

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 28.—APRIL, 1894.

I. THE ATTRACTIONS OF POPERY.

DR. JOHN H. RICE, with the intuition of a great mind, warned Presbyterians against a renewed prevalence of popery in our Protestant land. This was when it was so insignificant among us as to be almost unnoticed. Many were surprised at his prophecy, and not a few mocked; but time has fulfilled it. Our leaders from 1830 to 1860 understood well the causes of this danger. They were diligent to inform and prepare the minds of their people against it. Hence General Assemblies and Synods appointed annual sermons upon popery, and our teachers did their best to arouse the minds of the people. Now, all this has mainly passed away, and we are relaxing our resistance against the dreaded foe just in proportion as he grows more formidable. It has become the fashion to condemn controversy and to affect the widest charity for this and all other foes of Christ and of souls. High Presbyterian authority even is quoted as saying, that henceforth our concern with Romanism should be chiefly irenic! The figures presented by the census of 1890 are construed in opposite ways. This gives the papists more than fourteen millions of adherents in the United States, where ninety years ago there were but a few thousands. Such Protestant journals as think it their interest to play sycophants to public opinion try to persuade us that these figures are very consoling; because, if Rome had kept all the natural increase of her immigrations the numbers would have been larger. But Rome points to them with insolent triumph as prognostics of an assured victory over Protestantism on this continent. Which will prove correct?

II. DR. DRIVER ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH XIII. AND XIV.

ON first reading Dr. Driver's argument for the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters, one is apt to find himself saying, in the words of Agrippa, "Almost thou persuadest me." This is the more likely to be the case if he has read the preceding pages of Dr. Driver's able book; for then he will come to the consideration of the discussion of this particular question, impressed not only with the extent of Dr. Driver's learning and the accuracy of his scholarship, but, what is of much more importance, impressed also with his candor and evident intention to deal reverently with God's word. Further, he can scarcely fail to perceive that there is not a little justice in the views advanced in regard to the relation between a prophecy and its historical genesis, and that these views, judiciously applied, are capable of yielding the happiest results. This favorable impression, moreover, will remain and exert its powerful influence, notwithstanding the fact that the reader may have observed all along that Dr. Driver habitually overlooks or discards considerations which may seem to him to be of prime importance. If, under such circumstances, the "almost" fails to become an "altogether," the fault may lie in the prejudices or the unreasonable fears of the reader, but it is also at least possible that it may lie in some weak link in the argument that has been overlooked by Dr. Driver.

Now, the present writer, after patient and candid study, finds himself unable to accept Dr. Driver's conclusion as to the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters. He at least persuades himself that his abiding conviction that Isaiah, and not some unknown writer of the time of the exile, is their author, is due not to prejudice. On the contrary, it seems to him that Dr. Driver's own principles and formal admissions demand a conclusion the very opposite of that at which that distinguished scholar has arrived. Let us see

The following extract¹ will put the reader in possession of Dr. Driver's statement of the case :

“The first of these prophecies is one on Babylon (xiii. 2–xiv. 23), which differs from all the other prophecies of Isaiah which have hitherto been reviewed, in the remarkable circumstance that it stands *unrelated to Isaiah's own age*. The Jews are not warned, as Isaiah might warn them (xxxix. 6), against the folly of concluding an alliance with Babylon, or reminded of the disastrous consequences which such an alliance might entail; nor are they even represented, as in Jeremiah, as threatened with impending exile; they are represented as *in exile*, and as about to be delivered from it (xiv. 1, 2). It is of the very essence of prophecy to address itself to the needs of the prophet's own age; it was the prophet's office to preach to his own contemporaries, to announce to them the judgments, or the consolations, which arose out of the circumstances of their own time, to interpret for them their own history. As far as we have hitherto gone, this is what Isaiah has uniformly done. His prophecies have been replete with allusions to contemporary history—to Ephraim, Damascus, and the Assyrians. That history is the foundation upon which his grandest predictions rest. Here, on the other hand, the allusions are not to Assyria, but to *Babylon*; not the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, who sought Hezekiah's friendship, which was known to Isaiah (xxxix.), but the Babylon of the exile, which held the Jews in cruel bondage (xiv. 2, 3), and was shortly to be destroyed by the Medes (xiii. 17). To base a promise upon a condition of things *not yet existent*, and without any point of contact or association with those to whom it is addressed, is alien to the genius of prophecy. . . . With the long invective against Babylon contained in these chapters of Jeremiah (*i. e.*, chapters l., li.), the present prophecy is, indeed, in temper and spirit, remarkably akin; whilst, on the other hand, it exhibits few or none of the accustomed marks of Isaiah's style.”

Again, in another place,² he says :

“The first of these prophecies consists of an announcement of the approaching fall of Babylon (xiii. 19), and of the subsequent

¹ *Isaiah: His Life and Times*. By Rev. S. A. Driver, D. D., p. 85 f. ² *Ibid.*, p. 126 f.

release of the Jews (xiv. 1, 2) from the land of their exile. The reasons which forbid our attributing it to Isaiah have been stated briefly already (p. 86). The prophet is, in the first instance, *the teacher of his own generation*; hence it is a fundamental principle of prophecy that the historical situation of the prophet should be the basis of his prediction. Isaiah lived during the Assyrian supremacy; and it is the failure of *a particular Assyrian king* to destroy or subjugate Judah which he uniformly foretells. In the present prophecy Babylon is represented as holding the empire of the world (xiii. 19; xiv. 6f.), which it exercises in particular (xiv. 1, 2) *by holding the Jews in exile*; and it is *the city and empire of Babylon* whose overthrow is announced in it. By analogy it will have been written during the period of the Babylonian supremacy; for it is arbitrary to suppose (as has been done) that Babylon may have been mentioned by Isaiah as the 'representative' of Assyria. Not only does Babylon appear here as the sole and supreme seat of the world empire, but Babylon, in Isaiah's day, so far from being the representative of Assyria, was its antagonist, ever struggling to win independence (pp. 45, 55, 96). Moreover, the two empires of Assyria and Babylon are quite distinct in the old Testament; the *rôle* which they play in history is very different; they are never confused, still less 'identified,' by the prophets. The embassy of Merodach-Baladan, the temporary king of Babylon, to Hezekiah, afforded Isaiah a substantial motive for announcing a future exile to Babylon. It could supply no motive for such a promise of subsequent return from exile as these chapters contain. The circumstances of the exile—while the Jews were still in bondage, and the power of Babylon seemed yet unshaken—constitute a suitable and sufficient occasion for the present prophecy, an occasion of exactly the nature which the analogy of prophecy demands. On the other hand, the circumstances of Isaiah's age supply no such occasion. It only remains to add (for the purpose of obviating misconception) that in assigning the prophecy to a date during the exile, we do not divest it of its *predictive* character; it becomes no *vaticinium ex eventu*. The language of chapter xiii. makes it certain that it was written *prior* to the capture of Babylon by the Medes in 538.

Written some few years before this event, it would be as fully and truly predictive as were Isaiah's prophecies of the failure of Sennacherib (chaps. xxix.—xxxii.), which, indeed, as we have seen, preceded the event by not more than a single year."

This is substantially Dr. Driver's latest word upon this subject. It is unmodified by anything that he has said in his recent work on *Old Testament Literature*. We have quoted thus at length in order that Dr. Driver might have the full benefit of his argument, and we, the full benefit of his admissions.

I. In considering the above extracts, we desire the reader's attention, first of all, to some things which *do not* constitute the grounds upon which Dr. Driver feels constrained to reject the Isaianic authorship of these chapters. Attention to this point is a matter of justice to Dr. Driver. It may also prove to be a matter of importance in justifying the conclusion at which we hope to arrive as against Dr. Driver.

(a.) Let it be carefully noted, then, that Dr. Driver does not deny the Isaianic authorship of the chapters in question, because the recognition of it would carry along with it the *recognition of the supernatural in history and revelation*. If we understand Dr. Driver, he admits not only that God may interpose in human affairs, but he distinctly affirms that God did interpose, and that, too, directly and immediately, in the affairs of Israel. He believes not only in the supernatural in general, but also in the supernatural in the form of miracles. If we do not misconceive him, he has no more difficulty about admitting a miracle in the sphere of mind than one in that of matter. What he insists upon, and this is scarcely a matter for censure, is that before a divine interposition be admitted it should be shown that there is "*dignus vindice nodus*." It is much to be regretted that Dr. Driver, and other of his fellow-workers, should so express themselves as to create the impression upon many minds that they either have already, or else are just about, to surrender their belief in the supernatural. Such, however, is not the case. Dr. Driver believes in the supernatural. He is entitled to credit for this fact as a matter of personal justice, and we are entitled to the benefit of it as a matter of argument. For proven the "*nodus*,"

then, Dr. Driver cannot, upon his own principle, refuse to admit the "*vindex*."

(b.) He does not deny it, because to admit it would be to admit that there is such a thing as predictive prophecy in the strict and proper sense. Dr. Driver himself believes in predictive prophecy, and that, too, in the strict and proper sense, namely, as involving the announcement of an event still future, the occurrence of which could only be foreseen by God, and the announcement of which, upon the part of the prophet, is only to be explained upon the ground that he has learned it by a direct revelation from God. We say that Dr. Driver believes in predictive prophecy *in this sense*. Our warrant for the statement is, that he himself says that he does.

(c.) He does not deny it, because to admit it would be to admit that a prophet might predict a *definite* event belonging to the distant future, that is, lying entirely beyond his own time's horizon—lying beyond it, we mean, in the sense that there was nothing in the political or moral situation, as it presented itself to the natural eye of the prophet or his contemporaries, to suggest, still less to justify, the prediction of the occurrence of the particular event predicted. Dr. Driver himself believes in the prediction of just such events by both Isaiah and Jeremiah. He admits, for instance, the Isaianic authorship of Isaiah xxxix. 5-7; but this passage contains a prediction of the deportation of the Jews to Babylon. Now, this event did not occur for more than one hundred years, and so belonged to the distant future. And let it be noticed further, that there was nothing either in the political or moral situation to suggest, still less to justify, the occurrence of a deportation to *this particular place*, though that was evidently of the very essence of the prediction. Again, Dr. Driver admits that Jeremiah xxv. 11-12, is from the hand of Jeremiah.¹ This contains a prediction of the return from the Babylonish captivity. It was uttered something like seventy years before that event, and so belongs to the distant future. And here again, as in the previous case, there was nothing in the political or moral situation, as it presented itself to the eyes of Jeremiah or his contem-

¹ *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, page 244.

poraries, to suggest, still less to justify, the expectation of the occurrence of such an event. The language is either a "*vaticinium ex eventu*," or a prediction of a definite event belonging to the distant future, and in the sense above defined, beyond the time's horizon of the prophet who uttered it. Dr. Driver holds it to be the latter.

(*d.*) He does not deny it upon the ground that the prophetic writings "supply no analogy for such a sustained transference to the future as would be implied if these chapters were by Isaiah, or for the detailed and definite description of the circumstances of a distant age." He urges this as an objection against the Isaianic authorship of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but not against that of these chapters. Doubtless he had a reason for this, and certainly the most obvious reason is that he himself perceived that, if laid, the objection could not be sustained.

(*e.*) He does not deny it because his scholarship has led him to the discovery of any deficiency, defects, or conflicts in the *external* evidence for the genuineness of these chapters. He admits that the external evidence, such as it is, is wholly in favor of the Isaianic authorship of these chapters. He admits that in this respect, at least, they stand upon exactly the same footing as that of the first twelve chapters, the Isaianic authorship of which he himself allows. Hence, his rejection of the genuineness of chapters xiii. and xiv. is confessedly in the face of the external evidence.

These points are negative in form, but, unless we are greatly mistaken, they will be found to be full of positive significance. We bespeak for them the careful consideration of every reader. We have been at the pains to state them—*First*: merely as a matter of justice to Dr. Driver. If any merit attaches to retaining one's belief in the supernatural and in predictive prophecy; if any merit attaches to the bold avowal of such a belief in the face of the oppositions of this naturalistic age, then this distinguished scholar should have the credit for it. Conservative writers who for any reason misconceive or misrepresent his position here only injure their cause and themselves, as well as do a gross injustice to Dr. Driver. It matters not that Dr. Driver is not always self-consistent. Few of us are. It matters not that he holds views and

adopts methods upon other points that are dangerous. Upon the particular point now under consideration he has, in his latest book, put himself upon record in utterances of unmistakable plainness, which commit him to the position we have indicated above. He is unquestionably entitled to the credit of his position, and we to the benefit of it. *Second*: In order to emphasize a point which seems to us of prime importance, and yet one which is only too frequently overlooked, and that, too, by those who can least afford to do so. It is a sad fact, and yet one that cannot be denied, that many eminent Old Testament scholars have lost, or are fast losing, their faith in the supernatural, properly so called, and along with it their faith in the existence of any such thing as predictive prophecy. Many of the younger and less discriminating minds among the so-called progressives and radicals are apt to attribute this loss of faith in the supernatural upon the part of their leaders to the vast oriental learning, the superior methods of historical criticism, together with the greater intellectual acumen, freedom, and boldness of these trusted leaders, and to attribute their own loss of faith in the supernatural to the fact that they are, at least relatively to their youth and opportunities, far in advance of the conservative herd in these same respects. But as regards the leaders, such a case as that of Dr. Driver, even standing by itself, would suggest that there is some mistake somewhere in this conclusion. Few will be disposed to challenge the extent and accuracy of his learning in the Old Testament field, or his intellectual acumen and discipline. He follows, too, the most approved methods of criticism, and yet he retains his faith in the supernatural. As regards the flattering view which these neophytes take of their own attainments, it will be enough, at present, to say that it is more soothing to their vanity than indicative of their self-knowledge or their discrimination. This above all others is a time for every honest-minded, brave-hearted lover of truth among our younger scholars to distrust himself and to search into his motives. When the announcement, "*Le roi est mort!*" has gone forth, it is easy enough to shout, "*Vive le roi!*" This, however, is not the shout of freemen, but of those who exchange one master for another. For ourselves, we see no advan-

tage that the new traditionalism has over the old. The essential characteristics of each are the same. They are indolence, cowardice, and a cringing subservience to authority. Better to follow the counsel of the fearless old apostle, "Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good." But, *third*: we have been at the pains to call attention to these points in order, if possible, to eliminate certain irrelevant issues from this discussion. If we are to judge intelligently of the soundness of Dr. Driver's conclusion, we must be willing to take whatever pains are necessary in order to get clearly before us the ground, the only ground, upon which that conclusion rests, or can rest. Let it be constantly borne in mind, then, that—When Dr. Driver admits that God did from time to time reveal the future to his servants the prophets, he virtually admits that, looking merely at the abstract possibilities of the case, apart from the evidence as it relates to this particular case, God might have put these chapters in the mouth of Isaiah. This is not all. Dr. Driver's admissions here would seem to compel him to go further, and to admit that, proven a need for such a message as the one contained in these chapters, upon the part of the contemporaries of Isaiah, then, in connection with the external evidence, we would have strong, or, rather, unimpeachable, grounds for admitting their Isaianic authorship. At least, that is the way in which he himself seeks to establish the Isaianic authorship of chapters i.—xii. What he denies is not the *possibility*, but the *propriety*, of God's putting such a message as that contained in these chapters in the mouth of Isaiah. This, as we shall see, constitutes the very core of his objection to the view that they proceeded from Isaiah. Some may think that this raises a question of no less difficulty than delicacy. Certainly, in view of the fact that so many of God's ways are absolutely inscrutable to finite minds, it becomes us to be slow and cautious in asserting that the impropriety of such a message as this in the mouth of Isaiah is so great that God could not have put it there. Much in such a case depends upon one's standpoint, and it is not always easy for us to ascertain, or even duly to appreciate, the divine standpoint. True, Dr. Driver might say that the question, after all, is not of any great difficulty or delicacy, but resolves itself

into striking the balance between two probabilities, a task to which even ordinary minds are equal. Is it more probable that the fallible human tradition which assigns these chapters to Isaiah is in error, or that the indications in the body of the prophecy itself, which seem to make it only suitable to a later age, are misleading? It will be observed, however, that, even when the question is stated thus, it resolves itself into one as to the suitability or propriety of such a message as this in the mouth of Isaiah. Let the reader bear this in mind as we proceed.

Let him also bear in mind the fact that Dr. Driver does not allege the length of time which elapsed between the utterance of the prophecy contained in these chapters and its fulfilment as an objection against their Isaianic authorship. If at times Dr. Driver seems a little confused and vacillating in dealing with this point, it need not disturb us. For even if he were disposed to base an objection upon the matter of time, he is, by his own admissions, debarred from doing so. As we have seen, he admits that Jeremiah predicted the return from captivity seventy years before its occurrence. He also admits that Isaiah predicted the exile more than one hundred years before it took place. How, then, could he reasonably maintain that Isaiah could not have predicted the return from exile, when that event lay only seventy years farther in the future. Seventy years—why, what are they among so many? The time factor can only enter into our problem as it bears upon the question of *timeliness*. Let it be remembered, then, that Dr. Driver's objection to the Isaianic authorship of these chapters hinges not upon the question of time, but simply and solely upon that of *timeliness*. He maintains that in the mouth of Isaiah these chapters would have been "born out of due time"; and, so, would have served no useful purpose.

While many would urge the definiteness and detail of description of these chapters as against their Isaianic authorship, let it be remembered that Dr. Driver does not, and, we may add, cannot. True, the objection, if urged, would be utterly destitute of weight. The prophecy does not contain a definite and detailed description of the things predicted. On the contrary, while the picture presented is vivid, the terms employed in painting it are of the most

general kind. Granted that the event of a return from exile had been revealed to Isaiah in its naked simplicity; granted that he had poetic genius at all commensurate with his reputation, and the picture here drawn of the downfall of Babylon might easily have proceeded from him. The reference to the Medes as the instruments in executing the divine vengeance (xii. 17) is the only thing approaching definiteness of detail in either chapter. But, if any one think that it is inappropriate for God to descend to such definiteness of detail in revealing the future, if any regard such definiteness of detail as doing violence to the "analogy of prophecy," we should not forget that there lies ready to our hand that ever-easy to be invoked hypothesis of an interpolation. We confess that we do not admire the haste with which many resort to this suspiciously subservient hypothesis. To us it looks too much like quack criticism. Still, it is the vogue just at present, the panacea of those who have foregone conclusions to establish in the face of stubborn facts. Why then, if need there be, should it not be applied to this single verse rather than to the prophecy as a whole? What surgeon in his senses would think of cutting off a healthy arm in order, forsooth, to get rid of a small wart upon the extremity of the little finger? Whatever may be thought of such a procedure in criticism, in surgery it would be pronounced wanton butchery. But, we say again, that whatever objection others might urge upon this score, Dr. Driver can offer none. For, has he not admitted that a prediction of the distant future may be definite as to the event predicted, definite as to the place where the event is to occur, definite as to the time within which it is to occur? How, then, can he deny that it may also be definite as to the persons through whose instrumentality it is to be effected? No, Dr. Driver's objection might be summed up in two words—*cui bono?* Why should Isaiah reveal to the men of his generation an event that was not to occur until after they and their children and their children's children had all gone to their long home? What profit is there in such prophecies for those to whom they are primarily addressed? The event predicted is too remote, and the persons mentioned by name too utterly unknown even to

awaken the curiosity of Isaiah's contemporaries. The historical situation being what it was in Isaiah's day, Dr. Driver holds that the terms of this prophecy would have been meaningless, and hence necessarily useless, had it been uttered in the ears of Isaiah's contemporaries.

In order that we may have the real issue, the single issue, involved in Dr. Driver's objection clearly before our minds, it will be useful for us to press our analysis one step further. Let it be understood, then, that Dr. Driver's position as to the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters is not to be referred to *any light* which he, more than another, has upon this special point, such as might be supposed to belong to him in view of his admitted pre-eminence in Semitic studies, and his acquaintance with the results of modern archæological research. It cannot be traced to any new translation of the Hebrew. No more can it be traced to anything new in his statement of the historical environment. We should not, then, permit our judgment to be blinded by the halo which Dr. Driver's eminent ability and learning are apt to throw around any opinion to which he may lend the sanction of his name. It should be understood that we have to do mainly, if not merely, with certain preconceptions of Dr. Driver as to *the propriety, the timeliness, the utility*, of such a prediction as this, if attributed to Isaiah.

The real centre and core of his objection to the Isaianic authorship of these chapters is, that "no intelligible purpose would be subserved by Isaiah's announcing to the generation of Hezekiah an occurrence lying like this in the distant future, and having no bearing upon contemporary interests." It is true that he appeals to the analogy of prophecy, and to the internal evidence which the prophecy is supposed to furnish of its exilic date. It is true, also, that he undertakes to show that the Babylon of these chapters is not the Babylon of Isaiah's day, and further, that Isaiah had no motive for such a prediction as they contain. But all of these points are, after all, merely subordinate and ancillary to the position noted above. They derive their significance from the support which they are supposed to lend and the weight they are supposed to give to that position. We shall, as we proceed, notice

these points, but we wish the reader to understand in advance that, though Dr. Driver spends his main strength upon them, they do not constitute the cutting edge of his contention against the genuineness of the chapters. Dr. Driver, we will not say artfully, but unfortunately, gives such prominence to these subordinate points that the reader is apt to overlook the fact that Dr. Driver's real difficulty lies not in the external evidence, nor in any specific tangible feature of the internal evidence, but rather in this, that it is contrary to his own internal sense of the fitness of things that Isaiah should bother himself or his contemporaries with events that were not to occur until they and their children had been long dead, events, accordingly (let the reader mark the *non-sequitur*), which could have no bearing upon contemporary interest.

II. We proceed next to notice certain propositions which Dr. Driver lays down, and upon which he seems to lay great stress, propositions which, while they are in the main correct in themselves, yet lend no support to his view as to the non-Isaianic authorship of these particular chapters, because of the fact that they are irrelevant, or, at least, are not shown to be relevant, to that issue.

These propositions will be found, we think, to furnish Dr. Driver with the major premise of his argument. If our analysis of his discussion is correct, that premise is: *every genuine prophecy must bear directly upon the interests of the contemporaries of the prophet from whom it purports to come.* We comment upon the propositions about to be given, for two reasons: *First*, because while all of them are true in a general sense, some, if not all, will need more or less modification before they will express the whole or the exact truth. *Second*, because Dr. Driver seems to intimate that they are either denied, ignored, or overlooked by those who accept the Isaianic authorship of these chapters. Such, however, is by no means the case. We impeach the correctness not of his major, but of his minor premise. The latter, as already intimated, is: the prophecy of these chapters has no intelligible relation to or bearing upon the interests of those who were contemporary with Isaiah.

First: then, Dr. Driver says¹: "The prophet is, in the first instance, *the teacher of his own generation.*" Put the emphasis upon the words, "*in the first instance,*" where it clearly belongs by right, and this becomes a simple elementary truth which no one denies. The only conceivable reason for referring to it here is to produce, if possible, the impression that, had Isaiah uttered these words, he would not have been fulfilling his function as a teacher of his own age. This impression, however, would only be correct, provided this prophecy contained no profitable lessons for the people of Isaiah's own time. This is a proposition which Dr. Driver did not seem to think it worth his while to trouble himself with proving. He does not prove it, though he sometimes asserts it, and then again, as here, suggests it. He does not even try to prove it. While, then, we may admit the correctness of the statement, we deny its relevancy, until it has been proved that these chapters in the mouth of Isaiah would have been without instruction for his contemporaries.

Second: In the same connection Dr. Driver adds: "Hence it is a fundamental principle of prophecy that the historical situation of the prophet should be the basis of his prediction." Here, again, there can be no exception to what is said, provided only that the emphasis be placed upon the proper word, and that word is clearly "*basis,*" though we submit that "*occasion*" would be preferable, because less ambiguous. All, we suppose, are prepared to admit that the prophet's historical environment must furnish, so to speak, the starting point of all his predictions, otherwise his utterances would have been meaningless riddles to the men of his own day, riddles that would scarcely have awakened sufficient curiosity to have insured their preservation and perpetuation for the benefit of those whom they more particularly concerned. It is one thing to say this, however, and quite a different thing to assert, as Dr. Driver seems, inconsistently, to imply, that prophecy must have its goal as well as its starting point in the prophet's own present. If this were true, where would be the room for, or what the use of predictive prophecy? Predictive prophecy, while it ever takes its rise in the present,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

also ever projects itself, and aims to carry the thoughts of its contemporaries forward with it into the future. It is like a bird of passage, whose tuneful notes first strike the ears and cheer the hearts of those from among whom it takes its flight, but, in so doing, only remind them that the full sweetness of that liquid melody is not for themselves, but for those in other, happier climes, where the swift-winged songster is to find its final home. We are persuaded that the underlying fallacy of Dr. Driver's thinking here and elsewhere is, that it is only the *past* and the *present* which are competent to teach the present. We hope to show that the future, where her voice can be heard, even though it be but indistinctly, is no less potent a teacher of the present than is the past.

Third: On page 86 it is said: "It is the very essence of prophecy to address itself to the needs of the prophet's own age." This is true. Hence Dr. Driver should have been at more pains to give us a clear view of his conceptions of the needs of Isaiah's day, as related, or rather as unrelated, to the contents of this prophecy. He has done nothing of the kind, but goes off in a somewhat inconsequent manner to show that Isaiah's other utterances stand related to the needs of his own day, leaving the impression upon the reader's mind that such is not the case with the contents of these chapters. This, however, is manifestly the very point at issue, and ought to have been proved rather than introduced into the reader's mind by implication. It by no means follows, as the day the night, that because the events predicted in these chapters were not to occur for something like two hundred years, therefore the prediction of them could not have been called for that length of time before their occurrence. It must be admitted that Dr. Driver's argument, if it can be called such, limps painfully, if it proceeds, as it seems to proceed, upon the assumption that because the prophecy in these chapters would meet a felt want of those living about the close of the Babylonian exile, therefore it could not have met a felt need of those living one hundred and fifty or more years before that event. If any such impression has found a temporary lodgment in his mind, he has deceived himself.

Fourth: Again, in the same connection he adds: "It was the prophet's office to preach to his own contemporaries, to announce to them the judgments or the consolations, which arose out of the circumstances of their time, to interpret for them their own history." Was there, then, no consolation in the prediction of these chapters for those living in the time of Isaiah? It seems to be implied that there was not. Is the implication a fair one, however? It may be, but Dr. Driver has furnished no evidence of the fact. Then, again, it may not be, and in that event Dr. Driver's profound remark is not only irrelevant, but positively misleading. But, again, was it not the prophet's office to interpret for his contemporaries their past and their future, as well as their present history? Dr. Driver, as we have seen, believes in predictive prophecy, but what other office has such prophecy except to interpret for them their future history? And if this be true, how does it happen that Dr. Driver feels himself at liberty to assume that the prediction of deliverance from Babylonian exile would be without interest, significance or profit for the contemporaries of Isaiah? A little proof upon this point would go much further with thinking men than any amount of scholarly assertion or assumption.

Fifth: Again, on page 86 it is said: "To base a promise upon a condition of things *not yet existent*, and without any point of contact with the circumstances or situation of those to whom it is addressed, is alien to the genius of prophecy." We would tremble before the presence of "the genius of prophecy" here invoked to bolster up a weak cause, but we cannot repress a smile at the imposition which her learned conjurer has practiced upon himself in her name. Let us ask, is it the non-existence of the condition of things, or is it the lack of contact between it and the prophet's circumstances and situation which presents the difficulty to Dr. Driver's mind in the present case? If the latter, then we must insist that Dr. Driver's mere assertion, while exceedingly weighty, is not of the nature of proof. We venture to think that, Dr. Driver himself being judge, there is a most important point of contact between this prediction of deliverance and the situation in Isaiah's own time. But, if it be the non-existence of the con-

dition which is the bug-bear, then we confess to a feeling of surprise that Dr. Driver should take this position. Let it be remembered that he admits that Jeremiah predicted a return from exile. Was not this conditioned upon the going into exile, and remaining there until there were sentiments of repentance awakened in the hearts of the people? Was it not conditioned, also, upon the rise and victorious career of the Medo-Persian empire? Here, then, is at least one case in which a promise was based upon a condition of things not yet existent, viz., the captivity, and a state of repentance upon the part of the Jews, and the breaking of the power of Babylon by the Medes and Persians. Ezekiel does the same thing, and so do all the prophets, beginning with Samuel and those who follow after. Evidently what Dr. Driver had in mind was something like this: "To base a promise upon a condition of things not yet conceived, contemplated, or announced as going to exist, is alien to the genius of prophecy." But, if he had thought it worth his while to say this, who would have thought it worth while to notice it? Should it be said, however, that the Babylon of this prophecy was not conceived, contemplated, or announced as going to exist, at the time it is alleged to have been promulgated, then we will have somewhat to say in reply later on. We will only add here that we regard Dr. Driver as right in saying that "it is arbitrary to suppose (as has been done) that Babylon may have been mentioned by Isaiah as the representative of Assyria."

III. We come, now, to examine Dr. Driver's proof of his minor premise. That premise, as will be remembered, was: *the prophecy of these chapters has no intelligible relation to, or bearing upon, the interests of those who were contemporary with Isaiah.*

1. The first proposition which Dr. Driver lays down, presumably in support of this position, is that the contents of these chapters are "*unrelated to Isaiah's own age.*" As the italics are Dr. Driver's, we presume that he regards this proposition as one of importance.

(1.) The first comment that we have to offer here is, that Dr. Driver's language lacks clearness. Worse, it is characterized by a vicious ambiguity. It may mean any one of several things. It

may mean, for instance, that our prophecy is unrelated to *the needs* of the men of Isaiah's time. If so, it is merely an emphatic assertion of what ought to be proved. For, if this be his meaning, it is surely lame proof to say that "the Jews are not warned, as Isaiah might warn them (xxxix. 6) against the folly of concluding an alliance with Babylon, or reminded of the disastrous consequences which such an alliance might entail; nor are they even represented, as in Jeremiah, as threatened with impending exile; they are represented as *in exile* and as about to be delivered from it." All this may be true, and still, as we hope to show, the prophecy might have had direct and important bearings upon the personal needs of those who lived in Isaiah's day. We conceive, however, that the more probable meaning of Dr. Driver, when he says that this prophecy stands unrelated to Isaiah's own age, is that it is unrelated to the historical environment of Isaiah and his contemporaries, that it reflects a totally different historical situation, one in which the actual and relative positions of the several actors, as portrayed in our prophecy, differ entirely from those which obtained in the time of Isaiah. We infer that this is his meaning, because in this connection, and apparently as bearing upon this proposition, we are told that "his" (*i. e.*, Isaiah's) "prophecies" (*i. e.*, those found in the first twelve chapters of the book) "are replete with allusions to contemporary history, to Ephraim, Damascus, and the Assyrians; that history is the foundation upon which his grandest predictions rest. Here, on the other hand, all the allusions are not to Assyria, but to *Babylon*, not the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, who sought Hezekiah's friendship, which was known to Isaiah (xxxix.), but the Babylon of the exile, which held the Jews in cruel bondage (xiv. 2, 3), and was shortly to be destroyed by the Medes (xiii. 17)." Assuming, then, that we have correctly divined Dr. Driver's meaning, our next remark is—

(2.) In the light of his explanation, and more especially of his italics, the objection we are now considering seems singularly, and (we mean no disrespect) even ludicrously, irrelevant. The prophecy, be it remembered, relates, *no matter who wrote it*, to the deliverance of the Jews from their exile in Babylon. And

yet Dr. Driver tells us, not only with gravity, but with emphasis, that in these chapters the Jews "are represented as *in exile*"; and, more astonishing still, that "the allusions are not to Assyria, but to *Babylon*." This may be true, but it can scarcely be considered at all remarkable. The remarkable thing, it strikes us, would have been for Isaiah or any one else to predict a deliverance from exile without representing those whose deliverance was predicted as being in exile, or to predict a deliverance from exile in Babylon without alluding to Babylon. To require such a feat of Isaiah or of any other prophet would be worse than to require bricks to be made without straw. Dr. Driver, it seems to us, might, with a far greater show of reason, have laid the emphasis upon the words "*not the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan*." Had he done so, he would have conveyed some such idea as this: The relative and actual positions of the several parties concerned are so different, as set forth in these chapters, from what they were in the time of Isaiah, that such a picture as is here given would have been meaningless, and so, useless, to his contemporaries. The Babylon of Merodach-Baladan was upon terms of friendship with Judah. The two kingdoms stood upon very much the same footing as respects political importance and available resources. If anything, Judah had the advantage in all these particulars. Not only so, but the actual position of Babylon in the days of Isaiah was that of an Assyrian dependency. It was Assyria, and not Babylon, that filled the political horizon, and absorbed the universal attention of thinking men. Not for one hundred years after the time of Merodach-Baladan did Babylon rise to the position of what we would call a first-class power. During the whole of Isaiah's lifetime it continued to be relatively, if not absolutely, insignificant. But all this is reversed in our prophecy. Here "Babylon is represented as owning the empire of the world (xiii. 19; xiv. 6f.), which it exercises in particular (xiv. 1, 2) by holding the Jews in exile." Now, this is true, and the difficulty which it presents to the Isaianic authorship of chapters xiii. and xiv., if not insurmountable, is, at least, plausible. Assuming, then, that we have at last discovered the real point of Dr. Driver's objection, and reserving for the present some things we will have to

say as to its inherent irrelevancy to the issues before us, our next remark is that—

(3.) For those who, with Dr. Driver, admit the Isaianic authorship of Isaiah xxxix., the objection which we are now considering is robbed even of plausibility. There is a single fact which has evidently escaped the distinguished Oxonian, or he would have seen the futility of raising this objection here after recognizing the genuineness of Isaiah xxxix.

We refer to the fact that the Babylon of Isa. xxxix. 6-9 is not and cannot be the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, but it is and can be none other than the *Babylon of these chapters in miniature*. It cannot be the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, because, as we have seen, the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan was friendly to Judah, but the Babylon of Isaiah xxxix. is hostile, and holds the Jews in exile. It cannot be the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, for that Babylon was upon a footing of equality with Judah, but this equality no longer exists between Judah and the Babylon of Isaiah xxxix. It cannot be the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, for that Babylon was a dependency of Assyria, but the Babylon of Isaiah xxxix. is no dependency of Assyria, unless, indeed, the maid-servant is there represented as playing the rôle of mistress, and that, too, under the very nose of the mistress herself, and she a jealous one. None of the descendants of Hezekiah were going to be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon as long as Assyria held the reins of a world empire. The rise of the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan to the position of a world empire might have seemed incredible to the men of Isaiah's day, but Jewish eunuchs of royal blood standing in the palaces of the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan's day would have seemed simply ludicrous. The Babylon of Isaiah xxxix. cannot be the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan, because the terms of the prophecy in Isaiah xxxix. indicated clearly enough to Hezekiah that the prophet had his eye upon a Babylon yet to come. We can still almost hear the sigh of relief with which the good Hezekiah said, "There shall be peace and truth in my days." Evidently Dr. Driver has not duly considered the fact that Isaiah, in chapter xxxix., points out Babylon, not only as the place where Judah is to be carried into captivity, *but also as*

the power by which she is to be carried captive. Or else he has not duly considered what is involved in such a prediction. The fact is, that while Dr. Driver has made a noble fight for important truths, and upon certain vital points has held manfully to his moorings in the face of a well-nigh overwhelming flood of naturalism in high places—the fact, we say, is that to be perfectly consistent he ought to surrender his belief in the Isaianic authorship of chapter xxxix., or admit the Isaianic authorship of chapters xiii., xiv. His warm friend and admirer, Professor Cheyne, has quite recently twitted him in terms of painful plainness with being timid and vacillating, and, unkindest cut of all, with being out of harmony with the consensus of modern scholarship in reference to his views of predictive prophecy in general, and Isaiah xxxix. in particular.

(4.) But we go further, and are prepared to maintain that, even if the Babylon of chapters xiii., xiv. was not that of Merodach-Baladan, and the Babylon of chapter xxxix. was that of Merodach-Baladan, still Dr. Driver is no farther towards proving the non-Isaianic authorship of the former than he was before. As we have seen, he is unequivocally committed to the position that it is possible for a prophet to predict an event belonging even to the distant future. Where is the relevancy, then, in telling his readers that the Babylon of chapters xiii., xiv. is not the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan? Granted that it is not, granted that it is the Babylon of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, and Evil-Merodach, personages of whom neither Isaiah nor any of his contemporaries ever dreamed, still less ever heard, how does this prove that these chapters are not from Isaiah? Clearly it is not because God is incompetent to reveal to his servant the course of events during the times of these kings. Dr. Driver is as far removed from giving credence to such drivel as is any one. But doubtless he would remind us that the possible, in such a case, is not to be taken as the measure of the probable, certainly not of the proper. He would remind us that a prophet is not a fortune-teller, but a teacher sent from God, and that the *raison d'être* for each message must be sought in some lesson it would convey, some need that it would meet, and the only effect of such a prophecy as this from

the lips of Isaiah would have been to produce a vacant stare upon the faces of his countrymen and lead them to ask, What is he talking about? Has the poor fellow lost his wits?

As already pointed out, it is apparently with a view to establishing this last proposition that Dr. Driver informs us that the Babylon of these chapters was not the Babylon of Merodach-Baladan. But the careful reader will have observed that Dr. Driver nowhere takes the pains to prove that, if the Babylon of our prophecy is not that of Merodach-Baladan, then it could meet no want of the contemporaries of Isaiah. He seems to think that this is so clear that it may safely be taken for granted. But is he right? To answer this, permit us to ask another question: What was the *raison d'être* for the prediction of the exile, which, according to Dr. Driver, is made in chapter xxxix.? Was it uttered merely to wring with anguish the hearts of the godless, incorrigible, doomed multitude? Scarcely. Their hearts were not of the kind that could be so easily wrung. They were ever ready to say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Was it not rather mainly for the benefit of the godly, believing, indestructible, but still imperfect, remnant, that their hearts might be chastened, and so sanctified? Doubtless for their sakes. But if this remnant could be chastened by the prospect of an exile to come upon their posterity after they themselves were dead and in their graves, why might not they be cheered by the prospect that their posterity would be delivered from exile? Had there been a prediction of exile, without one of return from exile, might they not have fallen into blank, irremediable despair? Exile without return would have meant a perpetual casting out from the divine favor and a final dissolution of that covenant with God which was "all their hope and all their desire." If there was to be a remnant, godly and indestructible, then, having uttered his prediction of exile, Isaiah was, as it were, under necessity to predict a return, even though it should involve a reference more or less distinct to a Babylon different from that of Merodach-Baladan, for the vital element, the necessary aliment, of holiness, is hope; deprived of this, it must die. And let it be remembered that, according to Dr. Driver, if Isaiah has not predicted the return

from exile *in these chapters*, he has not predicted it anywhere. In the needs of the godly remnant, then, we find our "*nodus vindice dignus*." Upon his own principles, therefore, what right has Dr. Driver to deny the interposition of the "vindex"? If God may put into the mouth of his prophet a threat based upon "a condition of things not yet existent" (Isaiah xxxix. 6 f.), why should it be thought a thing impossible with God to base a promise upon a condition of things not yet existent? We think that we may fairly claim to have disposed of Dr. Driver's objection, so far as it rests upon this proposition. The further consideration of Dr. Driver's minor premise must be deferred for the present.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

Columbia, S. C.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 30.—OCTOBER, 1894.

I. DR. DRIVER ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH
XIII. AND XIV.

As shown in the first part of this paper,¹ the validity of Dr. Driver's conclusion as to the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters hinges upon the validity of the minor premise of his argument. That premise is embodied in the proposition, *the prophecy of these chapters has no intelligible relation to, or bearing upon, the interests of the contemporaries of Isaiah*. We have already noticed one of the propositions laid down by Dr. Driver, presumably in support of this position. We will now ask attention to some others which are laid down, presumably for the same purpose.

I. The first of these is expressed thus: "The circumstances of the exile—while the Jews were still in bondage, and the power of Babylon seemed yet unshaken—constitute a suitable and sufficient occasion for the present prophecy, an occasion of exactly the nature which the analogy of prophecy demands; on the other hand, the circumstances of Isaiah's age furnish no such occasion." Now, in reference to this proposition, there are several points that can scarcely fail to arrest the notice of the thoughtful reader: (1), The first is this: The sting of the proposition, if it has one, is in its tail. In other words, we may admit that the circumstances of the Jews, while still in bondage, constitute a suitable and sufficient occasion for the present prophecy, and the admission will be without prejudice to the position of those who maintain the Isaianic authorship of this passage, and without profit to those

¹ *Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1894.

who deny it. It would be lame logic, indeed, to affirm that, because the circumstances of the exile would have furnished a suitable and sufficient occasion for such a prophecy as we have here, *therefore*, the circumstances of Isaiah's age could have furnished no such occasion. It would be discourteous to impute such logic as this to a writer of Dr. Driver's eminent ability. If, however, the fact that the exile might have furnished a suitable and sufficient occasion for such a prophecy as the present does not prove that there might not have been a suitable and sufficient occasion for it in the days of Isaiah himself, it is hard to see what it can avail Dr. Driver to establish this part of his proposition. Evidently the whole weight of his argument against the Isaianic authorship of these chapters, so far as it is derived from this proposition, rests upon Dr. Driver's ability to show that "the circumstances of Isaiah's age" supply no suitable and sufficient occasion for them. We would not unnaturally expect him to give us the benefit of the considerations which have forced his own mind to this conclusion.

But the next thing that can scarcely fail to arrest the surprised attention of the thoughtful reader is, that, (2), Dr. Driver seems to expect his readers, one and all, to accept this vitally important part of his proposition upon his (*i. e.*, Dr. Driver's) mere assertion, and without one particle of proof. Indeed, it seems to be somewhat of an idiosyncrasy of our distinguished author, and other fellow-critics, to mistake their *conclusions*, especially when roundly and emphatically stated, for *arguments*. Unfortunately, however, there is a class of minds with whom the effect of such a method of argumentation is rather to produce amusement than to beget conviction. For instance, our own distinguished Dr. Briggs came perilously near making himself conspicuously ridiculous, when, after rehearsing an argument from the pen of Dr. A. A. Hodge, he proceeds to annihilate it by asking the momentous and decisive question, "But what does Biblical criticism say?" and then quoting as the utterances of this awful divinity some of his own ill-considered and unfounded assertions. If it should be said that it is hardly fair to require Dr. Driver, especially in such a case as this, to prove a negative, several things would have to be taken into consideration. In the first place, it may be admitted

at once that, if it is difficult under any circumstances to prove a negative, it will be doubly so in the present instance. Granted that God might put such a message as this in the mouth of Isaiah, and how easy it will be to conceive that the prophet either found or made an occasion for delivering it. The real question is, Had Isaiah a motive for such a message? Granted that he had, and it will be difficult indeed to persuade the average man of common sense that the circumstances of his age would furnish him no suitable or sufficient occasion for the utterance of it. It matters not that we may be unable to place our finger upon the veritable occasion itself, or even upon any probable occasion. Our ignorance is not to be made the measure of Isaiah's knowledge. He was probably more familiar with the circumstances of his own day than we are. But, again, if it is so difficult to prove a negative, would it not have been as well for Dr. Driver to have refrained from such a sweeping assertion? Having made it, however, there would seem to be nothing for him to do except to prove it, or recede from it. For hard as it may be on him to require him to prove what from the nature of the case he cannot prove, it would be harder still upon his readers to require them to accept as true a statement of fact for which confessedly there is and can be no evidence. But yet another thing will occur to the thoughtful reader: It is that, (3), Dr. Driver has himself pointed out at least the possible occasion of the utterance of this oracle. We do not say a suitable and sufficient occasion. For felicitous as is this phrase in its sound, we have misgivings as to whether Dr. Driver himself could define very accurately just what, even in his own estimation, would have constituted such an occasion. And we are more doubtful still as to whether he and Isaiah would have been of one mind upon this all-important point. If, however, the visit of the ambassadors of Merodach-Baladan furnished a suitable and sufficient occasion for the prediction of an exile to Babylon, then it will be hard indeed for most minds to see why that event, or some question called forth by Isaiah's prediction of exile, may not have furnished an occasion that would at least have warranted Isaiah in rounding off his message by predicting a return from exile. The wonder would have been had he failed to do so.

For nothing is more characteristic of the prophets in general, and of Isaiah in particular, than, after having announced a message of judgment, to follow it up with a word of hope. But, and this brings up for consideration another of the propositions by which Dr. Driver seeks to support his minor premise, we are told that while—

II. "The embassy of Merodach-Baladan, the temporary 'king' of Babylon, to Hezekiah afforded Isaiah a substantial motive for announcing (xxxix. 6) a *future* exile to Babylon, it could supply no motive for such a promise of *return* from exile as these chapters contain."

There are some things in this statement that we must pass by with a merely casual comment. That it is somewhat oracular in tone, after what we have already seen, need no longer surprise or disturb us. It is to be regretted, however, that along with the air of assumed authority it should partake of the not injudicious, though sometimes annoying and always suspicious, reserve and obscurity which so generally characterized the ancient oracle. One thing, and only one thing is clear, and that is clear, not because of Dr. Driver's authoritative assertion, but from the very nature of the case. We refer to the assertion that the embassy of Merodach-Baladan could afford "no motive for such a promise of *return* from exile as these chapters contain," nor, for that matter, for a promise of return in any conceivable form. It is not clear, however, what exactly is Dr. Driver's conception of a *motive*, and especially of a substantial motive. It is not clear either how the embassy of Merodach-Baladan could have furnished a *motive* for a prediction of exile. In fact, the reader is almost forced to the conclusion that, by a singular confusion of thought, the word *motive* has been used where *occasion* was intended. It will not be necessary to stop to prove that these things are in reality as wide apart as the poles. Often as they are confounded by superficial thinkers, such a crudity was not to have been expected in the present case. But, if occasion was what was meant, then while it is clear that the embassy of the king of Babylon would have furnished an occasion, or, if you please, a substantial occasion, whatever that may mean, "for

announcing a *future* exile," it is not clear why that event would not also have furnished an occasion "for such a promise of *return* from exile as these chapters contain." There seem to be but two possible grounds for such a position. One would be that the embassy from the king of Babylon led Hezekiah into a sin, which sin would furnish a most suitable occasion for an announcement of judgment, but a very unsuitable one for a promise of special divine interposition. This view, it must be confessed, is specious, but how narrow! Habit, if nothing else, would have prevented the prophet from stopping with the announcement of judgment. But more on this point later. It is enough to say in reply to such a view that it overlooks the obvious fact that the connection between an occasional cause and the effects which follow from it is, from the very nature of the case, loose, and, if the solecism may be pardoned, inconsequential. A careless hand turns a lever and lets on the water which sets in motion a dynamo, which in turn generates a current of electricity. Now, the effects of this current may be manifold, and divergent. All of them, moreover, will be determined by the will of another than him who started the current upon its course. Thus the unbelief of Ahaz became the occasion of the announcement of the birth of Immanuel. Dr. Driver seems to imply, however, that there are special features about this promise of return which preclude the idea that the embassy referred to could have afforded a suitable occasion for *it*. His language is: "It (*i. e.*, the embassy) could supply no motive for *such a promise* of return as these chapters contain." (We have taken the liberty of changing the position of the italics.)

Now this seems to admit that Isaiah might have given a promise of return *in some form*, only not in the form found in our prophecy. But, as a matter of fact, unless Isaiah predicts a return here and in chapters xl-lxvi, then he predicted an exile without giving any intimation of a return. The question will arise: Is this natural? Is it probable? We remark further, that if it is the promise of return found in these chapters which constitutes Dr. Driver's difficulty, we have at hand two simple, yet sovereign and approved, remedies, either of which would meet the case. The

promise it will be observed is contained, wholly contained, in verses 1, 2 of chapter xiv. Now, we might maintain, and that with the best of critical authority for the intrinsic propriety of the procedure, that these verses show traces of the hand of a redactor, who, by a few simple alterations just here, sought to recast an ancient and genuine prophecy of Isaiah so as to make it more entirely and impressively suited to the exigencies of those living in Babylon about the close of the exile; or, with equal propriety and support from critical authorities, we might pronounce these verses an interpolation. Why give the falsehood to the opening words of chapter xiii. for the sake of these two verses? Cut them out bodily and what is left will form an intelligible and symmetrical whole. It will be what xiii. 1, declares it to be, namely: "The burden of Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw." Why let go a stable tradition running back at least to the time when the Book of Isaiah received its present form, and launch ourselves upon the shifting currents of critical conjecture because of these two verses? If there is anything peculiar or suspicious about them, why not amend them? Why not cut them out, and let them go? We say, again, that, if we were determined to maintain the traditional view as to the authorship of these chapters, Dr. Driver's difficulty about the peculiarity of the promise found here need present no obstacle. And were we to resort to the hypothesis of a redactor, or an interpolation, there would be a poetic propriety in the defence. Tempting as is such an answer, however, we must refrain from having recourse to it, not merely because to employ it might have the appearance of poaching upon ground already pre-empted and posted by a certain school of critics, but principally because we feel an invincible mistrust of the reliability of an hypothesis which scatters its favors around with more compliance than the veriest prostitute. Heroic measures are for desperate cases. Let this hypothesis, albeit it would serve us as readily and as efficiently as it does them, remain in the service of those who have foregone conclusions to establish at all hazards. For ourselves, we prefer to bring our conceptions of what prophecy is into conformity with the record, rather than cut and carve the record until it squares with our preconceptions of

what prophecy ought to be. Reserving our right, then, to the benefits of this hypothesis, such as they may be, we decline to avail ourselves of them. We are prepared to admit that xiv. 1, 2 is an integral and an essential part of the prophecy. We are prepared to face the objections which Dr. Driver bases upon these verses, and abide the result. Let our first inquiry, then, be as to the peculiarity which marks out the promise of return here given as unsuited to the lips and time of Isaiah. It may simplify matters for us to place the very words of the promise before the eyes of the reader. This will enable him to judge for himself as to how peculiar it is. The promise, then, runs thus: "For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will again choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the stranger shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the people shall take them and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and for handmaids: and they shall take them captive whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors."

Now, can the reader believe it, this is all, absolutely all that there is in reference to the return of the Jews to their own land in the whole of these two chapters. What precedes is a vivid picture of the overthrow of Babylon. What follows is equally as vivid a picture of the contempt to which Babylon will be subjected when overthrown. We respectfully submit that the only peculiar thing that will appear upon reflection is, that Dr. Driver should have found any peculiarity about this promise. The peculiarity can hardly be in the thing promised, which is a return from exile in Babylon. Grant that Isaiah might predict an exile, and it seems arbitrary to say that he could not have predicted a return. As a matter of fact Dr. Driver says no such thing. But granted that Isaiah predicted an exile to Babylon, then, if he predicted a return at all, he must have predicted a return from an exile in Babylon. Just as little can the peculiarity be in the form of the promise. The terms employed are perfectly general. There is a marked absence of specific details. If Isaiah might have predicted a return, it is hard to see why he may not have employed some such language as this. It is hard to see how he could have

failed to use some such language. The peculiarity can scarcely be in the substance of the promise, so far as it relates to the circumstances attending the return. The substance of the promise from this point of view is thus admirably stated by Dr. Driver: "They will return to Palestine under such changed conditions that foreigners will now claim eagerly the privilege of incorporation in their community, and the nations will press forward to offer them an honorable escort upon their journey." What is there here, however, more than constitutes the very staple of prophecy as it bears upon the future of the people of God? The same words would answer for a statement of the substance in Isaiah x. 5; xii. 6; or Jer. l., li. 58. It matters not that Dr. Driver has come to regard the latter passage as dating from the exile. He does not assign it to that period simply because it breathes a confident assurance that Israel will yet hold the religious, or, if any one so chooses, the political, supremacy of the world. This belief was not born during the exile. It is not the setting of the promise which constitutes the objectionable peculiarity. If Isaiah might predict a return, it is at least conceivable that he might preface his prediction of this event with an announcement of the overthrow of Babylon. Why not? The return could hardly be expected so long as Babylon retained her supremacy.

Is it the tone of evident joy with which the announcement of the destruction of Babylon and the restoration of Israel is made that is the peculiarity of which we are in search? If so, then admit the existence of even a modicum of either patriotism or piety in the bosom of the prophet, and all difficulty at once vanishes. We have touched upon these points, not because they seem to us to have any real merit in them, but simply because Dr. Driver seems disposed in an indirect and vague sort of way to make something out of them.

What, then, is the peculiarity which forbids our regarding this prediction as from Isaiah? Certain it is that it is not to be found in the promise of return, as such. As little is it to be found in the general features of the setting in which the promise of return is imbedded. Evidently, if it exists at all, it must be sought elsewhere.

Before pursuing our quest further, however, it will not be amiss to dwell briefly upon a somewhat different point which Dr. Driver's statement thrusts upon our attention. Intentionally, or unintentionally, he has raised this question: Had Isaiah a substantial motive for uttering such a prediction as that of these chapters? Now, this strikes us a most pertinent and important inquiry; and we can but regret that Dr. Driver has given it so little of his attention. It is much more important and tangible than the question of occasion. For granted that Isaiah had a substantial motive for this prediction, and he would have been a pitiful fellow indeed if he failed to find a suitable occasion for making it. We press the question then: Had Isaiah a sufficient motive for the prediction under consideration? Were we seeking the occasion of the prophecy we would have to scan all the historical circumstances which might have given rise to it, which might, so to speak, have furnished a point of contact between the prophet's present and the future which he is to disclose. Not so, however, when we inquire for the motive impelling him. Here we must endeavor to put our finger upon that, whatever it may have been, which influenced him to embrace the opportunity furnished by what we call the occasion. Now, since every prophecy may and must be regarded as a means to some end, whatever leads the prophet to desire and seek that end will constitute a motive for uttering the prophecy.

What was there, then, to influence Isaiah to utter such a prediction as that before us? If it is from Isaiah, what end did he hope to accomplish by it? Now, we submit that the answer to such questions as these is not reasonably to be sought in the political occurrences of Isaiah's time. It is not to be restricted to effects to be produced upon his own contemporaries. Why might not the prophet have desired to do somewhat for those who were to come after him? It is fairly to be sought in the purposes of that God whose servant the prophet was. Those purposes reached far beyond the prophet's own time. Such, indeed, is the relation of the present to the future, that God always deals with the present, with his eye upon the future. If, then, we would know the motive of the prophet in any given case, we must in-

quire how that case stands related to the purpose of God. The purpose of God here we know, because he had announced it. It was, amid all the vicissitudes, and notwithstanding all the defections of his chosen people, to preserve and perpetuate a remnant that would serve as a holy seed for the church of the future. Now, let it be borne in mind that not only was the exile a means to that end, but so also was the *threat* of the exile; not only was the restoration a means to this end, but so also was the *promise* of a restoration. If asked, then, for the dominant motive, the divine motive for chapters xiii., xiv., we answer that it is the same as that which prompted to the utterance of chapter xxxix. The embassy of Merodach-Baladan may have furnished an occasion for the latter, but we must look deeper, and in a wholly different quarter for the motive. If any one asks for the relations between these particular utterances and the end specified, we answer that God rules men, and accomplishes his purposes through rational motives. These for present purposes may be reduced to two, viz.: fear and hope. The leaven of apostasy was actually at work in Isaiah's day. Had no check been put upon it, universal defection would have been the certain result. But, if the question be pressed, why this particular threat of a deportation to Babylon? we answer that the same God who gave the prophecy was shaping the history. To ask why he so shaped the history would be but a fruitless impertinence. The only question with which we have any concern is, Why, having determined upon this special discipline, did he announce it so long beforehand? Dr. Driver has not troubled himself apparently to find an answer to that question. Our answer, if permitted to suggest one, would be, the time for the judgment not having arrived, but the need of its influence being already imperative, he announced it thus long beforehand because he foresaw that the threat of judgment would, in its measure, exert the same powerful and salutary influence in restraining and correcting the tendency to apostasy that would be exerted by the judgment itself when it actually fell. So much for the threat of Isaiah xxxix. 6, which is admitted to be from the prophet himself, and not from another. But what of the motive for chapters xiii., xiv.? We answer that man cannot

live the life of God by threats alone. We are saved not only in hope, but by hope. The restoration was as essential a part of God's plan as was the exile, and the promise as essential to the preservation and perpetuation of the remnant as was the threat. In order that there might be a remnant, those who were to compose the remnant must from the time of Isaiah on, and all the more as things went from bad to worse, have some reasonable assurance that God would not cast off forever. For Isaiah to have created in the hearts of his contemporaries the feeling that they were rejected of God, would have been fatal to the very end he must have had in view when he uttered the threat of chapter xxxix. 6. The godless are sure to become ungodly. Such being the relation which existed between the matter of these chapters and the purpose of God, we venture to find in the piety and patriotism of the prophet the substantial motive that influenced Isaiah to utter them. Or, to state the case somewhat differently, the mere announcement of a captivity to Babylon (xxxix. 6) would have created needs in the hearts of the people, the desire to meet which would have constituted a substantial motive for the utterance of the prediction of chapters xiii., xiv.

But further, before dismissing this point it may be worth our while to look at it from another and lower standpoint. Given the prediction of chapter xxxix. 6 from the lips of Isaiah, and his mere pride of consistency would have been a motive for the utterance of that of chapters xiii., xiv. Let us look at the situation: The prophet is standing near the close of his career, relatively near, at least. He had, at the beginning of his course, struck two notes loud and clear. One of them was a note of warning and judgment. It was not vague and general. In at least one particular it was sharply, painfully definite. The judgment was to be progressive, and was not to cease until it culminated in the devastation of the land and the *deportation of the people*. By whom the judgment would be effected, where the people would go into exile, he does not then declare. But he staked his reputation as a prophet upon the certainty of an exile when he named his son Shear-jashub. Isaiah's doctrine of a "remnant" is universally recognized, but its true significance

seems to have been much overlooked. It is said that he teaches that though "divine justice requires that its unworthy members should be swept away," still "the chosen nation is imperishable"; and again, that "the approach of trouble or danger throws him back upon the thought of the permanence of the nation." Now, we submit that this is not only inadequate, but a wholly misleading account of Isaiah's doctrine of the "remnant." It is worse than the play of Hamlet with the part of the noble Dane omitted. Isaiah's doctrine is not that a "remnant" shall remain after the overflowing scourge has swept by, but that a "remnant *shall return.*" And "Shear-jashub" meant nothing unless it meant that the nation should go into captivity. To this position the prophet committed himself in what may be called his inaugural (vi.), whether it was uttered before chapters i.-v. or not. It was subsequently reaffirmed with all solemnity (vii. 3). In the closing year of Jotham the judgment strokes began to fall. In the reign of Ahaz the culmination seems to be imminent. Ephraim and Syria combine to afflict Judah. The prophet, however, from the mouth of God, declares that the fears which have seized upon king and people alike are ungrounded. In effect, he affirms that the end is not yet. Later the Assyrian comes down upon Judah "like a wolf on the fold." Again the prophet, from the mouth of God, assures Hezekiah that the end is not yet. Time passes on. The prosperity of Judah revives, and it begins to look as if the "consummation, and that determined," which the prophet declared he had heard from the Lord, were not going to take place at all. But again the prophet, with sublime confidence in the God of revelation, stands forward and declares, in the face of present prosperity, that the consummation determined will yet be accomplished. By revelation from God, he describes in a province at that time a dependency of Assyria the power by which, and in the capital of that province the place in which, the long-deferred judgment is to be executed. With sublime consistency he stands forward before king and court, and projecting his vision upon the near future, *if it can be proved*, or upon "the shifting future," if there is comfort for any in that way of viewing it, or speaking as one not knowing whether the event about to be predicted be-

longed to the nearer or to the relatively remote future, holding himself, in a word, "*independent of time*," and concerned only to impress those who heard him with the dread certainty of the event itself, he declares: "Behold the days come, that all that is in thine house . . . shall be carried to Babylon: nothing shall be left, saith the LORD of hosts. And of thy sons shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the kings of Babylon." One thing, then, is certain, and that is, that Isaiah, to the very end of his career, adhered consistently to the note of judgment, sounded at its beginning. But when this note was first struck it was accompanied by another, a note of hope; and during his subsequent ministry, as often as the former note was sounded it was invariably followed by the latter. This is a recognized characteristic of his style. He makes no threat but he relieves its gloom by some word of promise. By the time of Hezekiah this habit of his must have become, as it were, a second nature. Why, then, should it be thought a thing incredible that Isaiah should predict a return from exile? Consistency demanded that he should do this very thing. Had he failed to do so, how could he ever have had the courage to look again into the face of his own son, "Shear-jashub"? Alas for the prophet, if, in his old age, he should have been compelled to disown his son, or else ask for an act of the Sanhedrin changing his name to "Lo-shear-jashub." When Isaiah uttered the prediction of chapter xxxix. 4-7, he committed himself to some such prediction as that found in chapters xiii., xiv. If the former was spoken "out of his own heart," there is no assignable reason why he should have hesitated to venture upon the latter. If the former was spoken by revelation from God, it is hard to see why the same may not be true of the latter. Certainly there was no lack of motive for some such prediction. Having uttered chapter xxxix. 4-7, he had gone too far not to feel that he would have to go further. Had he not done so, every scoffer in Jerusalem would have plucked him by the skirt of his garment and said: "Accept our sympathy. We have long been expecting the demise of poor Shear-jashub, and now it seems that he is dead."

III. It will be proper in the next place to notice the only posi-

tive evidence of the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters which Dr. Driver, with all his learning and ingenuity, has been able to produce. It consists in certain indications of time, supposed to be furnished in the very body of the prophecy itself. What these are, and what their supposed significance, he himself shall be permitted to state. We are told, for one thing, that "they (*i. e.*, the Jews) are represented as *in exile*, and as about to be delivered from it" (xiv. 1, 2). Let the reader note the assertion here made. It is that those addressed were actually in exile. Let him also notice the proof adduced. It is found in the words, "For the LORD will have compassion on Jacob and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the stranger shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the peoples shall take them and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and for handmaids: and they shall take them captive, whose captives they were: and they shall rule over their oppressors." Again, in substantially the same vein, we are told: "Undoubtedly Babylon came within Isaiah's 'historical horizon'; but in order to vindicate Isaiah's authorship it must be shown that it came within it in a manner suited to form the occasion for *this particular prophecy*, viz., as the power which held the Jews in the thralldom of exile, and was destined ere long to be destroyed." And so, commenting upon chapter xiii. 17, Dr. Driver says: "Lit., Behold, *I am stirring up*, of the imminent future as chapter xvii. 1, &c." And once more we are told: ". . . The busy populous city shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: its castles and palaces of luxury will become the resort of wolves and jackals. And why all this? The prophet supplies the answer (xiv. 1, 2), *Because the time has come for Israel to be released from exile.*" Now, from these statements it is clear that Dr. Driver maintains that the fair implication, indeed the only fair implication, of the language used by the prophet is, that at the time it was uttered Babylon was in actual possession of the empire of the world, that the Jews were actual exiles in Babylon, that the time of their deliverance was actually drawing rapidly near, and that the fall of Babylon was an event

actually imminent. If this be true, then of course Isaianic authorship is out of the question. But it must be observed,

(1), It is one thing to show that the prophet *represents* the Jews as in exile, and the fall of Babylon as imminent, and quite a different thing to show that when the prophet uttered these words those addressed were actually in exile, and the fall of Babylon an event actually imminent. This is evident. For clearly there is such a thing as a prophet uttering his prediction not from his own actual historical present, but from an assumed present. He may, in a word, transfer himself, for the nonce, into the future, and then speak from it as though it were his own actual present, as though he and his contemporaries were themselves actors in the scenes which he depicts. Nor is there anything surprising about such a procedure. Every poet feels at liberty to do the same. The end aimed at is so obvious that everyone sees it at once, and so proper that no one questions it. In no other way can the prophet secure such effective vividness and dramatic force. Dr. Driver himself admits the validity of this procedure, and recognizes the fact that it was employed by the prophets. Thus he tells that throughout a considerable portion of the prophecy contained in chapters xxiv.—xxvii., the prophet speaks “not from his own standpoint, but from that of the redeemed nation in the future, expressing in its name the feelings of gratitude and devotion which he imagines that it will naturally entertain, and confessing the disappointment which the failure of its own exertions had brought upon it.” But, if in that prophecy the prophet assumed his standpoint in the future, why may not the author of these chapters, whoever he was, have done the same? If it be admitted, however, that the prophet is here speaking not from his own actual historical present, but from an assumed present, then several things are at once clear: It is clear, for instance, that he might have assumed his present in the distant, rather than in the near future. It is clear that what was really imminent from his assumed present might have been far distant from his own actual present. It is clear that Isaiah might have been the author of these chapters, even though he did for good reason choose to represent the exile as in progress and the fall of Babylon as an event near at hand. Hence

the question emerges, Does the prophet, whoever he may be, who gave us this prophecy, speak from his own absolute present, or does he speak from an assumed present, which is, in reality, future? The answer to this question must determine the validity or invalidity of Dr. Driver's position. But here it must be observed that,

(2), Dr. Driver has furnished no evidence whatever that the prophet is speaking from his own, rather than from an assumed, present. Let us see. One of the two passages which he cites is chapter xiii. 17. Now let the reader compare with this passage Genesis vi. 17. He will find that the construction is identically the same in each case, viz., the particle הַהֵנָּה with the participle. And yet according to interpreters generally, the flood was one hundred and twenty years in the future when God spoke to Noah. Further, a reference to Harper's *Elements of Hebrew Syntax* will assure the reader that Dr. Driver is an interpreter out of his own heart when he says of chapter xiii. 17: "Lit., Behold, *I am stirring up*, of the imminent future." The doctrine laid down by Harper and confirmed by Gesenius, yes, and by Dr. Driver also, is, that "the participle is used in the description of a state or action belonging to the sphere of the *future*, thus represented as beginning, and hence *certain*; only the context determining whether there is reference to a near or to a remote future" (the italics after the word certain are ours). But, if this doctrine be true, what warrant does this passage furnish for raising a question as to the Isaianic authorship of these chapters? Dr. Driver is not more fortunate in the only other passage he cites in proof of his position. He gives an admirable summary of the prophet's description of the desolation which is to overtake Babylon. This he concludes with the rhetorical question, "And why is all this?" He proceeds to say, "The prophet supplies the answer (xiv. 1, 2), Because the time *has come* for Israel to be released from exile: 'for Jehovah will have compassion upon Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and will settle them in their own land.'" We submit, however, that inspection will show that it is Dr. Driver, and not the prophet, who supplies this much desiderated answer. The idea of *time*, even of *relative time*, to say nothing of *absolute and actual time*, seems to be wholly absent from chapter xiv. 1, 2. The language evi-

dently refers not to the *imminence* of Israel's deliverance from exile, but to the *certainty* of her restoration to the divine favor. Let the reader examine in the light of its context, Zech. ii. 12, "And Jehovah shall inherit Judah in the holy land, and shall again choose Jerusalem," and say whether the prophet there refers to an event belonging to the impending future. But if not in Zechariah, then why here? The language is almost identically the same. We are justified, therefore, in saying that Dr. Driver has failed to produce any evidence from the body of the prophecy that the prophet was speaking from the standpoint of his own actual present. But we may go further, and say that,

(3), The body of the prophecy furnishes evidence that the prophet is not speaking from his own actual present, but from an assumed present. Such is manifestly the case in the taunt-ode which he puts in the mouth of redeemed Israel (xiv. 4ff). The same is true of the opening words of the prophecy (xiii. 2-6), where the prophet, speaking of what is certainly future, nevertheless describes it as though it were occurring under his very eye. But stronger and seemingly decisive evidence of the fact that the prophet is speaking from an assumed present is that furnished by a single clause in chapter xiv. 3. The entire verse reads, "And it shall come to pass in the day that the LORD shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy trouble, and from the hard service wherein *thou wast made to serve.*" It seems practically incredible that the prophet, if he were addressing those who even while he spoke were experiencing the gall and bitterness of oppression, should have said, "wherein *thou wast made to serve,*" thus referring to evils that they were groaning under at that very moment as a thing of the past. Certainly we would have expected him to say, "wherein thou art being made to serve." The Hebrew, however, will not bear this rendering. The verb (עָבַר) is a perfect, and is here correctly rendered as a past. Had the prophet been referring to experiences of contemporaries he would almost certainly, if not necessarily, have employed either an imperfect or a participle. The time indications in the body of the prophecy, then, so far as they are positive, and not wholly neutral, point to the conclusion that the prophet is speaking not from his own his-

torical present, but from an assumed present. This being the case, we again raise the question, and leave it with the reader, Why may not these chapters have proceeded from Isaiah?

IV. We come next to notice a concession made not only by Dr. Driver, but by all critics, even the most radical. It is, at least so it strikes the present writer, a concession of the utmost importance, and yet, strange to say, its importance is universally overlooked. If any are surprised when we state it, we can only say that we trust that they will be even more surprised before we dismiss it, surprised not that we should emphasize, but that Dr. Driver and his confreres should have overlooked, its significance. It is admitted, then, that we have some prophecies which are the genuine productions of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, a veritable historical personage, who exercised his prophetic functions during the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. Now we make bold to affirm that, admitting even this much, the critics must go further and admit the genuineness of the chapters under consideration; and that, venturing to deny the Isaianic authorship of these chapters, they render it impossible to adduce even probable evidence of the existence to-day of a single genuine Isaianic prophecy. Let us see. Does Dr. Driver, then, accept chapters i.-xii. as genuine upon the evidence furnished by the inscription (i. 1)? If so, the inscription of chapters xiii., xiv. (see xiii. 1) vouches with equal force for their genuineness. Does he accept chapters i.-xii. upon the authority of a continuous tradition ascribing them to Isaiah, the son of Amoz? There is the same evidence for the genuineness of chapters xiii., xiv. Is his conviction determined by the style of chapters i.-xii? Then the question arises, How are we to judge as to Isaiah's style until we have some writings which we are sure came from Isaiah's hand? Authorship must be established before there can be any argument from style. There is danger that critics may reason in a circle just here. Is it upon internal evidence that Dr. Driver assigns chapters i.-xii. to Isaiah, and for lack of it that he declines to admit the Isaianic authorship of chapters xiii., xiv? If so, several questions emerge: *First*, What is the nature of this internal evidence? It seems to be the agreement or supposed agreement existing between the matter of

chapters i.—xii. and the course of events in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah as learned from the Scriptures and confirmed by the testimony of the monuments. In a word, it resolves itself into the suitability of the matter of these chapters to the times of these kings. But can we prove that Isaiah wrote these prophecies merely by proving that the matter of them would have been suitable to the times in which he lived? Suitableness may determine the time at which a given writing was produced, but can it determine the person by whom it was produced? Further, who shall determine what constitutes suitability in such a case as this? The compiler must have regarded chapters xiii., xiv. as suitable to the times of Isaiah, or certainly he would not have put them in the mouth of Isaiah. Dr. Driver regards Isaiah xxxix. as suitable to the times of Isaiah, and so assigns it to that prophet. Dr. Cheyne declares it unsuited to the mouth of Isaiah, and laments the timidity of his learned and greatly admired friend of Oxford in yielding so much to conservative prejudice. Verily it looks as if the maxim, "*de gustibus,*" etc., held in the case of the critics as well as of others. But, again, will mere suitability establish even the time when, let alone the person by whom, a writing was produced? Was there ever a skilful forger who did not look well to this point? Verisimilitude along such broad lines as those laid down by Dr. Driver, and he cannot lay down any except the broadest, our present information does not warrant it,—verisimilitude along these lines would be within the ability of a bungler. Suitableness to the times environment of the prophet! Do we not hasten on in critical matters to a time similar to that spoken of in Judges, a time when every man will *think* that that is right in his own eyes? And are there not some so foolish as to regard such a time as one of ideal intellectual freedom? They readily enough perceive that when every man does that that is right in his own eyes liberty has passed into license, and anarchy stands at the door, or rather has already entered, and is preparing the way as fast as she can for despotism. It does not seem to occur to them, however, that lawless thinking is just as hateful, and not less injurious, than lawless acting. Freedom of thought is a blessed boon for which our fathers did

wisely to die. God forbid that we should exchange it for intellectual anarchy. But to return, does Dr. Driver base his acceptance of the Isaianic authorship of chapters i.-xii., and his rejection of such authorship for chapters xiii., xiv., upon the ground that in the case of the former the external evidence is confirmed and corroborated by the internal, while this is not true of the latter? This looks plausible, at least upon the surface. We should not forget, however, that, while a house may have, and may need, both a foundation and buttresses, it must have a foundation. Further, when certain material has been appropriated for the foundation, it cannot at the very next turn be used for buttresses. Dr. Driver will have to decide whether he is going to use the external or the internal evidence as the foundation of his faith in the Isaianic authorship of chapters i.-xii.

He cannot use the internal evidence for this purpose. This, as we have already seen, will not even furnish a stable foundation for the belief that these chapters were originally promulgated in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, still less can it furnish us even plausible grounds for crediting them to the person known as Isaiah, the son of Amoz. But how about the external evidence? Let it be remembered that in the last analysis this resolves itself into nothing more or less than the testimony of the person, or persons, whoever these may be, who compiled or edited the book which bears the name of Isaiah, and gave it its present form and contents. Now it will at least be admitted that if the testimony of this witness, or of these witnesses, is to furnish a solid foundation for a rational belief in the Isaianic authorship of chapters i.-xii., it can only be because the character and competency of the witness affords a solid foundation for confidence in his testimony. What, then, about the character and competency of these long-forgotten, but now famous, redactors? Suppose that upon the best of evidence they are proven to be not only incompetent, but swift witnesses, will their testimony avail as a foundation for a rational belief in the Isaianic authorship of chapters i.-xii.? Now, fortunately, we are in a position to speak with entire confidence upon this point. The critics who, so to speak, created these redactors, or who, at any rate, redeemed

them from the well-nigh hopeless oblivion to which their modesty and the ingratitude of an uncritical past had consigned them, the critics, we say, have made a special study of their motives and methods, and have followed their all but invisible footsteps through many an intricate maze. Hence the critics, if anyone, are prepared to give what might be called expert testimony upon this most important point. The critics, then, shall speak. Take for instance R, R₁, R₂, and the rest of the goodly company of redactors who have been given such a conspicuous place in the Pentateuchal controversy. The critics have put them through all their paces, and some very interesting ones they have, and what is the result? Simply this: While the public is greatly divided as to whether they were the shrewdest literateurs and most arrant liars that the world has ever seen, or merely arrant fools with the best of intentions and unprecedented luck, while the public, we say, are still divided upon this perplexing question, there is not a shadow of a doubt in anybody's mind, and least of all in the minds of their friends, the critics, upon the one point vital to our present contest. That single point upon which there is universal agreement is, that the statement of a redactor in reference to a matter of fact is at least as likely to be wrong as it is to be right. The correctness of this proposition is well-nigh fundamental to the very existence of the most approved schools and methods of modern criticism. What evidence have we, then, that the redactor of Isaiah is more reliable, or, if you please, more fortunate, than any one of the many Rs of the Pentateuch? But, again, Canon Cheyne has recently proved, at least to his own satisfaction, that the editor, or editors, of the Book of Psalms were either themselves deceived, or else attempted to practice a deception upon others, almost every time they touched a Psalm. But what evidence have we that the editor of the book bearing the name of Isaiah was either better informed or more fortunate than they? None whatever. On the contrary, we have unimpeachable evidence to justify the assertion that, whatever may have been his intentions, he is utterly untrustworthy. Canon Driver tells us that in assigning the material making up this book to Isaiah the editor was guided not by information but by conjecture. He also tells

us that in thirty-five out of sixty-six conjectures he blundered most egregiously, assigning to the times of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, and to the mouth of Isaiah, productions which belong to the time of the exile, and proceeded from some Great Unknown, or several such. Canon Cheyne makes the case even worse for this unhappy editor of our unfortunate prophet.

Now all this would be bad enough, even if this poor editor had expressed himself with some caution and reserve, and had stated somewhere in the book that he was merely giving us his best judgment in the premises. But he does not. On the contrary, it is evident that he is quite as confident that he is right in one conjecture as in another, quite as confident that he is right throughout, as Canons Driver and Cheyne are that he has missed it in a majority of instances. But this very confidence which he has in himself is ruinous to him in proportion as we have confidence in the critical conclusions of Canons Driver and Cheyne. And now we ask again, will Dr. Driver make the testimony of such a witness as this, a witness whom he has himself impeached and shown to be utterly untrustworthy, the basis for a rational belief in the Isaianic authorship of chapters i-xii.? Is it said that the very supposition with which we started has been forgotten? That that supposition was that it was neither the internal evidence by itself, nor the external evidence by itself, but the two together as mutually corroborating and confirming one the other, that lays a foundation for a rational belief in Isaiah's authorship of chapters i-xii.? We reply, no, this has not been forgotten. But we have yet to learn that nil added to naught, or multiplied by naught, or combined with naught in any conceivable way, will produce anything but naught. We have shown that the internal evidence in the present case, if it bears upon anything, bears solely upon the question of time, and not at all upon that of authorship. We have shown that the external evidence establishes neither time nor authorship. When neither give authorship it is hard to see how they can mutually confirm and corroborate one the other so as to assure us that Isaiah, the son of Amoz, was the person who produced chapters i.-xii. of the collection of prophecies at present ascribed to him. Dr. Driver must, therefore, either admit that

chapters xiii., xiv. are from Isaiah, the son of Amoz, or else admit that we have no sufficient warrant for ascribing chapters i.–xii. to him.

In concluding this somewhat prolonged discussion of a small and relatively unimportant part of the prophecy of Isaiah, the writer feels that he owes it to himself to say, that he has aimed at something more, and more important, than the vindication of the Isaianic authorship of these chapters. He has aimed to show that, notwithstanding his great learning, Dr. Driver evinces not only a lack of clearness in his statements, but a lack of clearness in his mental processes. This vice, we need scarcely say, is not likely to be found confined to this one alone of all his discussions. Again, he has aimed to show that Dr. Driver has what might almost be called a habit of floating a proposition which, taken by itself, few would admit, by linking it on to another which, taken by itself, few would deny. Further, we have aimed to show that Dr. Driver's conclusions in too many instances rest for their validity not upon evidence or weight of argument, but simply and solely upon the authority of his own *ipse dixit*. Not only so, but we have tried to show that Dr. Driver himself has been led to these conclusions not by the principles which he lays down, nor by the phenomena presented in the prophecy, but mainly under the influence, doubtless not suspected by himself, of his prepossessions. Finally, we have endeavored to make it patent to all that Dr. Driver cannot successfully impugn the genuineness of any portion of this grand book without cutting from under himself and others all ground for rational confidence in the *Isaianic* authorship of the rest of it. The reader must be left to judge how far we have succeeded. But clearly, if we have succeeded, we have attained much more important results than vindicating to Isaiah the authorship of chapters xiii., xiv.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

Columbia, S. C.