 9:18, 10:17, 17:13, 30:13, 27, 30.

¹²² The case of chap. 30:13, where the similar words *פתאם לפתע* refer to the coming catastrophe, is totally different, because here no description of the instrumentality of the judgment precedes.

¹²³ The other explanation of Ariel, which at present finds most favor, is likewise beset with difficulties. The use of the article in Ezek. 43:15 seems to exclude the view that it is a compound with El, “the altar-hearth of God.” To take it as altar-hearth simply, yields no sufficiently transparent symbolism. There must be some connection between the meaning of Ariel and the fact of David’s encamping there. The Septuagint rendering makes it probable that some words of ver. 1 have been lost, and it may be owing to this that the problem has become insoluble.

¹²⁴ In ver. 3 read with the Septuagint *כדוד* instead of *כדור*, “I will encamp like David against thee.” From the obvious connection between these words and ver. 1 it follows that the Septuagint is right in translating: *πολις ην επολεμησε Δαυιδ*, “the city against which David fought.”

¹²⁵ Duhm considers ver. 4b as a gloss, and rejects 5a-b and 8 as editorial enlargement of ver. 6, reproducing with substantial correctness Isaiah’s meaning in the last-mentioned verse. Stade, on the other hand, would omit ver. 7 and retain ver. 8, thinking that the former arose from a misunderstanding of the figure in ver. 8.

¹²⁶ Even if it could be admitted that “a dream,” “a vision of the night” (ver. 7) were suitable figures for expressing the multitudinousness of the enemies, the words, “the multitude of the terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away” (v. 5), admit of but one meaning, viz., that the besiegers will be suddenly swept off the scene.

¹²⁷ *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, p. 36, Note 1.

¹²⁸ *ערייך* is, to be sure, most naturally understood of the foreign tyrant, although even it does not bear that meaning exclusively. Cf. Jer. 15:21. But the case is altogether different with *לך* and the other terms used. As Cheyne well puts it: *ערייך* is the external, *לך* the internal foe of Israel. Nevertheless, a few lines later, he himself again confuses the matter by saying that the *לצים* are described as *עריצים* (*Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 195).

¹²⁹ “They look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Jehovah! yet He also is wise, etc.”

¹³⁰ The words, “Is it not yet a very little while” (ver. 17), show how the immediate nearness of the vision of

regeneration, due to the peculiar prophetic perspective, contributes toward rendering the contrast all the more effective.

¹³¹ Cheyne thinks that the author boldly conceives of Jehovah as being Himself visibly present among Israel to teach the pious, and that this points to a time when prophecy no longer existed. But this interpretation of ver. 20, "thy Teacher shall not be *hidden any more*," is far from necessary. The supposition is rather that at one time Jehovah was visible, when His prophets were heard, that afterwards He became hidden, and that in the future He will become visible again in precisely the same sense He was so originally, i.e., through prophetic revelation. The silencing of the prophets (vers. 10, 11) is a wicked removal of Jehovah, the resumption of prophetic teaching (vers. 20, 21) will be a reappearance of Jehovah; both cases are entirely parallel. The reference to conversion from idolatry in ver. 22 also makes it probable that in vers. 20, 21, something is described which forms a contrast to the people's previous conduct.

¹³² *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 203, 204.

¹³³ So the Revised Version, Ewald, Dillmann, Bredenkamp and others.

¹³⁴ Cf. Isa. 29:7, 8; Zech. 14:12.

¹³⁵ The lion in the figure is not represented at the point where he has already seized the prey, but as uttering the growl that usually precedes his leaping upon it (cf. Isa. 5:29). The idea is that the shouting of the shepherds fails to deflect him from his purpose. So it is declared of Jehovah in ver. 2 that "He will not call back his words."

¹³⁶ From the above it appears how unfounded is Cheyne's charge of lack of consecutiveness against the passage (vers. 5-9). The inner arrangement of these verses is perfectly logical and their coherence with what precedes of the closest. Especially ver. 8 points back most significantly to ver. 3. The Assyrian is to fall indeed, but not until all human power arrayed against him has been disposed of. Cheyne himself is constrained to admit that at least the rhythm and style of ver. 8a are characteristically Isaianic. The same may be said of ver. 9b.